By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 8144) granting a pension to Wesley Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8145) granting an increase of pension to Alfred O. Bragg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 8146) granting a pension to Sarah E. McVay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8147) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 8148) granting an increase of pension to Hadley S. Horth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8149) granting a pension to Anna E. Hudson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 8150) granting an increase of pension to Daniel P. Myers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 8151) for the relief of Emma Beaudry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UPSHAW: A bill (H. R. 8152) for the relief of the parents of Jeanette Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8153) for the relief of the widow of Walter D. McDonald; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8154) granting a pension to Thomas A. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 8155) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8156) granting a pension to Mary L. Ford; 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. BURROUGHS: Petition of 56 residents of Manchester, N. H., advocating the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Federal Employees' Union of Vallejo, Calif., in favor of a 40-hour week in the navy yards of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of National Tuberculosis Association against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of American Federation of Labor, opposing legislation abridging or restricting the constitutional rights of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of common council of the city of Milwaukee urging legislation to reduce the high cost of living, especially fuel, clothing, and foodstuffs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, of Appleton, Wis., favoring immediate action to reduce high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOODYKOONTZ: Papers to accompany House bill 6966, granting a pension to Sarah J. Holley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 7136, granting increase of pension to I. M. Conley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Petition of Business Men's League of Clarksville, Ark., protesting against the repeal of the zone postal rates on second-class periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS: Papers to accompany House bill 7679; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: Petition of members of St. Josephat's Congregation, of Loup City, Nebr., against the bill introduced by Senator MYERS to prohibit admission to the mails of the United States of newspapers, magazines, or publications printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., of Jugo-Slav nativity or descent, requesting a just settlement of all territorial disputes between Italy and Jugo-Slavia by application of the principle of self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of 148 citizens of York County, Nebr., urging Congress not to adopt any form of universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Local Union No. 131, Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, Pittsburgh, Pa., expressing its disapproval of war-time prohibition and urging that the present mild beer of 2¾ per cent alcohol should be exempt from the provisions of the eighteenth amendment, and also from the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of common council of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to high cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of Civil War veterans, of Cameron, W. Va., requesting increase in pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of United States League of Local Building and Loan Associations at their convention, at Detroit, Mich., July 24, 1919, favoring the passage of House bill 6371; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Chicago Clearing House Association opposing the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Farmers' National Congress favoring passage of House bill 7348; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Refactories Traffic Association of the St. Louis district urging support of the Poindexter bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Refactories Traffic Association, of St. Louis district, urging support of the Poindexter bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Chicago Clearing House Association, opposing the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of delegates of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, urging legislation to better working conditions for employees at the navy yards of the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of District Grand Lodge of New England, Knights of Pythias, of the Eastern and Western Hemispheres, colored, urging legislation to protect and guarantee fair play to the colored race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of National Civil Liberties Bureau, by Albert De Silver, director, New York, urging consideration of resolutions adopted by the American Federation of Labor; the National Woman's Trade Union League; and the Workers' Defense Union, protesting against Senate bill 1686 and House bill 6545, or any other peace-time legislation punishing sedition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hon. Frank O. Lowden, Governor of Illinois, calling attention to communication received by him from Dr. S. A. Forbes, State entomologist, concerning the enormous damages by the insect known as the European corn borer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of National Foreign Trade Council, by O. K. Davis, secretary, urging negotiation of a parcel post to Cuba and to that end in removal of Treasury regulation now preventing the importation of cigars in certain lots; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of A. J. Baldwin, care McGraw-Hill Co., New York, urging retention of zone postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Committee on Uniform Judicial Procedure of the American Bar Association, by Eugene L. Garey, lawyer, Chicago, urging passage of Senate bill 1214 authorizing the Supreme Court of the United States to make rules governing the procedure in cases at law to the same extent that it already has power to regulate the procedure of equity, admiralty, and bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., by Milton H. Smith, president, Louisville, Ky., protesting against any such legislation as Senate bill 5679 introduced March 3, 1919, because such bill empowers wire companies to encumber in perpetuity the properties of railroads by appropriating rights of way; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *August 2, 1919.*

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

Almighty God, Thou hast given to us our life. In this brief span of human experience Thou dost call us with the stern and solemn demands of stewardship to answer to Thee for the acts of our lives. It is but a step between time and eternity. We are moving on to the unfolding of the divine plan that reaches out into the never-ending world. All the solemn responsibilities of life together press upon us. Grant us this day to live in the light of the eternal issues. By the grace of God may we measure up to the duties of the day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

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. 7500) to protect the coastwise trade of the United States, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution rescinding the action taken under concurrent resolution of July 28, 1919, providing for the adjournment of the House from Saturday, the 2d day of August, until Tuesday, the 9th day of September, 1919, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2847. An act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind;

H. R. 5228. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Minneapolis, a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 5418. An act increasing the pay of printers and pressmen employed in the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5648. An act for the construction of a bridge across the Rainy River between Spooner, Minn., and Rainy River, Province of Ontario, Canada;

H. R. 6342. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River at the town of Usk, in the State of Washington;

H. R. 6434. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River about 2 miles above its confluence with the Washita River, near Preston, Grayson County, Tex.;

H. R. 6438. An act authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga.;

H. R. 6450. An act to amend an act entitled "An act 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";

H. R. 6692. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Forsyth, Mo.; and

H. R. 6805. An act to authorize the county of Dougherty, State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Flint River connecting Broad Street, in the city of Albany, said State and county, with the Isabella Road, said county and State.

HOUSE RECESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which was read:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the action taken under concurrent resolution of July 28, 1919, providing for an adjournment of the House from Saturday, the 2d day of August, until 12 o'clock meridian, Tuesday, the 9th day of September, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, rescinded.

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

The resolution was concurred in.

AGRARIAN LAW OF STATE OF SONORA, MEXICO.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have just received what purports to be a copy of what is known as the agrarian law passed by the State of Sonora under the powers given in the peculiar new constitution of that Republic. Inasmuch as it is a matter of intense interest not only here but probably to the State Department itself, as I know of no other copy, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

"AGRARIAN LAW.

"Plucarco Elias Calles, constitutional governor of the free and sovereign State of Sonora, to its inhabitants, makes known:

"That the honorable congress of the State has addressed me the following:

"No. 81.

"The congress of the State of Sonora, in the name of the people, decrees the following:

"*Agrarian law.*

"CHAPTER 1.

"General basis.

"ARTICLE 1. The object of this law is to create and foment small properties within the State.

"ART. 2. For the effects of this law, the following are considered of public utility:

"I. The dividing into fractions of large private land holdings;

"II. The forming of new agricultural centers with the land and waters which are indispensable to them;

"III. The utilization of waters in order to equitably distribute and apply them toward the cultivation of lands; and

"IV. Anything else which goes toward obtaining the objects enumerated in the preceding article.

"ART. 3. All inhabitants of the State who have the requirements which are specified further on will have the right of acquiring a parcel of land in accordance with the prescriptions of this law.

"ART. 4. The parcels of land referred to in the preceding article will be taken from private properties or from those which, by any reason, the State may have at its disposal.

"ART. 5. Privately owned lands which should be divided into fractions will be divided up by their owners in accordance with this law, but should they not make this division or oppose to its being made, the State, after expropriating same, for the sake of public utility will make the division.

"ART. 6. The expropriation proceedings will be enacted in accordance with the dispositions of the law relative thereto, excepting as regards that which refers to payment, which will be made in accordance with the dispositions of this law.

"CHAPTER 2.

"Agrarian officers.

"ART. 7. The proceedings which refer to matters relative to this law will be handled by the agrarian department of the State, subject to the executive power, and will be in charge of an engineer, having in his charge an office force as provided by the budget.

"CHAPTER 3.

"Classification of lands.

"ART. 8. For the effects of this law lands will be classified in the following manner:

"I. Agricultural lands.

"II. Grazing lands.

"ART. 9. By agricultural lands should be understood those which when asked for are under cultivation or which will be susceptible to immediate cultivation.

"ART. 10. By grazing lands should be understood those which when asked for are not cultivable, due to the nature of the land and which, being susceptible to cultivation, require, therefore, special primary works of irrigation, protection, or breaking up of the ground.

"ART. 11. Agricultural lands, in turn, will be subdivided into—

"I. Irrigation lands.

"II. Lands cultivable during the rainy season. (Temporal.)

"ART. 12. Irrigation lands are those which when asked for have the necessary water to assure at least one harvest per farming year.

"ART. 13. Lands cultivable during the rainy season are those which depend exclusively upon rainfall for their cultivation.

"CHAPTER 4.

"Regarding the maximum area of land which may be owned.

"ART. 14. The maximum area of land which may be owned by one person or legally constituted corporation is as follows: Fifty hectares in lands or private ownership located within the zone which was primarily surveyed as common land within town limits. (Ejidos.)

"Outside of the zone previously defined, the maximum area will be as follows:

"A. In irrigable farming land, 100 hectares.

"B. In agricultural land susceptible to irrigation during the rainy season, 300 hectares.

"C. In grazing lands, 10,000 hectares.

"ART. 15. The areas specified in the preceding article include the areas of one or more lots belonging to the same owner, whether they are adjoining one another or separated one from another or located in one or more municipalities.

"ART. 16. Persons or corporations which, in accordance with the law, have a right to possess lands may possess grazing, irrigable, or lands susceptible to irrigation during the rainy season at the same time, provided each class of land does not exceed the areas specified in article 14.

"ART. 17. When an owner of land susceptible to irrigation during the rainy reason, the area of which does not exceed the size specified for lands of this class, succeeds in making it irrigable land he may continue to own same in its totality.

"ART. 18. Grazing lands within the maximum area which may be asked for for cultivation purposes will be divided up in accordance with the stipulations of this law relative to agricultural lands.

"ART. 19. When the owner of grazing land, the area of which does not exceed the size specified by this law for this class of land, succeeds in converting it wholly or in part into agricultural land he may continue to possess it in its totality.

"CHAPTER 5.

"Regarding the division of lands.

"ART. 20. All properties which exceed the areas specified in article 14 and which belong to a sole owner or to a legally organized company will be considered as a large landed estate and the owner of same will be obliged, for the sake of public interest, to divide the excess amount of area within the time limit stipulated by this law.

"ART. 21. On and after the date of the promulgation of this law, owners of large landed estates within the State will advise the agrarian department of the preparatory operations of division they have made and will send in legalized copies of the respective contracts entered into.

"ART. 22. A period of 10 months, commencing on the date of the promulgation of this law, is given to property owners within which to make the divisions spoken of in the preceding articles.

"ART. 23. When the time limit to which the preceding article refers has elapsed, the areas of land in excess which belong to a sole owner or to a legally organized company will be divided up by the Government of the State, in accordance with Fractions VII and the respective subfractions of article 27 of the general constitution of the Republic and the law of expropriation for the sake of public utility of the State.

"ART. 24. The governor of the State will call together, by means of permanent notices in the "Boletin Oficial" (official Government paper) or by any other means of publicity, all persons who wish to acquire lots in the land which is to be divided up, setting forth conditions of purchase, etc., and when sufficient applications have been received he will proceed with the expropriation.

"ART. 25. For the effects of the preceding article, sufficient requests will be considered received when they reach 10 in number or when without reaching this number they cover an area of 50 hectares. In case the area to be expropriated does not exceed 50 hectares, it will suffice that the applications which are presented cover 50 per cent of said area.

"ART. 26. When a property is divided up the owner will have the right of choosing the portion of land which most suits him, provided it does not exceed the size specified in this law.

"ART. 27. The expropriation of lands made by the executive of the State, when enforcing this law, will be limited to the areas being requested.

"ART. 28. Lands which become property of the State through the exercise of economic coactive right will be turned over to applicants in legal form.

"CHAPTER 6.

"Regarding requests and adjudications.

"ART. 29. The maximum area to be granted will be the following:

"A. Of irrigable lands, 15 hectares.

"B. Of land susceptible to cultivation during the rainy season, 50 hectares.

"C. Of grazing lands, 1,250 hectares.

"Only in exceptional cases and when the applicants have sufficient means, within legal terms, to construct primary works of irrigation, protection, and breaking up of the ground, may the Executive grant as a maximum 100 hectares of irrigable land and 2,500 hectares for grazing purposes, provided the applicant has sufficient means to develop the land and better his live stock.

"ART. 30. Applicants for lands will address themselves in writing to the governor of the State and will state:

"I. Their name and surname, profession or occupation, address, nationality, civil status, and age;

"II. The amount of hectares which are desired and the class of land;

"III. Location of the lot or lots applied for and other data relative to location, expressing the name of the land and of the owner; and

"IV. The number of his dependents, if any, advising the sex and age of the members who compose his family.

"ART. 31. Applicants will substantiate in accordance with the respective regulations the following:

"I. That they have the draft animals and means for the cultivation of the agricultural lands requested, or, if they have not, that they have the necessary money to purchase them;

"II. To have at least 15 head of cattle and 30 sheep, or, if they do not have these, that they have sufficient capital to purchase them in order to make use of the grazing land requested; and

"III. That they substantiate what is expressed in fraction IV of the preceding article—that they are not landowners, and if they are, that they should state the area of the lot or lots, their class, location, and other data relative thereto.

"ART. 32. When there are various applicants for the same parcel of land, preference will be given as follows:

"I. To Mexicans who have served in the Constitutional army; those who have served or are serving personally in the Yaqui campaign; the sons and widows of these and any other persons who have served the cause of the revolution and public instruction; residents of the locality in which the lands requested are located;

"II. The persons mentioned in the preceding fraction who are not residents of the locality where the lands requested are located;

"III. Mexicans working on shares or lessees of the land which is parceled;

"IV. The residents of the locality; and

"V. Any other persons fulfilling the requisites established in article 27 of the general constitution of the Republic and in this law.

"ART. 33. The governor of the State will transfer all requests to the agrarian department, where a register will be kept of them in order to proceed by order of priority with the applications for lots in accordance with the preceding article.

"CHAPTER 7.

"Regarding grantees.

"ART 34. Persons granted lots will have the following obligations, excepting in case of proven "fuerza mayor" (something beyond control):

"I. If relating to agricultural lands which are under cultivation at the time of division, grantees must have them cultivated in their totality within the first year counted from the date on which they are given possession of them;

"II. If relating to lands which were not under cultivation when the division was made, but which are susceptible to immediate cultivation, grantees must cultivate 50 per cent of the land within the first year and the remaining portion within the second year;

"III. If relating to grazing lands requested for cultivation purposes, grantees will have five years in which to place the whole land under cultivation, they being obliged to place under cultivation each year at least 20 per cent of the total area given them;

"IV. If relating to grazing lands requested for that purpose, grantees must constantly maintain on the land at least 15 head of cattle or 30 head of sheep;

"V. When the time limits have elapsed which are stipulated by fractions I, II, and III, they must not fail to cultivate the land during two consecutive years;

"VI. Grantees must pay in due time the yearly payments which they should make to redeem the value of their parcel of land and the interest which said value yields as well as pay the State and municipal taxes which are placed upon them;

"VII. During the period of time the value of the lot is unpaid in its totality grantees can not transfer, mortgage, or encumber in any manner, nor speculate in any form, with the titles of ownership, any contract or operation entered into for those objects being absolutely null by law, the ownership of the lot referred to being transferable only by inheritance during the time its total value has not been paid;

"VIII. Grantees must inscribe their lot or lots in the office of the tax collector (Catastro) of the municipality to which it belongs and in the public registry of property, for fiscal and statistical purposes; and

"IX. Personally cultivate or administer the lot or lots granted them. They will not be permitted to cultivate same through absenteeism, grant same gratis, nor rent same in any form whatsoever.

"ART. 35. When a grantee fails to comply with the stipulations of fractions I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and IX of the preceding article, the Government will declare that the lot or lots which may have been granted can again be asked for, publishing a declaration to this effect in the Boletin Oficial three times consecutively, eight days apart, and making use of any other means of publicity.

"ART. 36. When the order mentioned in the preceding article is complied with, the lot or lots will be granted to the first applicant

who fulfills the requisites exacted by this law and who pays in cash 25 per cent of the money paid by the delinquent farmer and also 50 per cent of the value of the improvements made on the land, and the balance of the money paid or to be paid in installments as stipulated in the contract of grant. The 25 per cent mentioned will be delivered to the first grantee, the balance remaining in favor of the State, as well as the price of the improvements installed, the transfer expenses being for the account of the State.

"ART. 37. Grantees who infringe upon the dispositions contained in fractions VI and VIII of article 34 will be subject to the sanctions which the laws relative thereto establish, and as regards the payment of the annual payments which they have to pay to redeem the value of the parcel of land and the interest which said sum yields they will subject themselves to the disposition of the contracts of grant.

"CHAPTER 8.

"Regarding price and payments of lots.

"ART. 38. The value of the land appropriated will be paid by the government of the State in bonds of the agrarian debt, which will be redeemable at the time and in the manner stipulated by the law relative thereto.

"ART. 39. The value of each lot will be paid by the grantee in 20 annual payments to redeem the capital and interest which this draws at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

"ART. 40. The payment of the annual payments will be paid to the special department of the general treasury of the State during the first 15 days of the month of July.

"ART. 41. An annual payment not paid within the time limit will be subject to the payment of the interest as stipulated in article 39.

"ART. 42. When the division is made by the Government the value of each hectare will be that determined by or accepted in the tax or collection of rents offices with an increase of 10 per cent, in addition to the value of the improvements and the proportional expenses caused by the division. The value of improvements will be fixed by experts, one named by the owner, another by the grantee, and a third will be named by the Government in case of discord.

"CHAPTER 9.

"General dispositions.

"ART. 43. Lots granted as per this law will be turned over to grantees free of encumbrance, persons having credits against the land reserving the right to bring action in accordance to the laws relative thereto.

"ART. 44. The subterfuge of a bargain and sale contract (compravanta) entered into after the promulgation of this law will be considered as a direct act to elude the compliance of this law, and the lands contracted for by subterfuge will be liable by law, in view of this sole circumstance, to the identical consequences as large landed properties not voluntarily divided up by their owners.

"ART. 45. Difficulties which may arise due to the application of this law will be settled by the executive of the State.

"TRANSITORY.

"ART. 1. The executive of the State is empowered to issue the necessary regulations of the application of this law and name the employees of the agrarian department.

"ART. 2. This law will be published by public proclamation through the State on the 27th day of July of the current year, becoming effective on that date.

"ART. 3. For the application of this law all dispositions which counteract same are declared void.

"Communicate same to the executive for his sanction and observance.

"Hall of sessions of the congress of the State, Hermosillo, June 23, 1919. A. Trujillo; D. P. Alonso G.; Gonzalez, D. S.; W. G. Tena; D. S. Scrolls.

"For which reason I order same printed, published, and circulated for its due fulfillment.

"Palace of the government of the State, Hermosillo, Son., July 3, 1919.

"General: "P. ELIAS CALLES,

"*Chief Clerk in Charge of the Department.*

"General:

"M. PIÑA, h."

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I ask out of order, in connection with the matter just ordered printed in the RECORD, the adoption of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution (S. Res. 151) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State inform the Senate what steps, if any, have been taken by the United States in protest, or otherwise, to the Mexican Government, to prevent the threatened confiscation of landed estates owned by American citizens in said Republic, under what is known as the agrarian law recently promulgated in the State of Sonora.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN. I present resolutions adopted by the Sweetwater County Federated Trades and Labor Council, of Rock Springs, Wyo., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

THE SWEETWATER COUNTY FEDERATED
TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL,
Rock Springs, Wyo., July 28, 1919.

Hon. FRANCIS E. WARREN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR:

"*Resolved*, That JOHN B. KENDRICK and FRANCIS E. WARREN, representing the State of Wyoming in the United States Senate, are hereby requested to work for the indorsement and acceptance of the league of nations without reservations or amendments; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That our Senators read this resolution in open Senate so that it may become a matter of record; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the following committee, consisting of R. M. Denney, Robert T. Simkin, and J. H. Noblich, be instructed to notify the above-named Senators of the action of the Trade Council."

We, the above-named committee, hereby notify you of the action taken by the Sweetwater County Federated Trades and Labor Council on July 27, 1919.

Respectfully, yours,

R. M. DENNEY,
ROBERT T. SIMKIN,
JOS. H. NOBLICH,
Committee.

[SEAL.]

Mr. GRONNA presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from E. N. Saunders, president of the Northwestern Coal Dock Operators' Association, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed advance in freight rates on coal moving into certain territory, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted at the annual convention of the Tri-State Grain Dealers' Association, at Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a resolution adopted at an encampment of the National Council of the World War Veterans at Aurora, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation providing that aliens who have served in the Army of the United States shall be granted naturalization papers without expense or delay, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for an increase in the exempted incomes of discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MOSES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Milton, N. H., and a petition of sundry citizens of Unity, N. H., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lebanon, N. H., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Local Union No. 484, Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Dinuba, Calif., and a petition of Local Union No. 224, Plasterers and Cement Finishers' Association, of San Jose, Calif., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PAGE presented a memorial of Local Division No. 5, Ladies' Auxiliary to the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Rutland, Vt., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 681) to amend an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment.

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. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2710) to restore Lieut. Commander J. A. B. Sinclair to the Medical Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2711) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Maxwell-McKean Woman's Relief Corps, Salt Lake City, Utah, one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 2712) granting a pension to James W. Weaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2713) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

A bill (S. 2714) to provide for furnishing information with respect to shares of stock offered to the public and prescribing penalties; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) to insure the equitable administration of section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, providing relief for war minerals producers as intended by Congress, and to limit the liability of the Government thereunder to the appropriation already made therefor; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 7500. An act to protect the coastwise trade of the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

JOHN D. RYAN.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the morning Washington Post contains a somewhat sensational article regarding a gentleman who is well known to me. It is headlined, "John D. Ryan accused." It announces that grave charges involving the official conduct of this gentleman, who was at one time at the head of the Aircraft Production, have been developed at a certain hearing of a House committee. The premature publication of such a charge is perhaps unavoidable, and especially in exciting times like these, but it is a typical instance of the rank injustice that is thoughtlessly—and I am charitable enough to believe it is thoughtless—inflicted upon gentlemen of the highest standing and character, and which, of course, furnish material for their enemies to utilize as their interests or their opportunities may suggest.

I am proud of Mr. Ryan's personal friendship. He came to the assistance of the Government at a very critical hour during the prosecution of the war. It was a time when the fate of the struggle not only hung in the balance but the probabilities seemed to favor the boasted triumph of the German Kaiser. He left the management of a business of stupendous magnitude, and one which then more than at any other time required his personal attention that he might serve his country without money and without price.

He was appointed Assistant Secretary of War and subsequently assigned to the position of manager and director of aircraft construction by the President. He assumed these duties with the greatest reluctance, but due to his vigorous management and his experience as a director of large industrial affairs he succeeded in bringing order out of a somewhat chaotic condition, and had begun the production of aircraft upon a large and successful scale, only leaving his post when the danger was over and the armistice in full operation.

Mr. President, I have known Mr. Ryan ever since he was a struggling young man just beginning life in the city of Denver. He lived there for a number of years and his business career was absolutely without reproach. His abilities were notable from the outset. He soon attracted the attention of old friends in Montana, and shortly after the death of Mr. Daly he was translated to that State, where his abilities received full play and where his success was extraordinary. From there he went to the city of New York, since which time he has been actively engaged in industrial affairs and has everywhere received, as he has deserved, the commendation and confidence of all with whom he came in contact.

Mr. Ryan's record is as "clean as a hound's tooth," and it is outrageous that a man who has given the public service which he so freely gave should be subjected in advance to such disgraceful announcements as the one which I am criticizing. It is wrong. It can not be justified under any circumstances. Of course, if a full investigation should demonstrate that he or any other official has been guilty of improper practices that should be made known, but to anticipate such a condition by the publication of so-called grave charges is little short of criminal, and I for one condemn at this time and in this forum as vigorously as I can such premature attacks upon the reputation of honest and capable men. We can concede much to politics, but not the right to calumniate the character of an honorable and eminent citizen.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am glad that the esteemed Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has testified to his knowledge of Mr. Ryan's character and high standing. I am sure that the testimony of the distinguished Senator from Colorado will carry great weight with all who know him.

I, too, noted what appears to me to be a scurrilous attack upon Mr. Ryan by the action of a House committee in giving wide publicity to grave charges without any accompanying proof or a particle of evidence to support them. I noticed the report of it in the morning Post and hastily scanned it. I did not have time to read it in full, but shall. I regard it as most unjust and unfair to a thoroughly honorable man.

Mr. Ryan is a citizen of the State of Montana, where he has lived and made his home and conducted business for about 25 years. I have not had the pleasure of knowing him so long as has the Senator from Colorado, but perhaps I have known him quite as well. I have known Mr. Ryan nearly all of the time he has lived in Montana and I hold him in the very highest esteem. My confidence in him is unqualified and unbounded. I believe he is a man who always intends to do the right, and it alone.

Mr. Ryan is a gentleman of the very highest standing in the State of Montana, where he is widely known and esteemed. His standing is high all over the United States among the people who know him. His character is beyond question. His word is as good as any bond. His probity and integrity are irreproachable in every way; irreproachable and unimpeachable in the business world, personally, socially, and in every other way. The people of Montana have entire confidence in Mr. Ryan and in his integrity and honesty. I do not believe there is a particle of foundation for the charges that have been brought against him and that have been scattered broadcast in the prints of the day. Upon an investigation of the charges I believe Mr. Ryan will come out entirely harmless and unscathed. I believe it can be shown that he rendered highly valuable services to the United States Government in time of great stress and need, with no motive but the purest patriotism and the most unselfish loyalty. He accepted the position which was given him, that of superintendent of aircraft production and aviation, with reluctance at the urgent solicitation, I understand, of the President of the United States.

It was at a great sacrifice that Mr. Ryan accepted this important position. I have understood and I believe that the services which he rendered to his country in that position were of the highest order and of great value and were greatly appreciated by the President of the United States and the Secretary of War. In fact, in the same article to which reference has been made here I am pleased to see that the Secretary of War comes to the defense of Mr. Ryan and upholds his work in the warmest terms. The Secretary says Mr. Ryan is entirely innocent of the charges made and vouches for him.

Mr. Ryan served for a time during the war as Assistant Secretary of War. In that position he was intimately associated with Secretary Baker, who knew well his work. Mr. Ryan held that high position, with which were connected most important duties, without a word of reproach or of condemnation or of criticism, so far as I know, during the time he was rendering his valuable services. As Assistant Secretary of War Mr. Ryan was in entire charge of aircraft production. He devoted his entire time and all his ability and energy to the duties of the position, and it is a matter of common and general knowledge that during the time he held that office our Aviation Service was for the first time put upon a substantial, effective, operating basis, which made our Aviation Service a power in the war. It is also a matter of general knowledge, which I believe can be corroborated by authority of the War Department, that at the time the armistice with Germany was entered into Mr. Ryan had placed our Aviation Service upon a footing where it was for the first time capable of rendering great and invaluable service to the forces of the United States and the Entente Allies, so that if the war had continued any longer the Aviation Service would have been a most important factor in a speedy winning of the war for the United States and the Entente Allies and in bringing about crushing and overwhelming defeat of Germany and her allies. We were literally ready to swamp and overwhelm the Central Powers with a great, irresistible force of aircraft. In fact, before the armistice our aircraft had done a great part in bringing Germany to her knees. It was Mr. Ryan's ability, skill, and service that brought about this. He performed a patriotic, unselfish, valuable service for his country. When he took charge of aircraft production it was thoroughly demoralized and ineffective, and he brought success out of chaos.

I do not believe that there is a word of truth in or a particle of foundation for the reckless charges which have been made against Mr. Ryan and given publicity. I have entire faith in his integrity and innocence. I hope there will be a speedy,

complete, and thorough investigation of the charges, and if such be made I believe that Mr. Ryan's character will be thoroughly vindicated of the aspersions that have been cast upon it. I hope that his vindication, which I am sure will be complete, will be given as wide publicity as have the charges against him.

With those who know Mr. Ryan, and especially with those who have been associated with him in any capacity, personal or otherwise, and with those who have observed his great work here he needs no defense. I am sure they are all satisfied of his innocence, but for the world at large, for those who may not know him as well as some do, I hope that a speedy announcement will be made of the disposition of these charges, and I am sure that it will carry proof of innocence and vindication for a man who has rendered great service to his country and than whom none stand higher in the business world of the whole of the United States.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I am well acquainted with Mr. Ryan. I think the Senate has repeated the offense of the other House by giving publicity to these newspaper allegations without inserting at the same time the complete exoneration of Mr. Ryan by the Secretary of War, who is familiar with all the circumstances, whereas we are not. It is stated in the same article to which reference has been made:

> Secretary Baker admitted the facts as to the contracts for the Government sales of copper, but insisted that a full understanding of all the circumstances would show nothing improper reflecting upon Mr. Ryan, whom he regards as a high-minded, patriotic, devoted public servant and scrupulously honest in his business affairs.

In view of that fact I think there has been much ado about nothing. The Secretary of War further adds:

> Secretary Baker said that he was aware of the charges that had been made in connection with the spruce-production division; that he knew of demands made by Senator JONES (Republican) of Washington for an investigation, and that these demands had been supported by lumbering interests in the Pacific Northwest.
>
> He told the committee further that the War Department had made an investigation. This investigation, he said, was made by Maj. M. H. Ray, and the report was a complete exoneration of all the operations complained of.

CIRCULATION OF CURRENCY.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that Senate resolution 142 be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 142, submitted by Mr. MYERS on July 29, directing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate and report upon the advisability of a gradual reduction of the amount of money in circulation.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, is morning business closed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no further morning business, morning business is closed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 92, which has been on the calendar for some days.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may ask for a unanimous-consent agreement, which perhaps will cover the case the Senator has in mind?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar under Rule VIII, beginning with No. 51, which is the point where the Senate left off when it last had the calendar under consideration.

Mr. SWANSON. I object to beginning the consideration of the calendar at No. 51.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the number at which we should begin, because the Senate considered the calendar up to that number when it was last under consideration.

Mr. SWANSON. I was not present when one bill came up in which I am interested, and I desire to have that bill considered.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. FLETCHER. I hope the Senator will not move to adjourn. The bill which I have in mind ought to be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not refuse to put the motion to adjourn. The question is on the motion. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. McKELLAR asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I inquire if the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and vote "nay."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] and vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I observe that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has not voted. Having a pair with that Senator, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. That Senator being absent, and understanding that he would vote the same way that I shall vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (after having voted in the negative). I voted, assuming that my pair would come in. As he has not, I transfer my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BRANDEGEE (after having voted in the affirmative). I voted inadvertently. I am paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and let my vote stand.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK], and the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] are necessarily absent. I wish also to announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

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

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. NEWBERRY] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]; and

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—13.

Brandegee	Gronna	Phipps	Warren
Calder	King	Smoot	
Elkins	New	Sterling	
Fernald	Penrose	Thomas	

NAYS—46.

Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Curtis	Kirby	Nugent	Sutherland
Dial	Knox	Overman	Swanson
Fall	La Follette	Page	Trammell
Fletcher	Lenroot	Phelan	Underwood
Gay	Lodge	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	McCumber	Pomerene	Watson
Harris	McKellar	Sheppard	Williams
Henderson	McNary	Sherman	
Johnson, Calif.	Moses	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—37.

Ashurst	Culberson	Frelinghuysen	Hitchcock
Ball	Cummins	Gore	Jones, Wash.
Beckham	Dillingham	Hale	Kellogg
Borah	Edge	Harding	Kendrick
Colt	France	Harrison	Keyes

McCormick	Poindexter	Smith, Md.	Walsh, Mass.
McLean	Ransdell	Spencer	Wolcott
Martin	Reed	Stanley	
Newberry	Robinson	Townsend	
Owen	Shields	Wadsworth	

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

THE CALENDAR.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

The first business on the calendar was the resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall assure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war, and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world.

Mr. POMERENE and Mr. FLETCHER. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SIMON M. PRESTON.

The bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Simon M. Preston was announced as next in order. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Simon M. Preston, of Seattle, Wash., $5,838.36, being the amount of the defalcation of D. C. Kearns, a deputy collector under the said Simon M. Preston, who was collector of internal revenue for the first election district of Mississippi from the 1st day of June, 1869, to the 22d day of May, 1873, which was repaid to the United States Government by the said Simon M. Preston, and its collection by him from the said D. C. Kearns having been hindered and prevented by the pardon of D. C. Kearns by the President of the United States and the remission of the fine equivalent to said sum.

Mr. KING. Let us hear the report, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the report.

The Secretary read the report, submitted by Mr. ROBINSON on June 24, 1919, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Simon M. Preston, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that the bill do pass.

The facts in the case are fully set forth in Senate Report No. 763, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, which is appended hereto and made a part of this report.

[Senate Report No. 763, 65th Cong., 3d sess.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1102) for the relief of Simon M. Preston, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

The facts in the case are fully set forth in Senate Report No. 366, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session, which is appended hereto and made a part of this report.

[Senate Report No. 366, 64th Congress, 1st sess.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1288) for the relief of Simon M. Preston, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

A report made by this committee upon a similar bill during the Sixty-third Congress, which is hereto attached and made a part hereof, quite fully states the facts upon which the claim is based.

[Senate Report No. 375, 63d Cong., 2d sess.]

The Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 691) for the relief of Simon M. Preston, late collector of internal revenue for the district of Mississippi, reports as follows:

That it appears that Simon M. Preston was collector of internal revenue and also stamp agent for the first collection district of Mississippi from June 1, 1869, to May 22, 1873; that it was necessary for him to have deputy collectors; that one D. C. Kearns, who was highly recommended, was appointed deputy collector and entered into bonds, with sureties at the time deemed good, for the faithful discharge of his duties; that said Kearns continued to act as deputy collector until the 1st of March, 1871, when it was discovered that he, the said Kearns, had embezzled moneys collected by him for the United States and was a defaulter for the sum of $6,400, for which amount said collector, Simon M. Preston, was bound to the Government and for which he stood debtor to the Government in his account; that the said collector caused the said Kearns to be indicted and convicted and fined $5,836.38, which was the amount of his unpaid defalcations, and sentenced to be imprisoned for 12 months; that the said Kearns was soon after pardoned by the President of the United States and relieved from said fine and imprisonment; that the said Kearns and the said sureties were irresponsible, and there was no means of getting the amount embezzled by him; that the pardon and release of said Kearns removed all chances of compelling restoration from him, and the said collector, Simon M. Preston, was obliged to make good to the Government the defalcation of said Kearns, whereby great injustice was done him.

It further appears that said collector, Simon M. Preston, was a stranger in Mississippi when he was appointed collector there and did not know and was unable to find out the financial responsibilities of said Kearns's bondsmen. These bondsmen were all men of apparently good reputation and prominent in the citizenship of Mississippi.

It also appears that as a result of the suit brought by said Preston against the sureties of said Kearns there could not be recovered the amount of said defalcations, the balance being the amount claimed in this bill, viz, $5,836.38.

It further appears that the statute under which said Kearns was tried and convicted provided that in case of conviction the defendant should not only be imprisoned but he should be fined the amount of his defalcation. He was convicted and fined according to statute and sent to prison, but soon thereafter Gov. Ames, an ambitious statesman of Mississippi, listened to the requests of influential friends of Kearns and urged upon President Grant the pardon of Kearns. It seems quite clear that President Grant consented to do this with the understanding and upon the consideration that the amount of Kearns's defalcation should be made good. The President was informed that this had been done, and there seems to be no doubt but that the President believed that Kearns and his friends had repaid the amount stolen, whereas the fact is that Preston himself had paid the amount to the Government. The claimant, Preston, protested against the pardon of Kearns until the latter repaid to Preston the amount of money that he, Preston, had paid to the Government on account of the wrongdoing of Kearns. It appears that certain influential friends of Kearns were at the time of the pardon making arrangements to refund to Preston the amount he had been obliged to pay for his defaulting deputy, but the hasty pardon by the President prevented the consummation of this.

We do not believe that Mr. Preston has any legal claim against the Government, but we do believe that he has an equitable claim due to the fact that by the action of the President in granting a pardon the claimant was denied the right which the statute evidently contemplated when it required as a part of the penalty the imposition of a fine equal to the amount of the defalcation.

Mr. Preston has no other remedy, and the use of the remedy herein granted is inferentially indorsed by the Supreme Court of the United States (148 U. S., 573) in the following language:

"It is a well-settled rule of law that the Government is not liable for the nonfeasance or malfeasance or negligence of its officers, and that the only remedy to the injured party in such cases is by appeal to Congress."

We therefore report the bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, are any of these parties now alive?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is unacquainted with them.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Claims. I wish to state that I have been unable to attend the meetings of that committee. I want it understood, however, that I shall not vote for this bill until I get some explanation as to whether the person claiming this amount is alive.

Mr. PENROSE and Mr. SMOOT. Let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 1479) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane was announced as next in order.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Let it go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1004) for the relief of the owner of the steam lighter *Cornelia* was announced as next in order.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. KIRBY. Let it go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1005) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa* was next on the calendar, and was read.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would like to ask some member of the Committee on Claims in charge of the bill, as there are a number of bills of this character, why there should be special bills upon this subject? What are the exceptional circumstances in these cases that call for the action of Congress? Ought there not be a general law covering all cases, unless there be special circumstances in these particular cases? I think the Senate ought to know something about it before it passes these bills. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

Mr. KING. I make a similar request as to the three bills following this one on the calendar, namely, the bill (S. 1006) for the relief of the schooner *Horatio G. Foss*, the bill (S. 1222) for the relief of the schooner *Henry O. Barrett*, and the bill (S. 1223) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be passed over.

BUFFALO RIVER ZINC MINING CO.

The bill (S. 728) for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co. was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co., a corporation of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $4,200, being the amount of money paid by the said company to the United States of America on or about the 21st day of July, 1904, as the purchase price of certain public lands in Searcy County, Ark., the patents to which have since been canceled at the suit of the United States of America and the said lands having been restored to the public domain: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall first make an investigation of all the facts concerning said claim, and shall be satisfied of its justness and of the good faith of the said company and its officers, and that the acts of the agent of the company by reason of which the said patents were canceled were done wholly without the knowledge or consent of said company or any of its officers, and shall certify these facts to the

Secretary of the Treasury, the expense, however, of said investigation, if any, shall be deducted from the amount found to be due said company.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARUNDEL SAND & GRAVEL CO.

The bill (S. 1670) for the relief of the Arundel Sand & Gravel Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask to have the bill read, and then I would like to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was read in full yesterday.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this is a claim growing out of a collision between a schooner, or some ship belonging to this company, and a United States ship on the 26th day of November, 1917. As I understand the law, one can sue in the Court of Claims on a contract. This is a claim for unliquidated damages, and unless authority is given for the court to determine the question the claimants have no authority to get recovery. The difference between this and other claims in bills that have been presented here is that it does not provide for the payment of money, but simply empowers the district court to hear the facts and enter a decree, as is done by the Court of Claims, and then the case comes back to Congress. In this case the district court can decree either for the Government against the party or in favor of the party against the Government. It is very difficult to get such cases before the Court of Claims, and this claim has been pending two years. In cases of this kind, where the Government was at fault, the collision having been caused by a Government vessel, it is nearly impossible for the claimant to get relief.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask, if relief is to be given in these particular cases, why should there not be a general law upon the subject giving everybody like relief?

Mr. SWANSON. I understand the Government has never gone far enough to allow suits in the Court of Claims for unliquidated damages.

Mr. LENROOT. But why should there be a special bill for each of these cases? If it is right at all, why should there not be a general law letting everybody in like circumstances go into court and bring an action?

Mr. SWANSON. Because the cases are not very numerous.

Mr. LENROOT. There are numerous bills on the calendar for that purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. It has never been possible to get any general legislation. It seems to me a great hardship if a person has suffered great loss on account of the fault of the Government that he can not go into the courts of the Government itself and have a decree entered either for the Government or against the Government, and let it be brought back to Congress. It does seem to me it is very hard that this kind of a case should not be disposed of in this way, but should wait for general legislation.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think there is a good deal of force in what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. If we are going to deal with these collision cases, they should all be dealt with alike. The others are to go over, and I think this one ought also to go over.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the difference between this and the other cases is that the others directed money to be paid out of the Treasury. Congress has always insisted on the right to supervise the decrees that are made for the payment of money from the Treasury.

Mr. LODGE. Not of an admiralty court.

Mr. SWANSON. It generally has done so. I should say that this bill is so drawn that it will come back to Congress.

Mr. LODGE. Decrees of United States courts are always paid.

Mr. SWANSON. If there is a judgment against the United States. Provision is made for the Attorney General to be notified and to have a suit brought, and then the decree is certified to Congress for payment.

Mr. LODGE. Let them all go together, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

EMMA H. RIDLEY.

The bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

GOVERNMENT DORMITORIES IN WASHINGTON.

Senate resolution 52 was announced as next in order and was read and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the proper officers of the United States Housing Corporation are hereby respectfully requested to transmit to the Senate information as follows:

(1) Information as to what percentage of the Government buildings known as employees' dormitories, situated between the Capitol Building and the Union Station, Washington, D. C., was completed and ready for occupancy November 11, 1918.

(2) Information as to what sum of money has been spent in the construction work in connection with these buildings since November 11, 1918.

(3) Information as to whether the said buildings are now complete and entirely ready for occupancy, and if so, when the work was completed. If work was not completed before May 11, 1919, how many men were at that time employed on them and when will the work be completed.

(4) Information as to what total revenue the Government was obtaining from the said buildings May 1, 1919.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH FRANCHISE.

The bill (H. R. 5032) to extend the franchise in the parishes and separate congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, incorporated by act of Congress approved March 16, 1896, is hereby authorized and empowered on the petition of the vestry of any parish or separate congregation to give the same right to women to vote and hold office as is now conferred upon men by existing law.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this bill is an illustration of the unwisdom of Congress in granting special charters. It seems to have been the custom in the past to grant special charters for charitable purposes, for business pursuits, and to religious organizations. It is an improper use of the powers of the Federal Government, indeed, a perversion of its powers, for the Federal Government to be granting private and special charters to individuals to engage in philanthropic or religious or business activities. We have a general statute operative within the District of Columbia under which individuals may incorporate for the usual purposes for which incorporations are permitted in the States. I have objected in the past and shall object in the future to the granting of special charters to individuals to carry on charitable work or to engage in private enterprises. I apprehend from the bill that a special charter has been granted, and perhaps the only way to amend it is by an act of Congress, but it reveals the absurdity, the unwisdom, and the impropriety of the policy pursued by Congress in the past. I ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], who reported this bill from the Committee on the District of Columbia, whether there was a special charter granted to this organization?

Mr. CAPPER. Yes; the Senator is correct as to that. The charter was granted many years ago, and the church in this city asked that it be amended, no one objecting to it. I think it is absolutely necessary to pass the measure now, if we grant the request of the church, so that women may be permitted to have a vote in the affairs of the parish.

Mr. KING. I entirely sympathize with the purpose. I think the women in the churches ought to vote as well as the men. Indeed, as a rule they contribute more to the churches than do the men, and they ought to have as much voice in the operation of the church as men.

Mr. CAPPER. It may have been a mistake to grant the charter in the first place, but it ought to be corrected at this time.

Mr. KING. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LODGE. It is not a case of issuing a new charter.

Mr. CAPPER. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. It is that which excites the Senator from Utah so much. It seems to me the bill is pretty harmless. At all events, it is simply to amend an old charter.

Mr. KING. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts had been paying attention, he would not have felt the necessity of addressing the Senate or addressing any remarks to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. LODGE. I had to address the Senator from Utah, because he has been occupying all the time of the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT N. COLLINS.

The bill (S. 2128) for the relief of Albert N. Collins was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That homestead entry 036506, Glasgow series, of Albert N. Collins, for lots 2, 3, and 4 and the southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 19, township 25 north, range 38 east, Montana meridian, be, and the same is hereby, validated, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue patent thereon upon submission of satisfactory proof of compliance with the law under which said entry was allowed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFUND OF LAND-OFFICE PAYMENTS.

The bill (S. 2129) to amend an act approved March 26, 1908, entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public-land laws," was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act approved March 26, 1908 (35 Stat. L., p. 48), entitled "An act to provide for the repayment of certain commissions, excess payments, and purchase moneys paid under the public land laws," be amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That where purchase moneys and commissions paid under any public land law have been or shall hereafter be covered into the Treasury of the United States under any application to make any filing, location, selection, entry, or proof, such purchase moneys and commissions shall be repaid to the person who made such application, entry, or proof, or to his legal representatives, in all cases where such application, entry, or proof has been or shall hereafter be rejected, and neither such applicant nor his legal representatives shall have been guilty of any fraud or attempted fraud in connection with such application: *Provided*, That such person or his legal representatives shall file a request for the repayment of such purchase moneys and commissions within two years from the rejection of such application, entry, or proof, or within two years from the passage of this act as to such applications, proofs, or entries as have been heretofore rejected.

"SEC. 2. That in all cases where it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that any person has heretofore or shall hereafter make any payments to the United States under the public land laws in excess of the amount he was lawfully required to pay under such laws, such excess shall be repaid to such person or to his legal representatives: *Provided*, That such person or his legal representatives shall file a request for the repayment of such excess within two years after the patent has issued for the land embraced in such payment, or within two years from the passage of this act as to such excess payments as have heretofore been made.

"SEC. 3. That when the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall ascertain the amount of any excess moneys, purchase moneys, or commissions in any case where repayment is authorized by this statute, the Secretary of the Interior shall at once certify such amounts to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is thereby authorized and directed to make repayment of all amounts so certified out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated and issue his warrant in settlement thereof.

"SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized 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."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

The bill (S. 276) to amend sections 4 and 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I will be glad if any member of the committee can make some explanation respecting this bill. Does it change existing law materially, and if there is any material change will some Senator be kind enough to advise the Senate or at least to advise me?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as the title of the bill provides, it amends sections 4 and 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916. The Senator will recall that the law provided that wherever an entryman had taken 320 acres under the enlarged homestead law, if it were land of the same character and contiguous to that land, he was entitled to take up to the amount of 640 acres as provided by the homestead law. This is simply an amendment to that law, which the Department of the Interior has asked, so that if land should be taken, it could be taken where it was not contiguous. But the Senator will note that on page 2 of the bill the committee offers an amendment providing—

that the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas of the character herein described open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land.

In other words, if there is no noncontiguous land, then land that is of the same character can be entered up to 640 acres, but if there be land contiguous to it then it can not be entered.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands, with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 6, after the word "thereof," to insert "*Provided*, That the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas of the character herein described open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land"; and, in line 21, after the word "entry," to insert "*Provided*, That the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas of the character herein described open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 4 and 5 of the act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916, be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That any homestead entryman of lands of the character herein described who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry shall have the right to enter, subject to the provisions of this act, such amount of lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act, within a radius of 20 miles from said existing entry, as shall not, together with the amount embraced in his original entry, exceed 640 acres, and residence upon the original entry shall be credited on both entries, but improvements must be made on the additional entry equal to $1.25 for each acre thereof: *Provided*, That the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas of the character herein described open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land.

"SEC. 5. That persons who have submitted final proof upon, or received patent for, lands of the character herein described under the homestead laws, and who own and reside upon the land so acquired, may, subject to the provisions of this act, make additional entry for and obtain patent to lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act, within a radius of 20 miles from the lands theretofore acquired under the homestead laws, which, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead laws, shall not exceed 640 acres, on proof of the expenditure required by this act on account of permanent improvements upon the additional entry: *Provided*, That the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas of the character herein described open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

HOMESTEAD SETTLERS AND ENTRYMEN.

The bill (S. 277) to authorize absence by homestead settlers and entrymen, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after "1918," to insert "upon the ground that he comes within article 111 of the act of October 6, 1917, fortieth volume Statutes at Large, page 398," and in line 9, after the word "who," to strike out "has made or shall hereafter make" and insert "before entering upon such course shall have made," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That every person who, after discharge from the military or naval service of the United States during the war against Germany and its allies, is furnished any course of vocational rehabilitation under the terms of the vocational rehabilitation act approved June 27, 1918, upon the ground that he comes within article 111 of the act of October 6, 1917, fortieth volume, Statutes at Large, page 398, and who before entering upon such course shall have made entry upon or application for public lands of the United States under the homestead laws, or who has settled or shall hereafter settle upon public lands, shall be entitled to a leave of absence from his land for the purpose of undergoing training by the Federal Board of Vocational Education, and such absence, while actually engaged in such training shall be counted as constructive residence: *Provided*, That no patent shall issue to any homestead settler who has not resided upon, improved, and cultivated his homestead for a period of at least one year.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to ask if there is not a House bill covering the same ground?

Mr. SMOOT. No; there has been no bill passed which covers this ground. I think the Senator has reference to the bill covering leaves of absence in drought-stricken sections of the country.

Mr. FLETCHER. I remember seeing the title "Leave of absence."

Mr. SMOOT. That had reference to leaves of absence, but no legislation of this character has been passed.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

UNITED WAR-WORK CAMPAIGN.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the united war-work campaign was announced as next in order.

Mr. PENROSE. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

BILLS RECOMMITTED.

The bill (S. 175) for the relief of Kny-Scheerer Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I have been informed that this bill S. 175, for the relief of Kny-Scheerer Corporation, and the next one on the calendar, S. 2145, for the relief of Edward N. McCarty, were reported by the chairman through mistake. I therefore move that they be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 631) repealing certain provisions contained in the urgent deficiency act approved December 22, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LENROOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator for the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PETER M'KAY.

The bill (S. 390) for the relief of Peter McKay was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask some member of the committee if there is any general provision for meeting cases of this character,

Mr. GRONNA. I was not present in committee when it was agreed that this bill should be reported out, but I will say to the Senator that I am familiar with the case, because a similar bill was before the committee during the last session. It is in compliance with general law. We have the right in cases of this kind to allow one year's salary, and so far as I know no bill has been reported out for more than one year's pay where it was a case of personal injury.

Mr. KING. This, I understand, is a personal injury and not a death case?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; it is a personal injury case.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Peter McKay, or his legal representatives, the sum of $2,500, as full compensation for permanent injuries received by the said McKay on the 5th day of May, 1904, at Fort Worden, in the State of Washington, by being struck with a large piece of log hurled by the explosion of an excessive blast of powder discharged without warning by employees of the United States Government engaged in clearing lands at said Fort Worden under the direction and control of the United States Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

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

ALASKAN STEAMSHIP CO.

The bill (S. 629) for the relief of the Alaskan Steamship Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice that the auditor, Mr. E. D. Hearne, in summing up this bill in his report, makes the following statement:

The Alaskan Steamship Co. was clearly under contract with Nichols to take the 122 cannery employees from Seward to Seattle, and the claim of $25 per capita for that part of the trip is without equity.

I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JAMES W. CROSS.

The bill (S. 822) for the relief of James W. Cross was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 5, after the name "Cross," to strike out "$660" and insert "$92," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James W. Cross $92, as full compensation to said James W. Cross for personal injuries received as a result of an accident October 26, 1914, without negligence on his part, while he was engaged in the performance of his duties as a laborer at the State, War, and Navy Department Building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

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

ALFRED SJOSTROM.

The bill (S. 1195) for the relief of Alfred Sjostrom was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$720," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alfred Sjostrom the sum of $720 for injuries sustained by him while in the performance of his duties as an employee of the Government at Battle Mountain Sanitarium, Hot Springs, S. Dak., on December 3, 1910, in an accident in which he lost all the fingers of his right hand.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

HENRY BLACKBURN.

The bill (S. 429) to authorize an exchange of lands with Henry Blackburn was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, before the word "six," to strike out "east" and insert "west," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to accept title to the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 19, township 39 south, range 6 west, Salt Lake meridian, and to convey in exchange therefor to Henry Blackburn, of Orderville, Utah, title to the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 30, township 39 south, range 6 west, Salt Lake meridian, and upon reconveyance the land deeded to the United States shall thereupon become part of the Sevier National Forest and subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

ENTRIES OF MINORS ON PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (S. 1729) permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry or other entry of the public lands of the United States was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any minor of the age of 18 years or over, and otherwise qualified under the public-land laws, shall be permitted to make homestead entry, under and subject to the homestead laws of the United States: *Provided*, That no minor shall be permitted to make final proof upon such an entry or receive patent therefor until he or she shall have attained the age of 24 years: *Provided further*, That such entryman shall comply with all the requirements of the homestead laws as to cultivation and improvement of the land entered, but shall not be required to establish or maintain residence thereupon until he she shall have attained the age of 21 years, and final proof upon such an entry may be submitted at any time within two years after such entryman shall have attained the age of 24 years.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill permitting minors of the age of 18 years or over to make homestead entry of the public lands of the United States."

LINCOLN HIGHWAY ASSOCIATION.

The bill (S. 2220) granting to the Lincoln Highway Association, incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan, a right of way through certain public lands of the United States was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That right of way 500 feet in width through the public lands of the United States, beginning at or near Orr's ranch, Tooele County, Utah, thence via Broad Hollow Pass and the north point of Granite Mountain to a point known as Black Point, thence westerly to the mouth of Overland Canyon and for 10 miles into said canyon, is hereby granted to the Lincoln Highway Association, incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan. There is also granted the right to take from the public lands adjacent to the right of way, material, earth, stone, and timber necessary for the construction of the highway.

Before the grant of the right of way herein provided for shall become effective, a map of location of the route of said highway and an outline of the general rules and regulations under which the Lincoln Highway Association will govern said highway, must be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That all or any part of the easement herein granted may be forfeited and annulled by the Secretary of the Interior for failure to construct the highway within five years after the approval of maps of location or for nonuser after construction or for abandonment without further legislative or judicial action.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] to the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, which is embodied in the report of the committee, recommending certain amendments to the bill. One amendment that he suggests is to limit the region outside of the right of way from which material can be taken from the public lands to 100 feet in width.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I notice that the Secretary's letter is dated December 27, 1917. A similar bill has previously passed the Senate with an amendment inserting the word "States," which had inadvertently been omitted. I think the pending bill covers exactly what the bill as it previously passed the Senate covered.

It is to provide for the construction of a link in the Lincoln Highway over which it is now almost impossible to pass. A citizen of the United States has donated $125,000, as I remember, for the construction of this road through this stretch of country, and it is expected to begin construction just as soon as this legislation is enacted.

Mr. FLETCHER. Would the Senator from Utah have any objection to the amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior, for instance, in line 5, page 2, so that instead of the language used in the bill, "and an outline of the general rules

and regulations under which the Lincoln Highway Association will govern said highway," it would provide that the applicant will be required to file for approval the actual rules and regulations under which it is proposed to conduct the highway, rather than a mere outline of the rules? That is one suggestion which the Secretary makes, and I do not see but that it would be entirely acceptable to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say, Mr. President, that I think that is sufficiently provided for by the following language in the bill:

Before the grant of the right of way herein provided for shall become effective a map of location of the route of said highway and an outline of the general rules and regulations under which the Lincoln Highway Association will govern said highway, must be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Of course it may be that the rules and regulations will be changed at some time, and if we provide for the filing of an outline the matter will always thereafter be under the charge and direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not going to insist on the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that so far as the land in question is concerned it is practically worthless. My colleague, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], knows very well what sort of country this road runs through. It is, in fact, at one end of a lake in the county referred to, where the water is briny and where nothing will grow. The bill is simply designed to secure the completion of that link of the Lincoln Highway. As I have stated, a citizen of the United States has offered to put up the money to build the road provided the right of way can be obtained, and of course that can not be done unless this bill is passed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think this is all right; but I have merely called the attention of the Senator to the amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior, thinking it might be entirely satisfactory to him and save trouble in the House.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DRAFT REGISTRANTS ASSIGNED TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 70) relating to the induction of registrants who applied and were accepted for induction and assigned to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction without fault of their own was not completed was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That registrants who applied and who were accepted, prior to November 1, 1918, for induction and assignment to educational institutions for special and technical training under the provisions of the act approved August 31, 1918, but whose induction, through no fault of their own, was not completed prior to November 11, 1918, shall, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, be regarded as having been fully inducted into the service, as of the day they reported and were accepted for duty and training at such educational institutions, and shall be entitled to the regular pay and allowances for said period of their actual military service under said act, and to a discharge from the military service as of the dates of termination of their actual military service under the said act.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AFFAIRS IN COSTA RICA.

The resolution (S. Res. 105) requesting the Secretary of State to inform the Senate why Nicaragua is permitted to invade Costa Rica, and why Costa Rica was not permitted to sign the treaty of peace at Versailles, submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on June 30 (calendar date July 1), 1919, was considered by unanimous consent.

The resolution had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 1, line 1, after the word "the," to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; in line 2, after the word "Senate," to strike out "why" and insert "if not incompatible with the public interest, whether"; in line 3, after the name "Nicaragua," to strike out "a country over which the United States is maintaining a protectorate"; in line 7, after the name "Costa Rica," to strike out "a nation which has been and now is a friend of the United States" and insert "or has permitted armed bands to organize or rendevous within her territory for such purposes"; in line 11, after the word "the," to strike out "Secretary of State" and insert "President"; in line 12, after the word "Senate," to strike out "if not incompatible with the public interest"; and on page 2, line 2, after the name "Versailles," to strike out ", in view of the fact that the present Government of Costa Rica had been formally recognized as a cobelligerent by all the Allies in the war against Germany, except by the United States, and recognized by the neutral nations of the earth as a constitutional government," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, whether Nicaragua has been and is now permitted, with armed forces, to invade and to threaten with invasion the territory of Costa Rica, or has permitted armed bands to organize or rendezvous within her territory for such purposes: And be it further

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, for what reason Costa Rica, a belligerent with the Allies in the war just ended, was not permitted to sign the treaty of peace at Versailles.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1726) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. I ask that that bill go over.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to my colleague that this is an exact duplicate of the bill which passed the Senate in the closing days of the last session, but failed of passage in the House.

Mr. KING. I am aware of that; but I desire to make some observations in regard to the measure which will take some time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ZONING COMMISSION.

The bill (S. 1369) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, in section 1, page 2, line 1, after the word "compensation," to strike out "The Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall be the executive officer of said commission, and such," and insert "Such"; and in line 7, after the word "compensation," to insert "There is hereby authorized for the expenses of said commission, including the employment of expert services, and all incidental and contingent expenses, the sum of $5,000, payable one half out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia," so as to make the section read:

That to protect the public health, secure the public safety, and to protect property in the District of Columbia there is hereby created a zoning commission, which shall consist of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, which said commission shall have all the powers and perform all the duties hereinafter specified and shall serve without additional compensation. Such employees of the government of the District of Columbia as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act shall be assigned to such duty by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia without additional compensation. There is hereby authorized for the expenses of said commission, including the employment of expert services, and all incidental and contingent expenses, the sum of $5,000, payable one half out of any money in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KING. I think I shall object to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CALDER. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. KING. Reserving the right to object, I will hear the Senator; but it seems to me the bill proposes to create another commission.

Mr. CALDER. The bill provides that certain officials of the Government already paid salaries shall be appointed a commission to determine the character of buildings which may be erected upon the different streets of the District of Columbia. I may say that it is copied to some extent from a law enacted in New York City some years ago. It will prevent a man building a garage, a business house, upon a residential street or in a section reserved for private homes; it will prevent the erection of great, high apartment houses on streets reserved for a different character of buildings.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an inquiry?

Mr. CALDER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. It seems to me that there is no necessity for creating a vast amount of machinery for the purpose of passing upon permits for the construction of buildings. I can not understand why an additional appropriation should be required.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, it is necessary to have the proposed commission appointed in order to lay out the districts and determine the different zones; but after once having established the zones, the building department of the District government or the District Commissioners will be able to carry out the law without any further expenditure. The $5,000 provided for in the bill is for the purpose of employing experts to assist in determining the zones and the character of buildings which may be erected in various locations. I think this measure is very much desired by the residents of the District of Columbia generally; it is a measure tending to beautify the city, and it is strongly urged by the District Commissioners.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator if there is not already a law regulating the height of buildings, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. CALDER. There is such a law; but there is no law regulating the use of buildings and the character of buildings that may be erected in the different sections of the city. This matter has been very carefully examined.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does the Senator think that the proposed zoning commission ought to have the right to say for what purpose a building shall be used?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; to this extent, that when a certain section may be set apart for a certain character of buildings it is desirable that buildings not of the specified character should be forbidden in that area. For instance, on Sixteenth Street, which is strictly a residential street, in the absence of restrictions of any kind, immediately contiguous to a beautiful residence some one may ask for a permit to build a garage. The enactment of this bill into law would prevent that.

Mr. SMOOT. That is just what I was fearful of. Some years ago I built a home on Connecticut Avenue at Calvert Street. It happened that I had room enough in the rear of the dwelling, facing Calvert Street, to build a small garage; but as soon as I undertook to begin the construction of the garage I was told that I could not carry on the work. I asked by what law could I be prevented from using my lot for that purpose, and was told that a garage might be detrimental to the adjoining property; and not only that, but it would not be very nice for the people on the other side of the street to have a garage to look at all the time.

Mr. President, I know what the sentiment is here; and I know that if this bill passes, and the words "use of building" are in it, they will say just where you can have your garage. If you have not got a piece of ground near your home, inside, where nobody can see it, you will never have one.

I think this bill will have to be amended so far as the use of the building is concerned, at least. For that reason I ask that it go over.

Mr. CALDER. I am certain that if the Senator examines the bill carefully he will be assured that it is a meritorious measure.

Mr. SMOOT. It will stop the building of garages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A garage is a building, is it not?

Mr. KING. I ask that it go over also.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

MILK RIVER VALLEY GUN CLUB.

The bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "acres," to insert "to be used," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club for lots 5 and 6 and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 32, township 31 north, range 31 east, Montana meridian, Montana, containing 76.69 acres, upon payment of $1.25 per acre and the further payment of $50 per irrigable acre for the construction of irrigation works for the Milk River irrigation project, the irrigable area being fixed at 30 acres, to be used for a game preserve: *Provided*, That said Milk River Valley Gun Club shall apply for patent and tender full payment within six months from the date of approval of this act: *Provided further*, That patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in said land, and the right to the use of the land for extracting the same, and shall be subject to all rights under the T. E. Brady Canal and Bowdoin Lake Reservoir approved by the Secretary of the Interior October 23, 1901, under the act approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. L., p. 1095), and the patent shall also reserve to the United States right of way for canals, ditches, and telephone lines heretofore or hereafter constructed by the authority of the United States: *And provided further*, That if the land is ever used for any purpose other than that herein authorized title thereto shall revert to and revest in the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LANDS FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES.

The bill (S. 794) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "grounds," to insert "*Provided*, That if any land so conveyed cease entirely to be used for school purposes, title thereto shall revert to and revest in the United States," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be hereby authorized, upon application by the proper officers of a school district located wholly or in part within the boundaries of a project of the United States Reclamation Service, to issue patent conveying to such district such unappropriated undisposed of lands within any Government reclamation town site situated within such school district as, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, are necessary for use by said district for school buildings and grounds: *Provided*, That if any land so conveyed cease entirely to be used for school purposes, title thereto shall revert to and revest in the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

LIGHTHOUSE RESERVATION, NORTH POINT, MD.

The bill (S. 2494) to transfer the tract of land known as the lighthouse reservation at North Point, Md., from the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce to the jurisdiction of the War Department was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described tract of land situated at North Point, Md., now under the control and jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce, and known as the Lighthouse Reservation, at North Point, Md., be, and the same hereby is, transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of the War Department for use for military purposes:

Beginning at a post now set in the ground north, 82° east, 1¼ perches from the center of a stump, and north 65° west, 14 perches from a large black oak tree now marked, and running thence south 65° east, 14 perches to the said black oak, thence still south 65° east, 12½ perches to a post north, 65¾° east, 12 perches to a post standing southwardly 9 feet from a large white oak, thence south 47° east, 48 perches to a marked sassafras, thence still south 47° east, 2 perches, to the water of Chesapeake Bay, thence bounding on the water of said bay and Patapsco River south, 74° west 7 perches, south 80½° west 10 perches, north 71° west 15 perches, north 57½° west 12 perches, north 46½° west 12 perches, north 46½° west 44$\frac{4}{10}$ perches, until it intersects a line drawn south 48° west from the place of beginning, and thence to the beginning, containing 7 acres and 22 square perches of land more or less.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CRANEY ISLAND AND FISHERMANS ISLAND, VA.

The bill (S. 2495) transferring the tract of land known as Craney Island from the jurisdiction of the War Department to the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department and transferring the tract of land known as Fishermans Island from the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department to the jurisdiction of the War Department was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that the military reservation known as Craney Island, now under the control and jurisdiction of the War Department, lying on the western side of the Elizabeth River in Norfolk County, Va., and bounded by the waters of the Elizabeth River, Craney Island Creek, Thoroughfare Creek, and James River, be transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service; and that the sand spit or island called Fishermans Island or Linen Bar, now under the control and jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, situate, lying, and being in the county of Northampton off the point of Cape Charles, between the Atlantic Ocean and Chesapeake Bay, in the eastern district of Virginia, about 12 miles south of Cape Charles City and about 1¼ miles from Cape Charles Light, containing 225 acres, more or less, above high-water mark, be transferred to and placed under the control and jurisdiction of the War Department for use for military purposes.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2496) authorizing the retirement of members of the Army Nurse Corps (female) was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ORION MATHEWS.

The bill (S. 608) for the relief of Orion Mathews was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withdraw that request. This bill has passed the Senate twice, has been unanimously reported by the Senate Military Affairs Committee twice, and is a very meritorious measure.

Mr. KING. I will withhold the objection until I hear the Senator. I understood that it was a case of desertion.

Mr. MYERS. The facts of the case are these: The report shows that Mr. Mathews, who was very young, enlisted and served during a large part of the war. He served until his term of enlistment was out. Then he immediately reenlisted, and served until March or April, 1865, when he disappeared from the service and did not report again, and technically the charge of desertion was entered against him. Affidavits and proofs brought before the committee show, however, that Mr. Mathews participated in about 40 battles, that he served four years, that he was wounded at Antietam, was subsequently wounded in another battle, and a notation of honorable discharge was entered after his name in the war records. The committee thought, in view of his four years of service, whatever may have been the cause for his disappearing from the service at that late day, less than a month before the surrender of Gen. Lee, that he might well be restored to an honorable position on the records of the War Department. That is all that the bill does. It has been reported by the committee twice and has passed the Senate twice, but it has never passed the House for lack of time.

Those are the facts. There is a great deal of merit in them.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course the purpose of the bill is to restore this man to the rolls of the War Department and give him a pension. I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 609) for the relief of James Duffy was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 610) for the relief of Henry J. Davis was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.

The bill (S. 2476) to amend the act establishing the eastern district of Kentucky was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That regular terms of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Kentucky shall be held at the following times and places, namely:

At Jackson: Beginning on the first Monday in March and the third Monday in September in each year.

At Frankfort: Beginning on the second Monday in March and the fourth Monday in September in each year.

At Covington: Beginning on the first Monday in April and the third Monday in October in each year.

At Richmond: Beginning on the fourth Monday in April and the second Monday in November in each year.

At London: Beginning on the second Monday in May and the fourth Monday in November in each year.

At Catlettsburg: Beginning on the fourth Monday in May and the second Monday in December in each year.

At Lexington: Beginning on the second Monday in January and the second Monday in June in each year.

And at such other times and places as may hereafter be provided by law.

The clerk of the court for the eastern district of Kentucky shall maintain an office in charge of himself, a deputy, or a clerical assistant at each of the places of holding court within said district.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee report to strike out the preamble.

The preamble was stricken out.

THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS.

The bill (S. 2447) for the relief of the Philippine Scouts was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "duty," to insert "or when any such officer has heretofore resigned for the purpose of retirement as an enlisted man," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers of the Philippine Scouts shall hereafter be retired under the same conditions as officers of the Regular Army, and shall then be placed on the unlimited retired list. Any former officer of the Philippine Scouts who vacated his office in the Philippine Scouts by discharge or resignation on account of disability incurred in line of duty, or when any such officer has heretofore resigned for the purpose of retirement as an enlisted man, may be reappointed to his former grade and then retired. Officers of the Philippine Scouts now on the retired list, or hereafter retired, shall receive the same pay as retired officers of like grades and length of service in the Regular Army. Hereafter retired officers of the Philippine Scouts shall be eligible for advancement in accordance with the last proviso of section 24 of the act of June 3, 1916.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

RELIEF AND PROMOTION OF CERTAIN ARMY OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 2448) for the relief of certain officers of the United States Army, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

Mr. NEW. I hope the Senator will withhold that request for a moment, and permit me to say a word or two about this bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I will withhold it for the Senator to make a statement.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, all the items in this bill have previously passed the Senate. They were inserted in the military appropriation bill which passed the Senate just before June 30, and were stricken out in conference by the House conferees solely on the ground that the House conferees did not want that kind of legislation attached to an appropriation bill. As I understand, there was no dispute whatever on the part of any of them as to the merits of any one of the items making up this measure. All of them passed the Senate after full consideration. They were included in this omnibus bill merely to overcome the objection that was made by the House conferees to their being considered on an appropriation bill, which, I think, is a valid objection, so far as that goes, but I hope the bill may be considered at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. As I understand, each of these claims has been examined and recommended by the department.

Mr. NEW. Every one of them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have just read the balance of the bill, and see just what it provides. I notice that Mr. Barber was a lieutenant in the British Army, but was an American citizen.

Mr. NEW. No; that is not the fact. Does the Senator want information concerning that case?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I simply state that, as I understand, he was a lieutenant in the British Army when he lost his eyes.

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. And yet he was an American citizen.

Mr. NEW. No.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if he was not an American citizen, why should we make this provision for him?

Mr. THOMAS. He was in the American service.

Mr. NEW. For this reason: I shall be very glad to make an explanation of that.

Barber was a lieutenant in the British Army. He was sent over here at the request of this Government to instruct our officers in the art of throwing hand grenades. We supplied the hand grenades to be used in his instruction. We gave him a defective hand grenade, and in the act of hurling that grenade it exploded prematurely, and this officer was instantly rendered totally and forever blind in the service of the United States Government. If ever there was an act of justice called for, it is that this officer be placed upon the pay roll of the United States Government for that reason.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator's statement clears up the matter entirely, and I have not any objection at all to the passage of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Barber, a first lieutenant of the Dorset Regiment of Infantry of the British Army, who lost the sight of both eyes and became totally blind by reason of a premature explosion on February 14, 1918, while acting as an instructor of the United States troops at Camp Wheeler, Ga., as compensation for disability resulting therefrom, such sums of money as by the act entitled "An act 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, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, is provided to be paid as compensation for disability to an injured person who has lost both eyes or become totally blind from causes occurring in the line of duty in the service of the United States; and such compensation shall be payable and be paid as of and from the 14th day of February, 1918, and under and according to the terms, conditions, and basis of computation in said act provided, and such sum shall be in full of all claims, legal or equitable, of the said Frank Barber, his heirs, representatives, or assigns.

SEC. 2. Col. William A. Simpson: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Col. William A. Simpson, United

States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

SEC. 3. Maj. H. W. Daley: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Maj. H. W. Daley, National Army, to the position and rank of major on the retired list.

SEC. 4. Capt. Daniel W. Hand: That the name of Daniel W. Hand, now captain of Field Artillery, be placed on the lineal list of officers of Field Artillery in the position it would have occupied if he had not suffered the loss of rank announced in General Orders, No. 156, War Department, August 8, 1910; and the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Capt. Hand, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the grade which such restored position on the lineal list requires, to be an additional number in the grade until absorbed, and no longer.

SEC. 5. Capt. Leonard F. Matlack: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate Capt. Leonard F. Matlack, now serving with the Eighth Cavalry, to the position and rank of captain on the retired list.

SEC. 6. Credit in the accounts of Col. Jesse McI. Carter: The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Col. Jesse McI. Carter, Cavalry, United States Army, the sum of $352.23, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

SEC. 7. Capt. J. C. Garrett: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, J. C. Garrett, formerly a captain of Cavalry, to take rank as if he had remained continuously in the service.

SEC. 8. Col. Samuel R. Jones: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be and he is hereby authorized to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate Col. Samuel R. Jones United States Army retired to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 1699) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

The bill (S. 170) to amend section 25 of the act of December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act of September 7, 1916, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "than," to strike out "one" and insert "five," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act of September 7, 1916, be amended by adding a subsection (a) to read as follows:

"SEC. 25a. That any member bank located in a city or incorporated town of more than 500,000 inhabitants and possessing a capital and surplus of $1,000,000 or more may, under such rules and regulations as the Federal Reserve Board may prescribe, establish branches, not to exceed 10 in number, within the corporate limits of the city or town in which it is located: *Provided*, That no such branch shall be established in any State in which neither State banks nor trust companies may lawfully establish branches."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

THOMAS SEVY.

The bill (S. 428) for the relief of Thomas Sevy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to accept title to the following-described lands, either in whole or in part, upon certification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the lands are chiefly valuable for national forest purposes and approximately equal in value to the lands to be given in exchange therefor: The east half of section 32; the north half of the northwest quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter of section 32, township 35 south, range 4 west of Salt Lake base and meridian, situate in the Sevier National Forest; and to issue to Thomas Sevy in lieu thereof patents to the following-described areas, or to such parts thereof as are found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be approximately equal in value to the lands conveyed: The northeast quarter, the north half of the southeast quarter, the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 31, township 37 south, range 5 west of Salt Lake base and meridian: *Provided*, That the lands conveyed to the Government shall thereupon become parts of the Sevier National Forest and subject to all laws and regulations applicable thereto: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall jointly report to Congress, in detail, the factors upon which the valuations were made.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOUTHERN STATES LUMBER CO.

The bill (S. 577) for the relief of the Southern States Lumber Co. was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the Southern States Lumber Co., a corporation, Pensacola, Fla., $603.79.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS IN WYOMING.

The bill (S. 420) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Wyoming under the Carey Act, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, within his discretion, to continue not beyond May 5, 1929, the segregation of lands embraced in approved Wyoming segregation list No. 22, under the Carey Act, and to continue not beyond June 10, 1929, the segregation of lands embraced in approved Wyoming segregation list No. 25, under the Carey Act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN ALBERT THOMPSON.

The bill (S. 2378) to authorize the issuance of patent to John Albert Thompson, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent for the west half of the northeast quarter of section 23, township 158 north, range 90 west of the fifth principal meridian, North Dakota, to John Albert Thompson, pursuant to his homestead entry 02022, Minot series.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to set aside and appropriate, in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of the act of June 17, 1902, entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for reclamation of arid lands," the sum of $120, which was paid by said Thompson as purchase price of the described land.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS IN FLORIDA.

The bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State 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, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be lawful for the properly credited agent or official of the State of Florida having in charge the adjustment of its school grant to apply to the Commissioner of the General Land Office for the survey of any townships or parts of townships of public lands unsurveyed in any of the surveying districts of said State, with a view to satisfy the grant in aid of schools made to said State of Florida by the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereto to the extent of the full quantity of land called for thereby; and upon the application of said agent or official the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall proceed to have the survey or surveys so applied for made, as in the case of surveys of other public lands; and the lands that may be found to fall within the limits of such townships or parts of townships as ascertained by the survey shall be reserved, upon the filing of the application for survey, from any adverse appropriation by settlement or otherwise, except under rights that may be found to exist of prior inception, for a period to extend from such application for survey until the expiration of 60 days from date of filing of the township plat of survey in the proper district land office, during which period of 60 days the State may select any of such lands not embraced in any valid adverse claim for the satisfaction of its school grant, as aforesaid, with the condition, however, that the agent or official of the State, within 30 days from the date of such filing of the application for survey, shall cause a notice to be published, which publication shall be continued for 30 days from date of first publication in some newspaper of general circulation in the vicinity of the lands likely to be embraced in such townships or parts of townships giving notice to all parties interested of the fact of such application for survey and the exclusive right of selection by the State for the aforesaid period of 60 days as herein provided for, and after the expiration of such 60 days any lands which may remain unselected by the State and not otherwise appropriated according to law shall be subject to disposal under general laws as other public lands: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall give notice immediately of the reservation of any townships or parts of townships to the officials of the local land office of the land district in which the land is situated of the withdrawal of such townships or parts of townships for the purpose hereinbefore provided: *Provided further*, That the agent or official of the State of Florida hereinbefore mentioned is authorized to advance money from time to time for the survey of the township or townships, or part thereof withdrawn, at such United States depository as may be designated by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the money so advanced shall be reimbursable.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMISSION ON HOUSE CONSTRUCTION AND HOME OWNERSHIP.

The bill (S. 168) to create a commission to investigate and report to Congress a plan on the questions involved in the financing of house construction and home ownership and Federal aid therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL IN CITY OF WASHINGTON.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to employees of the United States Department of Agriculture who died in the war with Germany was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should not object to a joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial to all the employees of the United States who died in the war with Germany, but this does not cover the ground to that extent, and I shall therefore ask to have it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

OMER G. PAQUET.

The bill (S. 2445) to permit the reenlistment of Omer G. Paquet in the United States Army was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to permit the reenlistment in the United States Army, at the grade held by him at the time of his dishonorable discharge from the service, of Omer Germain Paquet, formerly a quartermaster sergeant; and the said Omer Germain Paquet shall, for the purposes of computing continuous service, for ascertaining the rate at which he shall be paid, and for retirement, be considered to have served continuously from the date of his last enlistment.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

The bill (S. 2472) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

ALBERT H. CAMPBELL.

The bill (S. 1637) for the relief of Albert H. Campbell was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Albert H. Campbell shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as captain of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, on the 30th day of May, 1865.

Mr. CURTIS. The Committee on Military Affairs recommend an amendment to the bill. I move to add the following proviso:

Provided, That no pension, pay, bounty, or allowance shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

RECREATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

The bill (S. 2224) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

T. L. LOVE.

The bill (S. 358) carrying into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to T. L. Love, surviving partner of Robert Love & Son, of Wake County, N. C., the sum of $5,000, to satisfy the findings of the Court of Claims, certified to the President of the Senate January 26, 1915 (S. Doc. No. 851, 63d Cong., 3d sess).

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. FREDERICK B. SHAW.

The bill (S. 2343) for the relief of Capt. Frederick B. Shaw was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Frederick B. Shaw, United States Army, the sum of $356.50, said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be payment in full for all losses of personal property incurred by him by reason of the sinking of the U. S. transport *Meade* in the harbor of Ponce, P. I., on or about May 16, 1899. But the accounting officer of the Treasury shall require a schedule and affidavit from him, such schedule to be approved by the Secretary of War.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M. LEA.

The bill (S. 2440) for the relief of the estate of John M. Lea, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "pay," to insert "in full settlement of the following claim," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, in full settlement of the following claim, to The Nashville Trust Co., administrator de bonis non cum testamento annexo of the estate of John M. Lea, deceased, late of Nashville, Tenn., the sum of $6,883.31, that being the amount found due by the Court of Claims for rents collected by the Quartermaster Department, United States Army, during the Civil War from the tenants of said John M. Lea, which rents were paid into the Treasury of the United States, as reported to Congress in Senate Document No. 48, Sixty-fourth Congress, first session.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

V. E. SCHERMERHORN AND OTHERS.

The bill (S. 1330) for the relief of V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the name "Schermerhorn," to strike out "$6,250" and insert "$2,767.45"; and on page 2, line 3, after the words "sum of," to strike out "$7,592" and insert "$3,109.45," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to V. E. Schermerhorn, E. C. Caley, G. W. Campbell, and Philip Hudspeth, their heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, the following sums: V. E. Schermerhorn, $2,767.45; E. C. Caley, $192; G. W. Campbell, $16; and Philip Hudspeth, $134, for the destruction, on October 15, 1908, of their property by fire, which occurred on the Fort Riley (Kans.) Military Reservation while Battery A, Sixth Field Artillery, was engaged in target practice near the northern boundary, and which spread to and caused serious damage to privately owned farms adjoining the reservation; and the sum of $3,109.45 is hereby appropriated for said purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

ELIZABETH B. EDDY.

The bill (S. 2453) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in the claim of Elizabeth B. Eddy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Elizabeth B. Eddy, widow of Charles G. Eddy, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $602.92, and the said sum is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KATIE NORVALL.

The bill (S. 1546) for the relief of Katie Norvall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $10,000 as full compensation to Katie Norvall for the death of her husband, G. Norvall, who was drowned while engaged in the performance of his duties as fireman and engineer, as a result of a collision between the navy-yard launch *Highlander* and the ferryboat *Vallejo* near the Mare Island ferry slip, Vallejo, Calif.

Mr. THOMAS. I move to strike out, in line 6, page 1, the figures "$10,000" and to insert "$5,000."

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire how that would compare with the measure of compensation provided by the Federal compensation act? I am not sure what amount of compensation, under that act, the beneficiary would be entitled to. It seems to me we ought to conform to that act if possible.

Mr. THOMAS. I will state my purpose in offering the amendment is I am afraid of the precedent that would be set by the

granting of such a large sum of money in a private bill of this sort. I moved the amendment without reference to the Federal compensation act.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think we ought to conform to that act. If we pass a bill, it seems to me the measure of damages allowed ought to be on the same basis that is there provided.

Mr. PHELAN. I ask the Senator from Colorado to withdraw his objection.

Mr. THOMAS. I will withdraw the objection at the request of the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, this is the case of a widow with several children, whose husband was drowned in San Francisco Bay through the carelessness of an agent of the Government. The amount, $10,000, I assume, is about right as compensation for the death of a husband in the service of the United States under such circumstances.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator allow me to call attention to the report of the committee, which is, in line 6, to strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,173.12"? It seems that that is the basis upon which the bill is favorably reported.

Mr. PHELAN. But the bill itself appropriates $10,000 in full compensation.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN M. FRANCIS.

The bill (S. 176) for the relief of John M. Francis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to John M. Francis, father of late Cadet John C. Francis, West Point Military Academy, who died on duty at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., the sum of $181, burial and transportation expenses.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to know whether there is any precedent for the payment of this amount of money. It is the first bill I ever saw of the kind. I ask that it go over, without some explanation.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I know about the bill. This boy was a cadet at West Point, who was admitted in perfect health, and because of some conditions there he contracted tuberculosis. He was in the academy for about two years, and was sent to New Mexico to recuperate. The Government sent him there, as they would send a soldier. He was there several months and died. They sent his body home. His father is in very moderate circumstances, and it seemed to me that where the Government sent the body home they should pay for the cost of sending it home.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, many cadets have died at West Point and Annapolis, and I have never yet known of a bill to pay for the transportation of the body home, or to defray the expenses attached to it. If we undertake to do this, Mr. President, we had better pass a general law covering all cases of death. That is all I have in mind. It may be just, but I do not know of any such bill ever having passed the Senate.

Mr. CALDER. I do not, either, Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest that the Senator let the bill go over, and then I will look it up and see about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

RINALD BROS.

The bill (S. 1456) for the relief of Rinald Bros., of Philadelphia, Pa., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Rinald Bros., of Philadelphia, Pa., the sum of $645, as an additional price for paint in excess of the amount named in the contract between Rinald Bros. and the Quartermaster's Department, at Philadelphia, for the year ending June 30, 1917.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF INDIAN APPROPRIATION ACT.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) to amend section 18 of the Indian appropriation act, approved June 30, 1919, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It amends the second paragraph in section 18 of the Indian appropriation act approved June 30, 1919 (Public, No. 3, 66th Cong., p. 22), by adding after the last word in the proviso at the end of the paragraph the words "out of any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the Cherokee Nation."

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOREST RESERVES IN NEW MEXICO.

The bill (S. 667) limiting the creation or extension of forest reserves in New Mexico was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, in line 5, after the words "limits of the," to strike out "State" and insert "States"; and in the same line, after the words "New Mexico," to insert "and Arizona," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no forest reservation shall be created, nor shall any additions be made to one heretofore created, within the limits of the States of New Mexico and Arizona except by act of Congress.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to further amend that bill by inserting the words "and Colorado" after the words "and Arizona," in line 5.

Mr. SMOOT. Was not the word "Colorado" in the original act?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think so.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure it was.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am quite sure that the provision of the bill applies already to Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I withdraw the amendment.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill limiting the creation or extension of forest reserves in New Mexico and Arizona."

APPOINTMENTS AT WEST POINT.

The bill (S. 2446) to amend section 1318, Revised Statutes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "case," to insert "That during the calendar years 1919 and 1920"; on line 7, to strike out the words "any person" and insert "any appointee"; on line 9, after the word "in," to strike out "either"; on the same line, after the word "the," to strike out "volunteer or regular service" and insert "Army"; and on line 10, after the word "late," to strike out "European war" and insert "war with Germany," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1318, Revised Statutes, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows: "Appointees shall be admitted to the academy only between the ages of 17 and 22 years, except in the following case: That during the calendar years 1919 and 1920 any appointee who has served honorably and faithfully not less than one year in the Army of the United States in the late war with Germany, and who possesses the other qualifications required by law, may be admitted between the ages of 17 and 24 years."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

QUARTERS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

The bill (S. 2623) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases," approved April 16, 1918, was announced as next in order.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the termination of the emergency mentioned in an act entitled "An act to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases," approved April 16, 1918, the provisions of the said act shall be applicable to every commissioned officer of the Army of the United States who is assigned to duty at a place where suitable public quarters are not available for himself and dependents, and who is not entitled to commutation of quarters under any other provision of existing law.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAVEL ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED MEN.

The bill (S. 2624) to provide travel allowances for certain retired enlisted men and Regular Army reservists was announced as next in order.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 126 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended by section 3 of an act entitled "An act permitting any person who has served in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps in the present war to re-

tain his uniform and personal equipment, and to wear the same under certain conditions," approved February 28, 1919, shall be held to apply to any enlisted man for whom the law authorizes travel allowances as an incident to entry upon and relief from active duty with the Army who has been called into active service during the present emergency, or who shall hereafter be called into active service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2676) to amend section 56 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2677) to provide for further educational facilities by authorizing the Secretary of War to sell at reduced rates certain machine tools not in use for Government purposes to trade and technical schools and universities, other recognized educational institutions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. This concludes the calendar.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, this morning made a favorable report on Senate bill 681, and it is now on the calendar. It is purely a formal matter. The Senate passed a similar bill at the last session of Congress, and it does not involve any appropriation. I ask unanimous consent to take it up for consideration at this time.

It relates to an appropriation made several years ago for a public building in the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex. The wording of the appropriation act required that the building should be constructed so as to include a courthouse, with provision for holding court in the public building. There is a Federal building now in use in Santa Fe which accommodates the Federal court, and the Federal judge and other court officials and all people who are acquainted with the conditions want to have the law modified so that the building shall not be required to be constructed in such fashion as to accommodate the court, but that it shall be for the post office and other public purposes.

There are a good many other public activities in the city of Santa Fe which are being accommodated through the renting of private properties. A similar bill passed the Senate at the last session but failed to receive attention in the House. There is no objection to it from any source that I have ever heard of, and it should be passed in order to enable the Treasury Department to proceed with the construction of the building in Santa Fe.

Mr. THOMAS. Let the bill be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That so much of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 875), as authorized the erection of a building for the accommodation of the post office and United States courts at Santa Fe, N. Mex., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to require that said building shall be for the accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices, exclusive of the United States courts.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator whether it will be possible to have an executive session to-day?

Mr. CURTIS. I think not to-day.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is important that the nominations of members of the Shipping Board shall be acted upon to-day, if possible. Does the Senator think we can have an executive session for that purpose on Monday?

Mr. CURTIS. There are several Senators interested in the matter who were informed that at this time, on the conclusion of the consideration of the calendar, there would be an adjournment without an executive session. For that reason I think it better to let the matter go over until Monday. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 4, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *August 2, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, we lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee that measures are being put into practice to alleviate the unparalleled conditions existing in our country; that the authorities will look into them with a view of cutting down the high cost of living and profiteering in all branches; that the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness may be realized in getting back to the normal; that good government may obtain in all the conditions of life. In the name of truth and right and justice. Amen.

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

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. STEENERSON rose.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. To make a privileged motion.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I make a privileged motion to change the reference of a certain bill which I have here for the adjudication of private claims, which was referred to our committee. We considered it, and I have been directed to move a change of reference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves a change of reference of a bill, which he sends to the Clerk's desk and which will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4738) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870 (16 Stat. L., p. 670), authorizing the Postmaster General to continue to use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand-stamp patents, and directing him to "determine upon a fair, just, and equitable compensation for the use of said inventions"; or arising otherwise.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's motion?

Mr. STEENERSON. To refer it to the Committee on Claims.

The SPEAKER. Where is it now?

Mr. STEENERSON. In the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the bill reported be transferred from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to the Committee on Claims. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reference of the bill H. R. 1186 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be vacated and that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send up the bill to be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1186) to confer certain additional powers upon the Federal Trade Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to change the reference from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary. Is there objection?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the reference in the first instance was correct, inasmuch as the bill relates to the increase of the powers in the Federal Trade Commission in the matter of granting licenses to corporations doing interstate-commerce business. The Federal Trade Commission was created by an act which passed through our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the matter of granting licenses is connected with interstate commerce. However, our committee took action on this matter yesterday, and in view of the rather peculiar circumstances surrounding our committee at the present time and our desire not to delay consideration of the measure by some other committee, we do not object to its reference, with the understanding that it shall not be considered as a precedent hereafter of taking from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce any matter relating to the Federal Trade Commission or the powers it exercises.

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

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, wish my position to be clearly understood with respect to this reference. This matter is essentially and inherently

within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Federal Trade Commission, as stated by the distinguished chairman, my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], was elaborately considered and reported by that committee, and the subject of the reference essentially relates to the jurisdiction of that committee. But in view of the statement of the chairman of the committee I offer no objection, but I do wish to emphasize his contention that this reference is not to be considered as a precedent.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The reference is ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize the President to convene the first meeting of the international labor conference in Washington, and to appoint delegates thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 3854) for the repeal of the daylight-saving law.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 26.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the action taken under concurrent resolution of July 28, 1919, providing for an adjournment of the House from Saturday, the 2d day of August, until 12 o'clock meridian, Tuesday, the 9th day of September, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, rescinded.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize the President to convene a meeting of an international labor conference in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

BRIDGE ACROSS FLINT RIVER, GA.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 7110.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. PARK. It is a bridge bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7110) extending the time for the construction of a bridge across Flint River, in the State of Georgia.

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved April 17, 1916, to be built across the Flint River, Ga., by Mitchell County or by Baker County, Ga., jointly or separately, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to start in on bridge bills with the measures that are now pending.

Mr. PARK. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold it a moment.

Mr. PARK. It will not take a minute.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws his objection. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

PAYMENT FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION WORK.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to call up House joint resolution 165, a resolution containing about five lines.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to inquire what this joint resolution is about.

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent has not been given yet. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report. After it has been reported, objection can be made.

The Clerk read the title of H. J. Res. 165, to allow the payment of bills lawfully incurred for construction work actually performed or construction material actually purchased and delivered prior to the approval of an act approved July 11, 1919 (Public, No. 7, 66th Cong., H. R. 5227).

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. This joint resolution is simply to cure a mistake that was made when the other bill was passed, is it not?

Mr. McKENZIE. In putting the limitation in the Army appropriation bill we intended to prevent the further expenditure of money in the purchase of real estate or construction in various camps and cantonments, but we did not intend to prevent the payment for work performed or material delivered prior to that time; but the Comptroller of the Treasury has made a ruling that the limitation extends to work performed and material delivered prior to that time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This is to cure that?

Mr. McKENZIE. This cures that.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if this is to cure the construction of the so-called limitation upon the purchase of real estate in the Army bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. If the real estate had been purchased and the contract completed prior to the passage of the bill, they would be permitted to pay for it, and in my judgment that should be permitted; but if the contract had not been completed, then they are barred under the limitation.

Mr. WALSH. What does the gentleman mean by a completed contract for real estate? Down here at Camp Benning or somewhere they purchased a large tract while that measure was under consideration.

Mr. McKENZIE. And paid for it.

Mr. WALSH. So this would not apply to that in any event?

Mr. McKENZIE. No.

Mr. ASWELL. Reserving the right to object, what effect would this have upon a contract already signed by the War Department for the construction of a road to a camp, which road is now under process of construction but not yet paid for?

Mr. McKENZIE. If it is inside of a military reservation, it would not be affected by this legislation at all.

Mr. ASWELL. But it is not.

Mr. McKENZIE. The purpose of this bill is to permit the Government to pay a great many business men who have really performed their work and delivered the goods and are now being held up by this ruling of the comptroller.

Mr. ASWELL. This road is at a base hospital that is being used by the Public Health Service. Now, the contract has been signed and the work is in progress. What effect will this have on that?

Mr. McKENZIE. If anything this joint resolution would assist those parties rather than injure them.

Mr. OLIVER. What bill does the comptroller construe as forbidding the payment?

Mr. McKENZIE. The limitation that was placed on the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. OLIVER. When was that passed?

Mr. McKENZIE. The 11th day of July.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, what effect will this resolution have upon that land attempted to be purchased down in Georgia, which contract was made after the adjournment of the last Congress? Will it permit them to go ahead with that contract?

Mr. McKENZIE. It will not, without further authorization from Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say that it is probably necessary to pass this joint resolution, but in the report appears this statement:

The Comptroller of the Treasury in passing on this limitation has held erroneously, in the judgment of the committee, that work and construction performed or materials delivered prior to the date of the passage of this act could not be paid for out of any of the unexpended balances.

I hardly think that statement is correct, and I do not think it ought to be allowed to go through without notation. I do not think the committee meant to hold that the judgment of the comptroller was erroneous in this regard. Personally I think that the judgment of the comptroller was correct, and that the War Department unlawfully expended that money, and even now have no right to spend a dollar of the money that we appropriated for war by using it for peace-time construction, which they are now doing. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois that men who delivered material and did work have an equitable claim and should get their money, but I do not believe we ought to say that the comptroller erred in making what I consider to be an absolutely sound ruling.

Mr. McKENZIE. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas that if there is any blame connected with the Military Affairs Committee in that connection it rests wholly with me.

Mr. KITCHIN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman if it would not be more equitable to strike out the word "delivered" and substitute the words "actually produced under the contract of purchase"? That carries out what the gentleman wants, does it not? The joint resolution reads:

That the foregoing provisions of said act shall not be construed to prevent the payment from the unexpended balances of said appropriations of bills lawfully incurred for construction work actually performed or construction material actually purchased and delivered prior to the approval of said act.

Now, that confines it to the goods that were purchased and actually delivered over to the Government, and it leaves out those cases where the Government purchased, and the contractors actually produced under the contract exactly what was contracted for, but had not actually delivered it. Take shoes, for instance. The Government, say, actually purchased so many shoes and the manufacturer actually produced the shoes under the contract, but had not bodily delivered them. Or take lumber, for instance. Here is a bill of lumber which has been purchased, and the lumber has been manufactured and produced under that contract of purchase, but has not been actually delivered. Now, why should not that lumberman have his bill paid as well as the lumberman who had actually delivered the lumber? I would suggest that, in order to cover all the equities where one actually produced articles under a contract of purchase although he has not delivered it, we strike out the words "and delivered" and insert "actually produced under the contract." Would not that be more fair?

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that that was discussed in the committee, and we decided that we would take care of such cases when there was absolutely no question as to whether the goods had been delivered and the work performed, but that we would not open the doors to any doubtful contract or permit men to come in under this bill with questionable contracts, realizing that if a man has a just claim it would be taken care of—if a man has such a claim that the gentleman speaks of it will be taken care of. The price of lumber and shoes and everything that can be thought of, instead of going down from the time the man made the contract, unless he had a most unconscionable contract, has been going up, so that he can get more now than he could under his contract.

Mr. KITCHIN. Suppose he had lumber of special dimensions that he could not put on the market. He has actually produced it, every foot of it, under the contract of purchase. Why should not that man have his pay?

Mr. McKENZIE. I appreciate what the gentleman says, but we felt that it would be unwise at this time to go into that.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The class of cases mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina, the shoe men and the lumbermen, although they may have prepared material for delivery to the United States Government, they still have the materials and ought not to be paid for them until the Government gets them. There is no claim against the Government for this material; they can sell it to people who want it and are ready for it.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas raised the question that the pending resolution in fact seeks to legalize and provide payment for illegal contracts. Did the committee go into that question?

Mr. McKENZIE. It did not.

Mr. OLIVER. You are not seeking, then, to legalize that which the committee was informed was illegal, and the ruling of the comptroller was not based on the illegality of the contracts, but solely because of limitations contained in the July 11 act. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKENZIE. I so understand.

Mr. GARRETT. Further reserving the right to object, I want to say this in justice to those of us who argued this question when it was up before. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] that the construction the comptroller placed on this matter was the correct construction, and several of us justified our position in opposition to the limitation that the Military Affairs Committee sought to place on the bill, and justified our position of opposition to the resolution that the Rules Committee reported to make it in order after it had gone out on a point of order under the general rules of the House, upon the very theory that the comptroller has sustained because we construed the law that way. It was because I felt, for one, that it would affect these very contracts which it is now sought to relieve by this resolution that I opposed the proposition as submitted by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House joint resolution 165.

To allow the payment of bills lawfully incurred for construction work actually performed or construction material actually purchased and delivered prior to the approval of an act approved July 11, 1919 (Public No. 7, Sixty-sixth Congress, H. R. 5227).

Whereas by an act approved July 11, 1919 (Public No. 7, Sixty-sixth Congress, H. R. 5227), it is provided as follows:

"That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate for the construction of Army camps or cantonments except in such cases at National Army or National Guard camps or cantonments which were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been or may be found more economical to the Government for the purpose of salvaging such camps or cantonments to buy real estate than to continue to pay rentals or claims for damages thereon, and except where industrial plants have been constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes and the purchase of land is necessary in order to protect the interest of the Government"; and

Whereas doubt exists as to the proper interpretation of said provision and as to the intention of Congress in enacting the same: Therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the foregoing provision of said act shall not be construed to prevent the payment from the unexpended balances of said appropriations of bills lawfully incurred for construction work actually performed or construction material actually purchased and delivered prior to the approval of said act.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, in order to clarify what I said a moment ago. I did not catch all that was said by the gentleman from Kansas. My attention has been directed to the fact that he stated that he thought there was no legal right to make the contracts originally. In view of that fact, and that I stated that I agreed with the gentleman from Kansas on the construction made by the comptroller, I wish to correct that statement. I do not agree that they had no authority to make the contract. I think they did. I agree that the ruling of the comptroller was correct. I do not understand that the comptroller placed it on the ground mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. As I caught the reading of the resolution, it has a long preamble and a short legislative provision. I suppose it was drawn in the department.

Mr. McKENZIE. It was.

Mr. MANN. If they were familiar with legislative proceedings, as they ought to be, they would know that it is not a proper method to refer to the preamble to know what the legislation is. It is customary to strike out the preamble after the consideration. The legislation here depends wholly on the preamble, which is not in the legislative provision.

Mr. McKENZIE. This is simply a construction of the act.

Mr. MANN. It is not a construction; it is legislation. It is repealing a part of an act of Congress and does it by reference to the preamble.

Mr. McKENZIE. I can not exactly agree with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman has read the resolution—and of course he has very carefully—he must realize that it refers to the preamble. That is the only place where the act is described.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the joint resolution to be engrossed and read a third time.

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

On motion of Mr. McKENZIE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD—LEGAL ASSISTANCE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 209.

Resolved, That the select committee, appointed under the provisions of House resolution 171, to make inquiry into the operations of the United States Shipping Board, the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation, or any agency, branch, or subsidiary of either, is hereby authorized to employ such stenographic, legal, and clerical assistance,

including accountants, as it may deem necessary, and is further authorized to have such printing and binding done as it may require.

All expenses incurred by the said committee under the provisions of House Resolution 171, including expenses when sitting outside the District of Columbia, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers, ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution follows the one which was offered some days ago by the Committee on Rules. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to make a short statement in respect to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask some gentleman who feels capable of answering the question, what this committee wants with a lawyer? The whole committee is made up of lawyers.

Mr. IRELAND. If the gentleman will very graciously withhold that question for a moment, I would state that that is what I have in mind in yielding to the gentleman from Massachusetts. That was the point in the committee, and the only point of contention.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What do they want with lawyers to help this committee?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I expected that question might be asked, and I stated to the Committee on Accounts in presenting the resolution that it is not the intention of the special committee to retain an attorney to conduct the examination for the committee in questioning and cross-questioning the witnesses before that committee, but in view of the great number of contracts, leases, and other legal documents that have been drawn and signed, in many cases involving questions of maritime law, the committee felt that it might be necessary to employ a lawyer to examine the documents for the committee and to present such as he felt necessary to the committee with his interpretation, to assist the committee in examining the large number of contracts, leases, and other documents.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If they are going to hire a lawyer, what is the committee going to do? What are they good for?

Mr. WALSH. The committee will be busy enough in conducting the examination into this very important department of the Government, which has been very active during the last three or four years; in fact, since its creation and establishment. The committee, of course, will have to hold hearings and hear the statements of a great many officials and people who have been connected with transactions in the activities of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. These appointments on these committees are highly honorable and gentlemen like to get them. The members of this committee, almost without exception, are good lawyers.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman, although he does say "almost without exception."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And these committees go to work usually and hire some high-class city lawyer, and the country lawyers, although they are the best lawyers in the world, never get a look-in on any of these appointments to act as attorneys. We have been talking a great deal here about economy, and, of course, I suppose this lawyer, whoever he may be, will get $15,000, for that seems to be about the minimum figure.

Mr. WALSH. That was the precedent established by the majority party in the last Congress, I will say.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not care who established it. The committee does not have to follow precedents.

Mr. WALSH. No; and I do not think that that precedent will be followed, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I want to know is, if this would not be a good time to save even as small an amount as $15,000?

Mr. WALSH. A very good time, I think.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am in favor of it.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If it be true, and I have no doubt that it is, that all of the members of this committee are very eminent lawyers——

Mr. WALSH. "Almost without exception," the gentleman from Missouri says.

Mr. LONGWORTH. "Almost without exception," are there any members of the committee who know anything, or practically anything, about admiralty law?

Mr. WALSH. I think not.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And, therefore, the employment of such an attorney is necessary. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is talking about the precedents set by the majority party in the last Congress. I think some of those precedents are very bad. Yesterday we struck the lawyers from the resolution for the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department. Why not do the same thing with this?

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman appreciates the fact that the Shipping Board has been operating a vast number of plants under contracts and arrangements and leases, and has been operating ships under arrangements which have necessitated the drafting of legal documents involving many questions of maritime law. It would seem that it might become necessary for an attorney to make an examination of many of those legal documents and to assist the committee in construing them for the purpose of conducting the thorough examination which will be required and which it is, of course, expected the special committee will make into the affairs of the Shipping Board, the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and any other subsidiary organizations connected with it.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Is it the purpose of this investigating committee to have the publicity agent of the Republican national committee present to make notes or take notes?

Mr. WALSH. It is not the purpose to have the publicity agent of the Republican national committee on the pay roll of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Has Creel got a job? [Laughter.]

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASWELL) there were—ayes 105, noes 43.

So the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. IRELAND, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

CLERKS TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 224.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation at the rate of $150 per month during the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress for the services of one clerk to each of the following-named committees: Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior, Committee on Railways and Canals, and Committee on Education.

Compensation for the clerks to the said committees to commence from the time such clerk entered upon the discharge of his duties, such time to be ascertained and evidenced by a certificate signed by the chairman of the said committee.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to state to the House that these clerks that are provided for in this resolution were those omitted in the last resolution brought in, because these chairmen had not appeared before the committee and given reason why they should be granted.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman know whether any of these committees have had a meeting this Congress?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes; several, I think, have. I can not tell just which ones or how many meetings they have had, but they gave us the assurance——

Mr. ASWELL. Has the Committee on Railways and Canals had a meeting this session?

Mr. IRELAND. The chairman is here, and I can not recall what his answer was as to——

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield for a brief question, does not the gentleman know that the Committee on Railways and Canals has not had a bill for five years and do not do any investigating?

Mr. IRELAND. We heard otherwise from the chairman of the committee when he appeared before us.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will look up the record he will find that that committee has had no business and I do not think they have had a clerk or have done any business.

Mr. IRELAND. The same committee had a clerk under the Democratic Congress, however. I do not know whether they have had any business or not.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If the gentleman will permit, I desire to state that the Committee on Education has no clerk and it has had a great many hearings and a great many meetings. We need a clerk for that committee, I know.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think the gentleman is right in that.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I think the Committee on Education should have a clerk, but why on earth should $150 a month be paid to a clerk to the Committee on Railways and Canals when we know that the business it did all of last session was to have about three meetings? It has very little business, and the service of a clerk is wholly unnecessary, and I dare say the committee will not have a meeting this whole session, not just the first session but during the whole of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and there will be no necessity whatever for a clerk, so what is the use of spending the money? I was a member of this committee last year. We had three meetings, from which no legislation whatever resulted, and I do not know of any business during the whole of the Sixty-fifth Congress that necessitated a clerk for that committee.

Mr. IRELAND. But the committee had a clerk, however, did it not?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it had a clerk, but it should not have had one. Merely because this side of the House provided one is no excuse for having one.

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly not. But the gentleman must recall, though, we should profit by Democratic mistakes——

Mr. BLANTON. That was an instance where we followed a bad precedent set by our Republican friends.

Mr. IRELAND. Very possibly. I am not sure about that. We have the assurance of the chairman that he has sufficient work before the committee to necessitate the employment of a clerk. Now, we can hardly go back of that assurance until proven otherwise.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. My information is that that committee will have a considerable amount of work to do this year. I understand that an investigation is to be undertaken as to the difference in cost of transportation by canal and railway, which would be a very important investigation and could scarcely be conducted unless the committee had a clerk.

Mr. IRELAND. I understand there is quite a comprehensive case coming from the State of Ohio.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call attention to the fact that a clerk was provided by this resolution for the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department. I made that statement yesterday, that the committee had theretofore taken such action and the House will remember that it was denied. Now, we provided one in this resolution, and had already taken this action providing for a clerk for the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department before the other resolution, which was considered and debated here yesterday, was taken up, and I ask the chairman if he will not confirm that as being the fact?

Mr. IRELAND. It is absolutely the fact, and the only reason it was not handed in before was they brought in several separate bills.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then my statement was correct when I stated that the committee had already provided for it?

Mr. IRELAND. In that particular; yes, sir.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. I would like to be informed who is chairman of what has heretofore been a very unimportant committee. Who is chairman of it now?

Mr. IRELAND. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman say there is business before his committee that requires the services of a clerk?

Mr. IRELAND. I have been so informed.

Mr. GARD. My observation of the Committee on Railways and Canals is that they never had but one bill in the last Congress. I do not know what they have now, and I should like to have a word from the gentleman from Illinois as to how many bills they have before that committee.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. IRELAND. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER. I will state that in the last Congress we held extensive hearings, and we had a number of meetings of that committee in the minority room in the House Office Building. We had 150 people from Indiana and Ohio on canal projects who represented the business men's associations from those States. In this Congress there has been introduced a resolution or two on which we will have hearings, and there has been one resolution introduced providing for surveying for a canal in Florida, and I am informed by the gentleman that introduced that resolution there will be some business men from that State that will want to come before that committee. And I have been informed that in all probability there will be a bill introduced for a canal project in Ohio and Indiana, and possibly Pennsylvania. If so, it will require hearings, and we will have quite a number of business men before the committee.

Mr. GARD. How many bills are now pending?

Mr. WHEELER. There are two before the committee now and in all probability there will be two more.

Mr. GARD. Two?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. For what length of time does the resolution contemplate the employment of these clerks?

Mr. IRELAND. Only during the first session of this Congress.

Mr. OLIVER. It appears from the questions asked, and from the information before the committee, that the business of these committees will be rather spasmodic. Would it not be better to authorize the appointment of a clerk only for the time a committee actually needs one?

Mr. IRELAND. That might have been a better method.

Mr. OLIVER. Rather than provide for the appointment of a clerk for 12 months?

Mr. IRELAND. That privilege, as we have always found, has been abused, and the compensation is usually about $6 a day, or $180 a month. A compromise was suggested by the gentleman from Georgia at $150 a month.

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman will recall that when this matter was before the House at the last session clerks were refused to these same committees, and my recollection is that we authorized some other committees to employ clerks only for such time as the committees might certify they were needed.

Mr. IRELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. OLIVER. Now, would it not be better to amend your resolution so as to provide for certification by the chairmen of these respective committees that a clerk is needed for the time he is to be actually employed.

Mr. IRELAND. Well, that is a debatable question. We acted as we thought best under the circumstances. We found that most any arrangement that might be made would be capable of abuse at any time.

Mr. OLIVER. That certainly would be the business way of handling a matter of this kind, since it clearly appears that many of these committees have had but little, if any, work in the past and even now contemplate but a little work for the future.

Mr. IRELAND. Personally I am in accord with the gentleman's views.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department. They have had only one meeting. I did not know that the committee was asking for a clerk. I would like to ask the gentleman to have the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department explain to this House the necessity for a clerk for that committee.

Mr. KREIDER. I will be glad to explain.

Mr. CANNON. Is that matter up before the House now? Is it included in this resolution?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. I asked permission to appoint my secretary as clerk without pay, and that stands; and, as I explained to the committee, I did not intend that the clerk to be appointed to that committee should receive any compensation whatever unless the committee should be compelled to have hearings and get such an amount of business that my clerk could not do the work. As long as my secretary does the work there will be no charges and no bill presented for the appointment of any clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Mr. IRELAND. I will say that that statement was made before the committee.

Mr. KREIDER. It is not my intention now to appoint a clerk with pay. The clerk there now gets no pay, and unless that work is of such a volume that the clerk can not do it, there will be no clerk hire.

Mr. HOWARD. Why create the right to appoint this clerk unless something comes before the committee that makes it necessary?

Mr. IRELAND. Because the gentleman, who is more conversant with the work of the committee than the gentleman making the interrogatory, assures us there is business coming before the committee. The clerk will not be appointed until there is such business to occupy the time of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are now having the annual round-up about these clerks for the minor committees. I wish to make a remark or two about this Committee on Railways and Canals. The Speakers have held that it fell into what

Mr. Cleveland would have called "innocuous desuetude." I do not know what the experience of the present Speaker has been about referring bills to that committee, but at the first of the last Congress I made up my mind I was going to either have the committee abolished or resurrected. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors had absorbed one half of its jurisdiction and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had absorbed the other half, and there were a good many bills introduced that ought to have gone to the Committee on Railways and Canals. And I concluded, as it had nothing to do I would give them something to do, if they would do it. So I went to the chairman of the committee and told him I would refer to his committee all the bills over which they had jurisdiction if he would agree to get his committee together and go to work. He said he would do it. Consequently I referred bills to them, and I have never heard a word about those bills from that day to this. [Laughter.] But there are bills that ought to go to the committee. There is a bill pending here—I do not know what committee it is in now—for digging a canal from Pittsburgh to Cleveland, or to some place up there on the lake, that is a very important and serious proposition. If that canal were dug it would be a great benefit to the commerce of that part of the country.

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

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not the fact that the committee failed to report any legislation after considering the matters which the Speaker laid before it the best proof of the good judgment of the committee rather than otherwise?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My own judgment about it is that all these bills that are referred to committees ought to be reported back here some way or other, either favorably or unfavorably. That is the answer to that question.

Mr. MANN. It would make a lot of reports.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know there would be a lot of reports, but the committee has got nothing to do but make a report.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. I would like to have two or three minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution ought to pass. I know that the Committee on Railways and Canals has some important business that may come before it.

But that is not what I took the floor to say. I am the chairman of one of the most important committees of this House and one of the hardest-working committees of the House. When it did business it did it promptly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. You had the girls to help you. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. No. We had no help from the girls. We did not require it with such able assistance as there was in the House. I have not asked the Committee on Accounts for a clerk for the Committee on Woman Suffrage. I have had my own clerk perform those duties. My clerk is the best clerk in the Capitol at Washington. [Applause.] She has been representing my district in Congress for the last two years, and may for some time to come. [Laughter.] Her salary for years was a good deal more than she is now getting, and I do not promise that I shall not ask the Committee on Accounts before the termination of this Congress that they allow enough additional to make her salary what it was and what it has been for years. I do not know whether I shall ask it or not. It would not be very much.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for just a few minutes?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Just a word, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the expenditure committees and their clerks. The expenditure committees ought in every session of Congress to be active. They have duties to perform that are important; not necessarily in the nature of investigations with a view of discovering something questionable, but investigations for the information of the House as to the conduct of the public business. These committees, every one of them, should be active enough to require the services of a good clerk. In this House the Committee on Accounts has insisted, before recommending clerks to these committees, that the committees urge the appointment of such clerks and bring evidence before the Committee on Accounts as to the intention of the committees to proceed to the work that properly falls to them and comes under their jurisdiction. Ordinarily these clerks are provided for as a matter of course at the beginning of the session. The Accounts Committee delayed making provision for these clerks until assured that the committees were going to do business. It is the duty of all of these committees to proceed to inquiries and investigations that will require the services of a good clerk. I am confident they will do so.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes; on this subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], that if the Committee on Railways and Canals is not busy, it ought to get busy, because one of the most important problems before the country to-day in connection with the high cost of living problem is the matter of transportation.

I have heard it said repeatedly during the last couple of years that one great phase of the transportation question to give effective relief to the people was the proper coordination of canals and the railways of the United States. One of the most effective methods by which rapid and cheap transportation should be effected would be the more effective utilization of our canals and waterways and railroads.

The other day I listened to a Member of Congress from Texas, who said that he had raised hundreds of bushels of tomatoes on his farm in Texas, and when they were sent to market and he got his account back from the commission merchant, instead of there being a profit, he was charged $2.50 as a handling expense; the people of the United States are wondering why it is that the farmer gets so little while it costs so much at the table, and one important phase of this situation is transportation. Germany tackled this question 50 years ago, and her best minds were directed to the utilization of the natural waterways of the country in conjunction with the railroads.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. I think if we are going to have the cost of living discussed under a resolution to provide a clerk to a committee, you had better have a quorum here. There are important measures pending here. Under a privileged resolution concerning a clerk, the gentleman is discussing the high cost of living, and I do not think we ought to permit absent Members to lose the benefit of this discussion.

Mr. IRELAND. I did not yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts for that purpose.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman said he was going to discuss the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I said I was, and I ask the House for leave to address it for three minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know what the resolution is?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The resolution calls for the appointment of a clerk for the Committee on Railways and Canals, and I think it should pass; and if I were not interrupted I think I would have given cogent reasons why this committee, instead of being moribund, should be one of the most active in the House, to the benefit of the people of the country.

Mr. WALSH. And they would not have to have a clerk under this resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Years ago the railroads throttled the canals, and it looks now as though the railroads still had influence enough to stifle canal development, which would be of inestimable service to the people of the country.

While I am on the floor I want to make a statement about the housing conditions here in Washington. I am told that the Government took over quite a lot of land to build small houses for Government employees, particularly those employed in the navy yard. The war ended before the buildings were started, though some money was expended by the Government in building cellars and clearing off the land in many places. I was told to-day that there are a number of employees in the navy yard here who would like to buy this land at the price paid by the Government and build their own homes. These men are now inadequately housed, living two or three families in a house, with 6, 8, or 10 persons trying to live under insanitary conditions, and they have clubbed together enough money to build a substantial number of houses on this land, provided the Housing Bureau will turn it over to them at the original cost to the Government. This the Housing Bureau hesitates to do because of the fear of criticism by Congress. I think I can say to this commission that if these men, who are now improperly housed, are willing to pay the Government for the original cost of this land and build their own buildings, that this Congress to a man will stand behind that proposition. I am told that the money spent on this land by the Government does not help the land in any respect as far as these men are concerned; in fact, in many cases it would be a hindrance, because the cellars that were dug are altogether too large for the small buildings they intend to build. I thought that I ought to bring this matter to the attention of the House to see if

there was any opposition, so that the members of the Housing Commission would feel that if they permit this sale to go on that they would have the indorsement of this body.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, at what time would it be in order to offer amendments to this resolution?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order now.

Mr. KITCHIN rose.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BLANTON. I offer the following amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND] yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to offer an amendment?

Mr. IRELAND. I have already yielded to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. IRELAND. Two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope no gentleman on this side of the House will object to this resolution. I have conferred with the Democratic members of the Committee on Accounts and they favor the reporting of this resolution in its present shape. I understand that they looked over the Republican personnel of the committees asking for clerical assistance very carefully, and the Democrats came to the conclusion that if such committees were really going to amount to anything they would have to have outside assistance to get along. [Laughter.] I am pretty sure they do, and they ought to do some work; and being absolutely in need of outside assistance to do it, I hope no Member on this side will object to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. IRELAND. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of an order which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That until further notice the House shall meet at noon on Tuesdays and Fridays. No business shall be in order except the Chaplain's prayer, the reading and approval of the Journal, the signing of bills and resolutions on the Speaker's table, and a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. IGOE. Reserving the right to object, I had a resolution pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, relating to the investigation of the price of shoes and other articles, which has been reported with amendments. Before introducing it I requested the consent of the majority leader for its consideration, and he was not disposed to give that consent. This resolution is now pending on the calendar, and the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. DENISON] would like to have unanimous consent for its consideration. I have asked the Rules Committee to provide a rule in the event that unanimous consent is refused. I do not know what action will be taken upon that resolution, and until it is passed by the House I shall object to any such order as that suggested by the gentleman from Wyoming. Therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 2847. An act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind;

H. R. 5228. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Minneapolis, a municipal corporation, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 5648. An act for the construction of a bridge across the Rainy River between Spooner, Minn., and Rainy River, Province of Ontario, Canada;

H. R. 6434. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River about 2 miles above its confluence with the Washita River, near Preston, Grayson County, Tex.;

H. R. 6342. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River at the town of Usk, in the State of Washington;

H. R. 6438. An act authorizing the counties of Aiken, S. C., and Richmond, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Savannah River at or near Augusta, Ga.;

H. R. 6450. An act to amend an act entitled "An act 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";

H. R. 6692. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Forsyth, Mo.;

H. R. 6805. An act to authorize the county of Dougherty, State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Flint River, connecting Broad Street, in the city of Albany, said State and county, with the Isabella Road, said county and State; and

H. R. 5418. An act increasing the pay of printers and pressmen employed in the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

LABORATORY GLASSWARE, SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS, ETC.

On motion of Mr. FORDNEY the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide revenue for the Government, to establish and maintain in the United States the manufacture of laboratory glassware, laboratory porcelain ware, scientific and surgical instruments, with Mr. TILSON in the chair.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield such time as the gentleman from North Carolina wishes, not exceeding one hour.

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN] five minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I take it this bill is the opening gun in the battle for a general increase of the tariff. It is doubtless the precursor of many more bills that we may reasonably expect will follow. We have upon the table in front of us a splendid array of surgical instruments. Yesterday we were delightfully entertained by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH] with an imposing exhibit of chemical and scientific glassware. I presume later in the session we will have demonstrations of the magnificent work done by the steel industry, by the brick industry, by the paper industry, and by the thousand and one industries of this country which have been clamoring for increased tariffs, to raise the protective wall to the absurd height which it had attained before the barrier was cut down, after repeated failures, I might add, on the part of the Republicans to keep their promise to lower it.

Gentlemen, the issue that confronts us to-day is the increased cost of living. How in the name of heaven are you going to accomplish anything in the way of reducing the high cost of living if you set out on the path to increase the cost of everything to the consumer? [Applause.]

It may be that the surgical instrument, the chemical laboratory, and glassware industries were stimulated by the force of necessity during the war. I do not deny that they have accomplished great things, and it may be that they ought to receive some encouragement to prevent their industries from being put out of business; but I tell you it is not the right way to do it by piecemeal. Get all of these bills together that you have pending now in your committee that relate to the tariff and give them careful consideration, and bring out a bill, not with tariff rates of 45 or 60 per cen ad valorem, as you do in this bill, but giving power to some intelligent commission to take into consideration the conditions and circumstances of the trade, industry, and occupation, the necessities of the moment, and to fix a tariff at a fair rate. I sincerely hope that you will not now start upon this road of bringing in these bills by piecemeal. If American industry needs encouragement, by all means give it intelligently. Do not take the word of the manufacturers that they need 60 per cent ad valorem in order to protect their industries, to prevent their being ruined by competition. One will demand 45 per cent, another 60 per cent, another, perhaps, will demand 80 per cent ad valorem. You should not be guided by their demands. [Applause.]

Their judgment is biased. They are governed by self-interest and not by any deep concern, either for the wage earners or the consumers.

There seems to be a general lack of coordination or system in all the panaceas suggested for the amelioration of the condition in which we now find ourselves. Capital wants high

protection to help it meet the inroads made by the income and war taxes upon its dividends. Labor wants increase of wages to help it meet the high cost of living. But it is neither by protective tariffs nor other artificial devices that you can make industries thrive and prosper; nor is it by a temporary sop to labor in the way of wages that you can make the life of the wage earner more endurable. We have been going along on that road—the road of the charlatan—long enough. The thing to do now is to make a declaration in this Congress that quack doctoring is at an end.

Let us announce to the world that prices are at their highest peak and that henceforth nothing shall be entertained—no proposal considered—which directly or indirectly will tend to enhance the cost of anything.

So long as we listen to the plaints of the manufacturers that they must have higher tariff barriers to protect them, so long will we be obliged to entertain the plaints for higher wages. Both are interdependent and inseparable. To increase tariffs will only enhance the cost of living, and it is the experience of mankind that a material increase of wages is soon absorbed in the general rise in prices which inevitably follows. The increase in wages is like chicken feed thrown to the little chicks in the barnyard, to be instantly gobbled up by the big roosters.

Every increase in either protective tariffs or wages is invariably used as a pretext for further profiteering. Prices of all commodities react immediately, and the cost of living receives another boost; the tariff raise and the wage raise are soon more than neutralized. Then your pet industries will be back here asking for further help to defy the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, protect American labor, and incidentally put a few more dollars in their pockets. Each step in this endless struggle to obtain equilibrium will find the wage earner the sufferer, because each advance is inexorably and inevitably absorbed by the general rise in prices, which is invariably out of all proportion to the advance in tariff or in wages.

Another objection, and a most serious one, is that after the process of raising prices has gone on for some time we begin to deal with larger and still larger units; which makes the business of profiteering easier, simpler, and more profitable. Thus where the market would justify only a raise, say, of 10 per cent, the profiteer adds 15 per cent to his price; the next in the chain of distribution adds 20 per cent, and, finally, when it gets to the wage earner he will be mulcted by an increase of 25 per cent upon the original cost. We come, then, to deal with the dollar as we formerly dealt with the half dollar or the quarter. Our currency is depreciated; our dollar has only half or one-quarter of its former purchasing value. The mechanic who earns $40 a week now is in a poorer state financially than he was a few years ago when he earned $25 a week. This is the difficulty of our present situation, which contains so much of peril and makes it so hard to unravel. Despite all our attempts to mitigate conditions, the ultimate consumer finds himself helplessly enmeshed in the struggle for existence. You are not helping him by piling up tariffs. You are only building new obstacles in the pathway to plague the Nation in the ultimate adjustment.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from North Carolina use all of his time? We have only one more speech on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has 55 minutes remaining.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, the policies of the two parties represented on the committee are very widely apart with respect to the pending bill and other tariff bills reported out by the committee. We Democrats recognize that in the chemical and dyestuff industries there should be some kind of protection or encouragement for their establishment and maintenance in the United States, because they relate directly to war preparation, and so many other and larger industries are dependent upon them. The Democrats recognized this in 1916, and for the first time in the history of this Government they provided a tariff sufficient under conditions then—under normal conditions—to establish and maintain the dye and chemical industries in this country. The Republicans having been in power for almost a half century, though claiming to the people that they were for the establishment and maintenance by a protective tariff of American industries, refused during all those years absolutely to attempt to build up or encourage in the least the small industries whose products were used by the big industries, such as dyestuffs. The textile manufacturers and paint manufacturers and other manufacturers, whose capital and output amounted to millions and hundreds of millions of dollars, had so much influence with the Republicans in Congress for the last 50 years that the little fellows who made or who wished to produce dyestuffs that went into the products of these big manufacturers could not have a peep in. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

When the war came, although the Republican Party had been in power almost 50 years, we found that it had not encouraged the establishment of the chemical and dyestuff industries, the chemical-glass industry, the magnesite industry, the tungsten industry, the optical glass and instrument industry, or any other industries for which they are now asking a monopolistic tariff and many of which are essential in the manufacture of munitions of war.

The Republican eyes were on the big fellows and not on the little ones, and when the little fellows came to Washington and asked some little protection to start or maintain their little industries they were kicked out of the Capitol and told to go home and let them alone. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They were looking after the interests of the textile, the iron and steel, and many other big industries, who used these smaller products in the manufacture of their larger products.

They, by their system of protection to the big interests, relieved them of the payment of any tariff on many of their intermediate products that went into the manufacture of their finished products. Many were put on the free list, a low tariff was put on the others, in both cases to enable the large beneficiaries of their system to purchase in the markets of the world as cheaply as possible the materials necessary in the manufacture of their products. These beneficiaries were given protection in the purchase of their materials, to the detriment of the American producers of such materials, and protection in the sale of their finished product, to the injury of the American consumer.

The Democrats also recognize that there were a few industries established during and by the necessities of the war producing materials that are essential in the manufacture of direct munitions that should be encouraged and maintained in time of peace.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to yield to all later on, if my time will permit, but let me make my statement first. The Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee contend that this is no time to fool with the tariff and fix rates on any of these propositions. I believe that every intelligent man, be he a Republican or a Democrat, who has not some special interest in his district or State to serve will agree with us.

The Republican theory of protection—and you Republicans listen; I might get it wrong; correct me if I do—is that in levying a protective tariff you should put the rates only high enough to equalize the difference in the cost of production abroad and the cost of production at home, especially the difference in the labor cost. Mr. Taft during his administration added "and the American standard of profit." This theory has been written into every Republican platform since the Civil War. It is the theory proclaimed in every Republican protective-tariff speech made in this House or in the Senate or on the stump since the Civil War.

They know, and you know, and every intelligent man in this country knows, that there is no possible way in these abnormal times to find out in any respect the cost of production abroad of any of the articles embraced in the pending bill or other articles. The Tariff Commission is unable at this time to find such cost. The commission has made reports on chemical glass, optical glass and instruments, magnesite, tungsten ore, and many other products embraced in this and other bills reported out by the Ways and Means Committee, and in none of these reports do they or have they undertaken to tell us the cost of their production abroad. It knew and knows that in these times, when cost of production and price are abnormal the world over, it would have been a useless task to have undertaken to ascertain the cost abroad. It has been unable to find out the cost of production here. Every man who testified before the Ways and Means Committee admitted that he did not know and could not find out the cost of production abroad of the articles enumerated in this bill on account of present conditions throughout the world. Every Republican on the committee will admit that there is no way now in these abnormal times to ascertain the cost of production abroad and that there was no proof before the committee of the cost of production abroad of the articles upon which Congress is asked to impose a high and exorbitant tariff. We could not get, nor could the Tariff Commission get, nor did the manufacturers who testified before us get, the evidence of the cost of production of the articles contained in this bill or know what it was. Is not that so, gentlemen of the committee? Did any man testify as to the cost of production of chemical glassware, of optical glassware, of surgical and dental instruments, or of any other article embraced in this bill? Not one.

Mr. BACHARACH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BACHARACH. I had an exhibit here yesterday of beakers, in which it was shown that the Japanese could land them in this country for $1.01, equivalent to 45 per cent ad valorem, and the American goods cost about that to make without the overhead expenses, and they would sell for $1.27½.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; one gentleman testified that he bought 13 little glass beakers and a few other little glass articles for such and such a price that were imported from Japan. But he did not say what was the cost of production there or that he knew. He did testify that the American-made beakers were superior to those of the Japanese, which could account for the difference in price. There are hundreds of different kinds of chemical-glass articles. He only testified to the price of two or three, which he said were imported from Japan. What is the price or cost of production of the others?

Mr. BACHARACH. The gentleman will recall the testimony of Mr. O'Brien, who was a worker. He testified in reference to the cost.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; he is the gentleman sent down by the manufacturers to ask for them a 60 per cent duty.

Now, there is absolutely no evidence, and every Member knows it, of the cost of production abroad. Every witness that came before us said it, the Tariff Commission knows it. If we should find out such cost to-day, on account of the extraordinary and changing conditions throughout the world to-morrow or next week or month it might be radically different.

How can the Republicans of the committee or House write a tariff rate at this time and carry out the theory of equalizing the cost abroad and the cost at home if they do not know the cost abroad and have no way of finding out in these abnormal times what it is? It is most difficult to ascertain the cost here, much less abroad. The Tariff Commission has had much difficulty in ascertaining costs here, and in many cases could not do so.

There is no way in this world for any Republican or any protective-tariff man here or elsewhere at this time to get information enough to write a Republican protective tariff according to the professed theory and principles of the Republican Party. But the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee and in this House do have all the information they want to write a protective-tariff bill according to the actual practice of the Republicans in writing tariff bills heretofore. Their theory has been, their profession has been, that the Republican principle is to have the rate so adjusted as to equalize the difference between the cost abroad and at home, and yet in the McKinley Act, the Dingley Act, and the Payne-Aldrich Act, of the dutiable articles at least 50 per cent had not only a tariff rate sufficient to equalize the difference in the cost of production abroad and at home but sufficient to cover the total labor cost of the articles made here.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Take cotton, for instance. They had a rate of an average of about 50 per cent. The labor cost in the cotton industry is less than 28 per cent. They had a tariff twice as high as the total amount of the labor expended in the production of the articles. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman was speaking, I believe, about the theory under which this 50 per cent tariff was imposed in this bill. Will the gentleman state upon what theory the 45 per cent tariff in the present law, the so-called Underwood bill, was fixed? Upon what theory was the 45 per cent tariff in the present law agreed on as the proper duty on this glass?

Mr. KITCHIN. It was agreed on because we had sufficient evidence on which to fix a Democratic rate. We agreed on 45 per cent because we believed it to be the best revenue-producing rate without being too heavy a burden on the users of such articles. We agreed on it not in order to protect the monopolists that would grow up here but to protect the Treasury and the users of this glassware. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Do I understand the gentleman to state that his committee had evidence as to the foreign cost and the domestic cost which enabled them to arrive at a duty of 45 per cent?

Mr. KITCHIN. We had evidence enough to enable us to write a tariff act according to Democratic theory—first looking to the interest of the Government, and second, looking to the interest of the consumer, with the manufacturer having the protection incident to such a tariff. But as to the 45 per cent on chemical glassware there was no protection in it to such an American industry, because, though Republicans had control of the Government from 1860 to 1913, excepting eight years, there was no American chemical-glass industry when we took control in 1913 and framed the Underwood Act. In asking his question the gentleman left out something. The Democrats in the Underwood bill saw, and I am going to show the gentleman the difference between that and this bill, that 50 per cent of all of the chemical glassware used in this country was used by students in colleges and universities, the students taking chemical and scientific courses. We kept that on the free list for those students. This bill, as I shall show the House, taxes the struggling students of the colleges and universities $13.33 each annually. They pay it out of their pockets; not into the Treasury of the Government, but into the treasury of a few manufacturers. In this bill you tax the students of the colleges and universities taking a scientific course $900,000 annually in order to help foster a monopoly of a half dozen chemical-glass producers in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is opposed to that feature of the bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. What?

Mr. LONGWORTH. The elimination of the free list.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; and I am going to show——

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is a new theory on the gentleman's part, is it not?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I did not understand him ever to oppose it the other day.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, yes; the gentleman must have understood me to oppose it. He could not have understood or thought that I would ever consent to make these struggling students pay tribute of $900,000 annually to a monopoly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understood differently from the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am trying to show the gentleman that he ought to oppose it, and that in his heart he will oppose it—I do not care how the machine makes him vote. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. The gentleman says that his party put the chemical glassware on the free list for use in the universities.

Mr. KITCHIN. And the scientific institutions for the benefit of the students; yes.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. In doing that, did you not absolutely destroy that industry in this country?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no; because though the Republicans had had control of the Government and had been framing protective-tariff acts for nearly 50 years there was no such industry here to destroy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There was not produced $10,000 worth of chemical glass in this country.

I think I have shown you that upon the Republican theory of a protective tariff you have no data at all upon which to fix a rate, but upon the practice, as I said, of Republicans in putting their real tariff principles into the statutes they have acted by this bill according to the rule by which every Republican Congress in the last 50 years in dealing with the tariff has acted. Their theory is one way, their profession is one way, but their practice is another. This is written in exact accordance with the principle of every protective-tariff bill that has been written by the Republican Party since the Civil War, of the McKinley bill, of the Dingley bill, and of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and what is that principle? To give the beneficiaries, the manufacturers, the rate that they want, that they ask for, based on no fact except their avarice and passion for profits. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Who said 60 per cent was the proper rate or tax for chemical glassware that the students of our educational institutions must pay, which on them alone will amount to $900,000 a year? Why, the manufacturers of this chemical glass. Did the Tariff Commission say 60 per cent? Oh, no. Did any one of these members of the committee say 60 per cent? Oh, no. Did anybody on earth say 60 per cent was the right and just rate except the manufacturers, the beneficiaries of that exorbitant duty? They asked it, it went in the bill, and that is the way all these high rates got in all the other bills the committee has reported out.

Mr. BACHARACH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. Is that the Vineland matter that the gentleman is going to refer to?

Mr. BACHARACH. I have it right here, but there is another matter. The gentleman stated that only the manufacturers asked for the 60 per cent rate. As a matter of fact, Mr. Clark, president of the Flint Glassworkers' Union, asked for 60 per cent.

Mr. KITCHIN. The manufacturers——

Mr. BACHARACH. But he is a workingman, and Mr. O'Brien——

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Clark is the president of the Glassworkers' Union, and Mr. O'Brien is connected with the glass-manufacturing business.

Mr. BACHARACH. And Mr. Parsons.

Mr. KITCHIN. The manufacturers told them to come down here to Washington and ask the Republican committee to put on a 60 per cent rate; that it would help the glassworker. They came and asked; and so it is still the manufacturers who, through Mr. Clark and Mr. O'Brien, as well as themselves directly, are telling you what rate they want and what rate you should put in. Is not that so? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BACHARACH. Does the gentleman recall what Dr. Herty said in reference to this 60 per cent rate?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I know what he said. He said the manufacturers said they wanted 60 per cent. He said that he was not an expert on the tariff; that he did not know what the rate should be; but they said they ought to have it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And he was for it. Of course I know what Dr. Herty said. You see I remember these little things. [Laughter.]

Mr. BACHARACH. Does the gentleman recall what Mr. Parsons, secretary of the American Chemical Society, stated?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir; I recall very well what he said. He stated positively that he knew nothing about what the rate should be—that he had never studied the question. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The American Chemical Society, through Dr. Parsons, let it be known that they did not object to 60 per cent; that they knew nothing about tariff rates; but that was what the manufacturers wanted, and they were willing to stand by what the manufacturers wanted in order to build up the industry. [Applause on the Democratic side.] How did these chemists know anything about the cost of production here or the cost of production abroad? They wanted the industry here. They did not manufacture. They did not care what the rates were, how high they were made. The only fellows who were interested in the rates were the manufacturers who are going to make money out of this exorbitant 60 per cent. And neither this chemical society nor the members of it are going to have to pay a cent of this tariff tax. The big corporations, in whose employ they are, like the Steel Corporation, the sugar and oil refineries, and so forth, that use much chemical glass in their testing laboratories, and the educational institutions, of whose faculty they may be members, and the students of such institutions, will have to bear the burden of the tax.

I trust I have given some reasons why the committee and the House can not at this time fix the rates in this bill or any other bill that will carry out the Republican professed theory of a protective tariff, because they are absolutely ignorant of all the necessary and essential data and facts. They have done, as I have said, in this bill, if it becomes law, what they have done in all bills—given the tariff favorites an opportunity to exact the amount of money they want from the pockets of the people in order to put it into their own pockets. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe Republican members of the committee will admit that at this time no one on or off the committee knows the cost of production abroad of the articles embraced in this bill, and it is most difficult to find out the cost of production here. They have had no evidence——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why does the gentleman say that when we will not admit it at all?

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no evidence of it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The record is full of evidence, which the gentleman will not read or quote.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no such evidence. There was evidence of what some gentleman said he paid for a few dollars' worth of a few little glassware articles which he said were imported from Japan. But this bill covers hundreds of different kinds of articles other than chemical glass. But I will test the gentleman. Here is a table containing several dozens of other articles in the bill, put on exhibition here to aid the passage of this bill. Now, I ask the gentleman what did this instrument I hold in my hand cost to produce in Germany or Japan?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It cost less than it was sold for. The gentleman has no argument——

Mr. KITCHIN. What did this one cost to produce and what did this one cost to produce in Japan or Germany? Where is the evidence and where is any testimony? You have the copy of the testimony; point me to the page. Well, what did this instrument cost in Germany or Japan? Why, I will vote for your bill if you can tell me that, or if you will cite a scintilla of testimony as to the production cost in Germany or Japan or the United States or elsewhere in the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. FORDNEY. Knowing, as the gentleman does, that the wages in Japan range from 15 to 50 cents per day and $6 in this country, which one do you think cost the more, the Japanese or the American? [Applause.] The gentleman has that evidence. He knows that is the difference between the wages in this country and Japan and——

Mr. KITCHIN. I know no such thing; neither does the gentleman. Is Japan shipping this chemical glass and optical glass here? Is she shipping surgical and dental instruments here?

Mr. FORDNEY. We have the Japanese goods there, and we have the prices there of what it cost to make in this country.

Mr. KITCHIN. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is correct as to the difference in labor cost, how absurd and ridiculous is his and his committee's claim that 60 per cent is sufficient tariff to protect these manufacturers against Japanese competition. It was claimed in the hearings that the labor is about 70 or 75 per cent of the cost of all the articles here—they said labor was 90 per cent on these things—but for the argument let us admit that labor is 70 or 75 per cent of the cost. The gentleman from Michigan tells you that the labor here is $6 a day for the same labor in Japan that receives from 15 to 50 cents. That is, the producer here pays at least twelve times—from twelve to forty times—as much as is paid for the same work in Japan. Now, in order to protect the manufacturers here, according to the gentleman's figures and theory, the tariff will have to be from 800 to over 2,000 per cent. Why did you give the pitiful 60 per cent when you would need from 800 to over 2,000 per cent in order to protect our manufacturers against Japan? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. FORDNEY. I will tell you why and let you know why. You know that no rate of duty can be put upon these goods that will equal the difference in the cost between this country and Europe and——

Mr. KITCHIN. We are talking about Japan now.

Mr. FORDNEY. You know that we can not make a law that will protect us against Japan.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then why bring in this tariff bill as a protection against Japan? Of course their statement of the difference in wages and costs shows that they are using Japan as a ghost with which to scare Republicans, especially Progressive Republicans, and some weak-kneed Democrats who want protection on some industry in their districts into voting for this exorbitant, monopoly-making tariff bill. If Japan is making these articles, and if 90 per cent or 70 per cent of the cost is labor—they testified that Japan was just flooding the country with this kind of wares—and Japan pays from 15 to 50 cents per day to the fellow who works and we pay here $6 per day, why the manufacturer would have to have over 1,000 per cent tariff in order to protect him, and it is an insult to him for Republicans to tell him that they are going to protect him with a little 60 per cent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If this were true, there is not a manufacturer in the United States who would remain in business 24 hours. If this were true, with a 60 per cent rate provided in this bill, Japan would sell every single one of these articles, and there would not be, there could not be, sold here an American-made article. Japan would wipe out every American manufacturer within 30 days unless the American workman was from twelve to forty times more efficient than the Japanese workman and turned out for his employer from twelve to forty times as much product. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] has let somebody impose on him. You see, these Republicans over here are so afraid of the real truth and right and justice of Democratic contention in these matters that they will not let me state it. They continue to interrupt me. Do not look so mad at me. [Laughter.] I am the most harmless Democrat you ever saw in your life. [Laughter.] I like a Republican just as much as I do a Democrat. You Republicans are just bad politically; that is all; and you are not enlightened on the tariff. [Laughter.]

Let us see if our position at this time is not a reasonable position, taking it from a patriotic standpoint. Nobody knows at this time how to write intelligently or scientifically a tariff bill on the Republican theory or on the Democratic theory, because we have got to know, in considering and writing a tariff according to the Republican theory, what the difference is between the cost of production abroad and here, and in considering a tariff according to the Democratic theory we ought to have a reasonable knowledge as to the difference in the cost. It is admitted by everybody that this is not known at this time, and can not be known what it will be a week or a month or a year

hence, because of the rapidly varying conditions. Here is the Democratic position: We realize the wisdom and necessity of maintaining the chemical and dyestuff industries and a few other industries essential in the production of materials for direct munitions of war, which industries were established here during and by the necessities of the war, but which are valuable in the production of necessary articles of everyday use. In the present and ever-changing conditions, having no data or facts upon which to intelligently base a tariff rate, the Democrats propose for a period of two years—a reasonable transition period from abnormal to normal conditions—a license system for importation of chemicals and dyestuffs and the few war essential materials referred to by me a moment ago; that the Tariff Board shall constitute the license board; that no license to import such articles shall be granted within the two years—the transition period from abnormal to normal—unless it be shown that they can not be obtained in the United States at a reasonable price; if such be shown, license to import shall be granted. This will with certainty protect these newly established war essential industries and at the same time prevent the manufacturers here from demanding exorbitant prices. By the expiration of the two years we can hope that conditions of production and values here and elsewhere throughout the world will become normal. By then the Tariff Commission and others can give Congress proper data as to the cost of production at home and abroad. We can then, if it ever could be done, ascertain the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Both the Republicans and Democrats will then be in an intelligent position to write a tariff and fix rates according to their respective theories. Why is not this the intelligent, reasonable, and patriotic position for all of us to take? We know and you know that any rate we can fix under existing conditions is a pure guess, unless we do as the Republicans propose to do by this and other bills, and that is give the rate the manufacturers desire and demand. As a permanent proposition we do not favor the import-license system. We propose it as a temporary measure to bridge over the extraordinarily abnormal conditions throughout the world. We would propose this as an amendment to this and other similar bills or in a motion to recommit, but unfortunately, according to the rules of the House, such an amendment or motion to recommit is subject to a point of order.

The Republicans on the committee are now solidly against our proposition. The beneficiaries of this bill are against it. Let me say to the House that the very first bill that I saw before our committee this session was a bill introduced by the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], leaving out all tariff and putting in it only the license system. This was the potash bill. We propose now, as to this and the other bills reported out, this principle. He ought to indorse our proposition, because we adopted his principle of the temporary license system.

Mr. FORDNEY. Does the gentleman know that he is in error when he makes that statement? If you will look at the bill you will see whether there is any tariff in it or not.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is no Republican tariff in it. I believe it did include a provision that after five years there should be a duty of $10 a ton on this product, but no tariff at all until after five years. But the policy that the Democrats are contending for now was incorporated in that bill, because it did not permit a tariff to be put upon it until five years, and the license board should have five years in which to license, long after the period from the abnormal to the normal had transpired. Our proposition is a license system for two years and then Congress can write a tariff in an intelligent way. But the gentleman and his party are now repudiating their own policy in their first bill in rejecting our proposition.

Now, gentlemen, let me get down to this specific bill. I will tell you why a good Democrat and a patriotic Republican can not vote for this bill. Are there any Progressive Republicans here? I guess they are all reactionaries, and I am sorry for it. [Laughter.] I believe they have got Brother LONGWORTH in the reactionary camp now. [Laughter and applause.]

I saw a great deal in the press before Congress met that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] was talking about "the old machine and the steering committee," and how "it had put the Republican organization of the House back into the hands of the old reactionaries." He got on the Ways and Means Committee, and I find that the reactionaries have now got Mr. LONGWORTH. [Laughter and applause.]

This bill levies a duty of 60 per cent on chemical glassware and 45 per cent on optical instruments. It removes the exemptions from duty to scientific and educational institutions. I want you Republicans to listen to this: Every tariff act from 1790 to the present—every Republican act, the McKinley Act, the Dingley Act, the Payne-Aldrich Act—has had in it this free, or exemption, clause, as to scientific and educational institutions, except the acts of 1846, 1857, 1864, and 1870. It was kept in by the Underwood Act. But these glass manufacturers came down here and told the Republicans of the Ways and Means Committee that they are tired of that clause in tariff acts and it must go out, and out it goes if this bill becomes law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I can not yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It will not take half a second.

Mr. KITCHIN. Give me 20 minutes additional time and I will yield to all the gentlemen on that side. We have plenty of time. We limited general debate to two hours yesterday because we thought we were going to adjourn to-day for a five weeks' recess, but we can not go home now, and we have plenty of time to discuss matters in this bill.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 20 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. In addition to the time I already have.

Mr. FORDNEY. I object.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Michigan, I know, does not want to know the truth about the tariff. [Laughter.] All he wants to know is what does the beneficiary want, what is the rate the manufacturer demands, and into the bill it goes. [Laughter.]

This bill, according to the evidence and figures in the Tariff Commission report, and every man on the committee who has investigated it knows it, as to chemical glass alone puts upon each student, each poor, struggling student in the chemical departments of our colleges or universities, a tax annually of $13.33, and it will mean, according to the estimated production and use now, a tax of $900,000 annually that the Republicans by this bill are going to take out of the pockets of the struggling students and transfer to the pockets of the glass manufacturers in the district of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH] and in one or two other districts. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Not a Republican can deny that.

Gentlemen, if there is a man that is a friend of these institutions and a friend of the poor, hard-working students in this country, how can he vote to strike out the exemption clause which has been in every tariff act, except the four I have mentioned, for the last 130 years—in the McKinley Act, the Dingley Act, the Payne-Aldrich Act, and now in the Underwood Act. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is what this is going to do.

In its investigation of the chemical-glass industry the Tariff Commission examined the chemical-glass manufacturers. Attention now: The Tariff Commission in its report of June 3, 1919, declares that the manufacturers of the chemical glass only asked for the elimination of the free-list clause and the 45 per cent rate that is now in the Underwood bill. But in this bill the Republicans not only remove the free-list clause, but increase the rate to 60 per cent. We have 45 per cent in the Underwood Act, but exempting the scientific and educational institutions and their students from the payment of duty, just as the Payne-Aldrich Act, the Dingley Act, and the McKinley Act did.

Let me read from the Tariff Commission report of June 3, 1919:

> The manufacturers that have established this new industry—
>
> Of chemical glass—
>
> in the United States since 1914 are satisfied with the existing rate of 45 per cent, but urge that the provision in paragraph 573—
>
> Which is the exemption to scientific and educational institutions—
>
> be eliminated.

The report further states that they said if this were done they could successfully compete with foreign products. But the manufacturers knowing the servility of the Republicans to the special interests came down here before the committee and said they took back their wants before the Tariff Commission and they now wanted a 60 per cent rate, and 60 per cent went into this bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH] said in his speech yesterday that Japan right now was flooding this country with importation of these articles. I have obtained from the Department of Commerce the statistics of all the glassware of every description that Japan has shipped into this country since the 1st of January of this year. From the 1st of January until the 31st of May of this year all the importations of glass and glassware of every description from Japan amounted to only $124,000! We are producing in this country yearly over $150,000,000 worth of glassware of all kinds. In other words, Japan's importation of glassware for a year amounts to only one-

sixth of 1 per cent of the total annual glassware produced in this country. Of every $100 worth made and sold in this country and imported from Japan, Americans manufactured and sold $99.82 worth and Japan sold 18 cents worth. Flooding us, of course! If I had a business in which I could sell $99.82 worth and my competitor could only sell 18 cents worth I would be the biggest fool in the world to stand before an intelligent audience, much less Congress, and say, "If you do not give me some protection that little Japanese is going to run me out of business." [Laughter.]

In the McKinley Act, in the Dingley Act, in the Payne Act, and in the Underwood Act educational and scientific institutions were exempted from the payment on optical instruments. This bill eliminates this exemption and increases the duty from 25 per cent to 45 per cent upon the importations of all optical glass and instruments. This imposes upon the educational and scientific institutions a tax additional to the chemical-glass tax of at least $250,000, according to present production and use. The larger part of optical instruments used in normal times in this country is used by such institutions. The two or three optical instrument manufacturers that produce practically all such instruments in this country demand that this exemption be eliminated, and that this tax of $250,000 be taken out of the treasury of these institutions and put into their treasury. The Republicans in this bill straightway did as they were bidden. On "philosophical, scientific, and laboratory apparatus, utensils, instruments, and appliances" the tariff by this bill is increased over 50 per cent. On surgical and dental instruments the tariff by this bill is increased from 20 per cent to 60 per cent—an increase of 300 per cent—at the demand and for the benefit of less than half a dozen manufacturers who produced 80 per cent or more of such instruments in this country. According to the figures of the manufacturers themselves who appeared before the committee as to the amount now being used in civil life in this country this increase of the tariff imposes a tax of at least $5,000,000 upon the doctors, surgeons, and dentists, including charitable hospitals, in this country. The Republicans by this bill, should it become a law, deliberately take out of the pockets of the doctors, surgeons, and dentists of the United States at least $5,000,000 and put it into the pockets of a half dozen manufacturers, to enable them to make as much profit as they want.

Have the doctors and dentists, have the hospitals, private and charitable, of this country signified in any way to the Republicans of the committee or of the House their willingness to bear this tremendous sacrifice to satify the passion for profits of a few favored manufacturers? Has the Ways and Means Committee had before it a single doctor or surgeon or dentist or a single representative of a hospital or a representative of any medical, surgical, or dental association? Not one. They have not been heard. Neither has any college nor university nor student, nor representative of them, who will bear the burden of over a million dollars a year put upon them by this bill for the benefit of a special few manufacturers, been heard. No one has represented before our committee the doctors and surgeons and dentists and hospitals and the educational institutions and the students of this country except the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, and no one is representing them on this floor except the Democratic Members of this House, who are now protesting and fighting this iniquitous bill, with its high and monopolistic tariff.

Now, another principle in this bill is an old-time principle, not professed, however, but always practiced, though, by Republicans, and that is favoritism to the special few. There never was a tariff bill written by a Republican Congress that was not brimfull of favoritism. You Republicans, listen to me now, if you please; I am going to tell you something of which you have not thought and which may interest you. The Republicans got so in the habit, in the last 50 years, of crowding tariff bills with special favoritism to the big interests at the expense of all the people that they have now, in consideration of tariff bills, invoked and made that policy operate among Republican Members of the House—bestowed favors upon a special few at the expense of the many Republicans of the House. This House is going to be surprised at this: Almost every Republican in the House has little industries here and there in his district, among many others, such as magnesite and pyrites and graphite and manganese, the latter more essential in war and in peace than any one of the materials which the bills reported out propose to protect. But we have not seen any bill reported out protecting these or any other industry in your district, have we? But what kind of bills have been reported out to protect the little industry in the district of the layman Republican Member? Where is it? There were hearings on manganese and graphite and pyrites, and so forth, but there is no bill reported out for them. There has been no consideration of them by the committee. The bills that are reported to-day happen to be bills introduced by Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee who have a little special industry in their districts to protect. [Laughter.] You even legislate for the few as against the many of your own members, gentlemen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let us see. The bill that we have now under consideration protects chemical glass, surgical and dental instruments, optical glass and instruments, and so forth. Where are the producers of these located? In the State of New Jersey. In whose district? In the district of my good, genial, likable, amiable friend, Mr. BACHARACH. [Laughter.] Who introduced this bill to let these New Jersey manufacturers mulct the people of millions in order to put it in their pockets? Mr. BACHARACH, of New Jersey, of course. [Laughter.] Whose bill was reported out? Mr. BACHARACH's bill. What committee is Mr. BACHARACH on? The Ways and Means Committee, of course. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Well, all of this glass and glassware in Mr. BACHARACH's district and in one or two other districts which is protected in this bill will not amount to more than $4,000,000, and yet the output of the glass industry in this country producing other kinds of glassware will amount to $150,000,000 a year. No bill reported out to protect any other kind of glass industry. Why? But they are in the districts of Republican Members not on the Ways and Means Committee. Why do not some of the 235 Republicans not on the committee get some consideration? Favoritism! I do not blame the Republicans. It is a natural thing for them. They have acquired the favoritism—the special-few—habit.

Here is another bill for the protection of magnesite, not manganese.

Well, where is the magnesite industry located? Why, up in the State of Washington, way out yonder in Washington, the district of my good friend, Mr. HADLEY, of Washington.

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, do not take my time.

Mr. HADLEY. I do not want to take the gentleman's time. I will get the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] to give the gentleman five minutes more time.

Mr. KITCHIN. Is not the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HADLEY. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. The evidence was that the biggest company in the United States producing magnesite was in Washington. Is not that so?

Mr. HADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Is not that so?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. KITCHIN. Just for a question; but let the gentleman be quick.

Mr. HADLEY. Does not the gentleman know that the hearings show that there is none of this magnesite that the gentleman refers to in my district?

Mr. KITCHIN. You are from the State of Washington, are you not?

Mr. HADLEY. I said "in my district."

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, all right. The gentleman is big enough to represent the whole State. [Laughter.] The largest company producing magnesite in the whole country is in the State of Washington. Is not that true? Magnesite is a Washington industry. The bill is introduced by Mr. HADLEY, from the State of Washington, not by the other gentlemen from the State of Washington in whose districts the industry is located. Why——

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest——

Mr. KITCHIN. Please do not interrupt me just now.

Mr. BLANTON. I want a lot of other Members to be here to hear this good speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. HADLEY introduced this bill, which I hold in my hand, to protect a little industry in his State. Mr. HADLEY's bill is reported out. We are going to consider it after we finish this bill. On what committee is Mr. HADLEY? On the Ways and Means Committee, of course. [Laughter.] Other Republicans have industries in their districts, but no bill is reported out to protect them. Why? Republican favoritism. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The few against the many.

There is tungsten ore, gentlemen, not nearly as important as a war material as half a dozen others that I might mention, and yet there is no bill for those others here, but there is one here to protect tungsten ore. Tungsten ore is produced in Colorado, and the gentleman who introduced the bill to protect that industry in Colorado is my good friend—as fine a gentleman as ever I met, and as diligent a Member as there is here—Mr. TIM-

BERLAKE, of Colorado. His bill is reported out by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee. The House will soon consider it. What committee is my friend Mr. TIMBERLAKE on? On the Committee on Ways and Means, of course. [Laughter.] That bill has been introduced, favorably acted upon, and reported out, and will soon pass a Republican House; but the other bills that Republicans not on the committee introduced to protect the industries in their districts are not yet reported out, and the Lord only knows when. [Laughter.]

We passed a bill here the other day over my protest to protect something that ninety-nine one-hundredths of you never heard of before in your lives—loganberry juice. Made where? Not in North Carolina, not in Pennsylvania, not in Michigan, not in Colorado, but made in the State of Oregon, practically all of it in the State of Oregon. The bill was introduced by Mr. HAWLEY, a Representative from the State of Oregon. That bill was promptly considered, that bill was promptly reported out, and that bill was promptly passed through the House, over my vote, however.

A MEMBER. What committee is Mr. HAWLEY on?

Mr. KITCHIN. What committee is Mr. HAWLEY on? Of course on the Ways and Means Committee. [Laughter.] His bill would not have been reported out by this Republican committee if he had not been a member. Now, there is one gentleman on our committee who I thought could not be persuaded or tempted to harvest the fruits of this or any system of favoritism. I saw a certain bill that was reported out, and I said, "Here, no doubt, is an exception to the rule. This gentleman certainly has no such industry in his district or State which his bill proposes to protect." He is one of the older members of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I will say that he is one of the most diligent and valuable members of that committee and did a great service on that committee during the last four years. No man did greater service on that committee in helping to prepare the big war tax measure of the last Congress than this gentleman "That gentleman surely," said I, "has no spirit of favoritism about him; surely he is not going to help Republican members of the committee to monopolize all protection bills. Surely here is a Member who introduced a bill, on purely patriotic grounds, to protect a legitimate industry in some other State or district than his own." It is a bill to protect what? The pearl-button industry. And its author is my friend Judge GREEN of Iowa. [Laughter.] I said to the clerk, "Go and bring me the hearings," and I read them, and lo and behold, when I read the hearings I found that more than 50 per cent of all the pearl buttons manufactured in the United States were made in one little town in the State of Iowa named Muscatine, and that over 75 per cent of the pearl buttons made in the United States were made in the State of Iowa—the good old State of my good old friend, Judge GREEN, the author of the bill to protect pearl buttons. [Laughter.] Then I said, "Ah, the Republicans are true to their rule, true to their practiced policy of favoritism." [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIFFIN. What committee is he on?

Mr. KITCHIN. What committee is he on? He is on the Committee on Ways and Means, of course. [Laughter.]

Does not it seem that, if not out of respect "for the opinions of mankind," out of decent regard and respect for the opinions of these 230 other Republicans not on the Ways and Means Committee who have industries in their districts the Republican Committee on Ways and Means would report out bills of Members not on the committee to protect some of the industries in their districts? [Laughter.] No. These Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means are a close corporation, and they propose to get all the benefits in reach, to the exclusion of others. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is natural All of these bills are to protect monopolies and to make monopolies, every one of them.

Of course another princple they carry out is to let the Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means monopolize all the bills that were reported out. [Laughter.]

As the Democratic national platform says, the Republican scheme of protection is a scheme that protects and enriches the few at the expense of the many. So you have just left out about 250 Members, or more, whatever the number is you have got. You other fellows have got to suffer. Under machine rule, orders have gone out from the steering committee and the committee of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] to those who are standing out in the cold with no bills to protect the industries in their districts and States, "You come and swallow this bill down, whether your district is protected or not. You have got to do it. If you do not, we are going to have Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania get up on the floor of this House and denounce you as he did Mr. EMERSON the other day for his disobedience of orders." [Laughter and applause.]

You know, gentlemen, that there were some Republicans put on this committee as new members at the beginning of this Congress. I am going to give Republicans not on the committee a pointer now. One of the new members of the committee is the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY]. He has a bill reported out. Another new member is the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE], and he has a bill reported out. Another new member is the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH]. He has a bill reported out, the one we are now considering. You other Republican gentlemen who have industries in your districts to protect did not have sense enough to know what committee to get on. [Laughter.] When you who have little industries in your districts go home, and you are asked why you did not protect this and that industry, you have got to tell them that these other fellows were smart enough to know what committee to get on and you were not. But the next time of the making up of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee there is going to be a scramble before the committee on committees, for all the Republicans that have little industries in their districts to protect will be candidates for membership on the Ways and Means Committee, because they now know what it means. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is recognized for 22 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not believe there is a man in this House who is better acquainted with our good friend [Mr. KITCHIN] than I am. When he makes a sacred agreement he is absolutely straight and dependable, but on his feet on this floor in a speech he is as slippery as a greased eel. [Laughter.] If the truth will not do, something else will be substituted therefor. [Laughter.] When the gentleman speaks of the difference between the cost of an article in this country and in a foreign country he knows that there on that table is an article of glassware which the undisputed evidence shows sold at wholesale in Yokohama only a few weeks ago for 59 cents, while the labor cost is $1.01 in the production of that article in this country. Yet he contends that we need no duty to offset the difference in the cost of production in this country and the cost of production abroad. How can intelligent men take such a position.

The President of the United States last night asked Congress to remain here and raise wages and at the same time lower the cost of living. A suggestion of that kind comes from a man who is not sincere.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] knows that there was evidence presented to the committee by a man representing practically all the colleges and chemical laboratories in this country, recommending a high import duty on this laboratory glassware and these surgical instruments, samples of which I have here, and he said the colleges and laboratories were almost unanimous in asking that a duty be put upon those articles that are now on the free list. The gentleman from North Carolina knows that. His memory is not so short.

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not catch what the gentleman said.

Mr. FORDNEY. A gentleman came before our committee who said he represented practically all the colleges in the United States and all the chemical laboratories, and that they had a meeting, and there were several hundred institutions represented, and they were almost a unit in asking for a duty on those articles, and he recommended a higher duty. If I have the time, I will read his remarks.

Mr. KITCHIN. I said a gentleman came before us and said the duty ought to be 60 per cent, but nobody came representing the students who have got to pay for these things.

Mr. FORDNEY. Oh, yes; this very man represented the students, and I will put his remarks in the RECORD. He said that those articles when sold to the students by the institutions that imported them free they did not sell them to the students at the price at which they were purchased, but sold them to the students at double the price paid for them by those institutions.

Mr. KITCHIN. He said some small institutions did that, but he did not give the name of a single college that did it.

Mr. FORDNEY. He represented those colleges, and he made that statement, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. KITCHIN. What is his name?

Mr. FORDNEY. I have but 20 minutes, but I will put his statement in the RECORD,

On page 61 of the hearings here is what Mr. O'Brien said in answer to a question:

Mr. O'BRIEN. No, sir; I have just got the statement "Japanese goods sold in New York, duty and transportation charges paid, $1 each. American manufacturing cost without overhead expenses, $1.01 each; price f. o. b. Yokohama, 59 cents."

Mr. Warren S. Hood, representing the Vineland Scientific Glass Co., of Vineland, N. J., was asked by the chairman of the committee if the Government really encouraged the manufacturers to produce these articles during the war, and I quote from the hearing:

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that the Government really encouraged the manufacturers to produce these articles during the war?

Mr. HOOD. Absolutely; yes, sir. They called us to Washington immediately after the declaration of war, and the manufacturers of apparatus were then formed into what was known as the apparatus section of the Council of National Defense. I was then secretary of that until I went into the Army. The first problem that we had to tackle was the biological containers for the Surgeon General's Department. Theretofore the Surgeon General had used the German product entirely, and they did not know where they were going to get the product, or who was to make it for them. That statement would be corroborated by the Surgeon General's office.

And now you would destroy that industry. Let me say to the gentlemen of the House that every time a tariff proposition is presented to the Democratic side of the House, they have a coniption fit, although for a hundred years they have written in their platform that they stand for a tariff for revenue only. The Democratic Party manages the affairs of this Government just now, and this Government never needed money as badly in its existence as it has since this war began, and now this year, in addition to $5,000,000,000 estimated to be collected from taxes, the administration is going to dispose of $2,000,000,000 of Government bonds with which to get money enough to run the expenses of the Government this fiscal year. Yet you would not vote to put one dollar of import duty on an article made in this country, while all the time shouting yourselves hoarse that you stand for a lower cost of living and higher wages for the laboring man. Any man who takes the position that by increasing wages he can lower the cost of living is either a fool or a demagogue or both. It is impossible to increase wages in the country and at the same time lower the cost of production, and you know it. You know that when your party came into power six years ago there was little complaint about the high cost of living in this country, and now the cost of living is sky high, and you are shouting yourselves hoarse at the Republicans to lower the cost of living. Oh, nonsense. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] speaks about me as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and says that I brought in a bill here to lower the tax upon loganberry juice made in Oregon. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that when he was the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means we passed a revenue bill, and Coca-Cola was untaxed. Coca-Cola is not made in Oregon or in Michigan; it is made in Georgia, down near the gentleman's home, where he lives in North Carolina. Put that in your pipe and smoke it. [Laughter.] Talk about favoritism! The gentleman has never known me to use partisanship or to be small enough to want a duty on an article in the district which I have the honor to represent or in the State of Michigan to the detriment of other parts of the country. I have stood for equal protection to all the industries in the States of the Union, and that is where I stand to-day. [Applause on Republican side.] I shall vote for protection to the industries in North Carolina the same as in Michigan or in Oregon. Will the gentleman from North Carolina do likewise? No. He will go crazy at the presentation of a tariff measure. But we are going to make you take it, great or small, whether you are willing or not.

I have here prices from the Japanese on a portion of these goods you see on this table. Some of these samples are Japanese and some of them are American. On the 14th of June this year they offered for sale, delivered in New York, some of these goods for 6.80 yen, and a yen is about half a dollar or a fraction less, which amounts to $3.30 our money, while at the same time it is shown that it does cost to produce that same article in this country $6. Yet these gentlemen think we need no protection. The gentleman from North Carolina argues here that we did not put the duty high enough to offset the difference between our cost and the Japanese cost. The most difficult problem in the framing of a tariff law is the fear of getting that duty so high that it protects our industries against Japan but makes it prohibitory as to those goods made in Europe. The European cost is greater than the oriental cost, and the gentleman knows it, and if we put on a tariff large enough to offset the difference in our cost and the cost of that article when made in Germany or anywhere in Europe, it is not sufficient to offset the difference in the cost between this country and the Orient. And if we do make the duty high enough to offset the difference between our cost and the cost in the Orient, then that duty is prohibitory as to Europe, and the European goods can not come at all. There must be a middle ground somewhere where we must give and take. The gentleman is well informed. He is a brilliant fellow, and there is no better fellow living, but you heard what I said about his speech on the floor of this House. Let him alone, for he will get the best of you, no matter what he has to resort to to do it. He is a buzz saw on his feet. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'Brien, president of a labor organization, and another gentleman from Pittsburgh came before our committee representing the glassworkers, 9,500 men, in the factories that he represented. He told us the great hardships of the men in hot weather in those factories, where they must work in a temperature of from 125° to 175°. In the wintertime it is more comfortable. He pointed out the wages that they were receiving, and he told us of the difference of the living conditions in this country and abroad. He said to the committee, "I want to go back to those 9,500 men and report to them whether or not you, the Congress of the United States, are going to legislate in the interest of the 9,500 glassworkers whom I represent, or will you legislate in the interest of the Japanese?" That is what he said. When you gentlemen get up here and get red in the face and shout at the top of your voices against a protective tariff in the interest of American labor, I want to know what you are going to say to those 9,500 men in those glass factories and millions of men in other American institutions. Charity begins at home. It is the duty of Members of Congress to legislate for the people who sent them here, not the people who shout to us from across the ocean through our Executive, through our President, while he was visiting in Europe. The President has recently issued an order, put into effect by the Railroad Administrator, reducing freight rates on oriental goods coming into this country entering Pacific coast ports. Reducing the freight rates from 20 to 90 per cent below the freight rates charged on domestic-made goods coming over the same route.

If he absorbed those sentiments while in Paris, I hope to goodness he never goes over again to represent the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.] Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen, I ask you in all seriousness to support these bills. This bill is in the interest of American industry. American manufacturers do not give a penny's worth for a protective tariff, except to enable them to pay the American scale of wages when they are in competition with the same article made in a foreign country where the labor of the foreign country receives less pay than the American laboring man receives, because, my friends, the labor cost in the production of any article made in this country is the highest item of cost. In other words, let me say, there is nothing produced in any factory in this country where the labor cost is less than 90 per cent of the total cost of production.

Therefore I repeat that the American manufacturer wants protection only to enable him to pay the difference in the labor cost here and across the sea. My good friend from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], before the Ways and Means Committee, presented some statistics on labor in Switzerland and compared them with wages paid in this country. He was asked the question whether he was reading weekly wages or monthly wages, and he replied weekly wages. Twice he was asked that question. He showed that the wages in Switzerland were as high as $53 a week. If he had put his glasses on and examined the very Government document that he was reading he would have discovered that it was monthly and not weekly wages that he was giving. When the hearings went to the Printing Office the Printing Office corrected his statement, and wherever the figure "1" was noted there was a notation at the bottom of the Government article that Mr. RAINEY presented to the committee saying wherever the figure "1" appears it is monthly and not weekly wages. But the gentleman reiterated twice that he was giving weekly wages, and from $46 to $53 per week. The gentleman was mistaken, but on a tariff proposition that is as near as the gentleman from Illinois can come to correctness [applause on the Republican side], just about one-fourth of what is right.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen, we have combined in this bill chemical glassware, optical glassware, and surgical instruments of all kinds. Before the war these articles were not made in this country. We could not compete with Germany. Germany used every unfair method to destroy industries of this kind the minute we started them in this country. No one has ever more clearly explained that than the Attorney General, Mr. Palmer, in his annual report as Alien Property Custodian, made last January, in which he goes on to show that there were five institutions in this country making chemicals. Three of those institutions were finally forced to go out of business for the reason

the chemicals they were making, say oxalic acid, which was then selling for 6 cents, was reduced to 4.6, and finally to 2.2 a pound, and immediately upon closing their doors the Attorney General said the price went up to 7 cents, higher than ever before, and when the war broke out and we took part in that war we discovered that those two institutions that remained in business were German owned and he, as custodian of alien property, took them over.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. In just a minute. Let me conclude this. Therefore the two institutions that remained in business were German institutions, and the "yellow-dog" fund in Germany was used against our own industries to drive them out of business. The war has operated as the high protective wall. Our industries have sprung up in aid of the Government in its effort to defeat the enemy. Do we need now any greater lesson than the one we have just received? Do we want another war to drive it into our heads that it is necessary for the American Congress to protect American labor and American capital? I think not. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the day following the passage of this act there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon articles named herein, when imported from any foreign country into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), the rates of duties herein prescribed, namely:

Glasswares and porcelain wares, laboratory apparatus, and other apparatus and appliances wholly or in part of glass or porcelain, for use in the sciences or in analyzing or testing or for use in education, 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, no one should take offense at anything the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] would say about Republicans or Republican doctrines, for we all know that he does not mean one-quarter of what he says and does not believe one-tenth of it. I have often spoken about the ability of the gentleman from North Carolina and his versatility. I have spoken of him so highly in that respect that I can scarcely add anything to it now but in one particular. In one respect the gentleman has shown that he is completely unsurpassed.

The gentlemen of this House have just listened to one of the greatest romances that was ever produced. I do not think it will be one of the "best sellers," but it is certainly unique in the respect I have mentioned. Throughout the speech of the gentleman, which was highly entertaining——

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the gentleman refer to the gentleman who has just finished?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Do not interrupt me just at that point, if the gentleman will pardon me.

He drew almost entirely upon his imagination for his facts, and it did not disturb him in the least as to what they might be. He asserted boldly that we did not know anything about what the cost of these Japanese-made articles was, notwithstanding the fact that we had before the committee Japanese-made glassware with the cost of it sworn to. He asserted there was no testimony as to the wages of the Japanese, notwithstanding the hearings were full of it. He asserted that there were no bills reported by the Ways and Means Committee except those which had been introduced by the members of the committee. Why, let me tell the gentleman, for his information, that not only has the committee considered every bill that has been presented by the Republicans but we have even been so fair, in order to relieve the gentlemen upon that side from the unfortunate situation which they are in by reason of their past declarations, that I have introduced on the request of a Democrat a bill for an industry located in another State, in a district represented by a Democrat, who thought it was not best that he should introduce it himself or that he should ask the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] to do so.

Mr. KITCHIN. May I ask just one question? With the exception of zinc, that is proposed now at the seventh hour, after we have resolved to report such bills out, name one that is reported by a member of the committee? Name one that was reported out, except the zinc proposition, that was not introduced by a member of the committee?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What of it?

Mr. KITCHIN. You said a while ago that it was a romance and was not true; that other bills had been reported out and introduced.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I said so, and I say so yet.

Mr. KITCHIN. Name one.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has just named one himself.

Mr. KITCHIN. I said with the exception of zinc——

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is the potato flour bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Forced out by the personal influence of my friend over there.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have named them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Now, the gentleman is not going to disturb me by saying I have looked after the affairs of my own State. I will plead guilty to that indictment as often as he wants to make it, but I will deny on behalf of myself and the committee that there has been any inattention to any measure which was introduced either by a Republican or a Democrat, and I challenge the gentleman to name one that has not received full consideration from the committee. Now, let the gentleman name one, if he can.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have named them all that were before the committee that have not received consideration and been reported out.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There were no others, and all have been considered fully. He said there had been hearings on manganese and on pyrites. That is all the product of the gentleman's imagination, which is so fertile that it can blossom out into almost anything. There were no hearings, no requests from anybody that there should be a tariff change on those articles; not a hint of anything of the kind. But that did not prevent the gentleman from claiming the contrary, with all the force and vigor at his command, and it brought thunderous cheers on the Democratic side when he made those assertions that had not the slightest foundation in fact.

I looked for some argument upon the other side. Instead of getting it we have heard merely unfounded assertions, and the wider they were from the fact the more vociferously they were cheered. This bill may cost students who are taking a laboratory course in chemistry a few dollars more, but not what the gentleman claims. In fact, our factories are making an article so much superior that it may save them money in the long run. The cost is largely in the breakage, and the American ware is much more durable. At all events the bill will save a war industry from extinction by the underpaid labor of Japan.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with my colleague who has just addressed the committee as to the entertainment afforded by the speech of the distinguished gentleman of North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. It is possible the gentleman from Iowa and other gentlemen who have not been in the House quite so long as I have received a trifle more entertainment from it than I did, because during the sixteen-odd years that I have been in Congress I have heard that same speech—I can not say how many times. This, at least, I can say, however, that the gentleman never delivered it more attractively, eloquently, and more entertainingly than he did to-day.

As usual, exact accuracy in statement of fact was subordinated to rhetoric, and some of the gentleman's allegations deserve further elucidation. My friend starts out by saying that this is a bill to create a monopoly in the manufacture of chemical glassware. Let me call your attention to this fact, that the present duty, the duty provided by the party of which the gentleman is the most conspicuous authority in tariff matters, is to-day 45 per cent. Is the difference between 45 per cent and 60 per cent the difference between fair competition and monopoly? According to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], 15 per cent must constitute that difference.

In reply to a question that I asked him, the gentleman justified a duty of 45 per cent on these articles on the theory that it was the best possible revenue-producing duty. If that is the case and he is sincere in his further statement that these are articles which deserve protection, which deserve fostering, then on his own theory it is necessary to make the duty higher, because the highest revenue point is that at which the largest quantity of goods are imported, and hence a duty of 45 per cent would permit the absolute flooding of this market with the German and Japanese products.

The gentleman made a most earnest plea in behalf of the unfortunate student, who was to be taxed, I think he said, $13. How he got those figures I have not the remotest idea, but my friend from North Carolina says that he is to be taxed $13 in order to create this glass monopoly.

Now, what is the fact about all this question of the "poor student"? Why, gentlemen, it is simply this: For years a paragraph has been carried in all tariff laws enabling educational institutions to import these articles free of duty, and under that for many years more than half of all our importations of these various kinds of chemical apparatus have been coming into this country. The situation, however, has always been entirely different from what it is at present. In the old days and up to this very moment the educational institutions were asking that their apparatus be brought in free, because they did not believe that it could be made in America, and so we leaned upon Germany entirely for every single piece of apparatus that we have in our chemical laboratories. But to-day the situation is different. Shut off from Germany by the war, American citizens showed that they were capable of making just as good chemical apparatus as the Germans were capable of making, and now we do not want any more chemical apparatus made in Germany. And to-day these very educational institutions themselves, about whom the gentleman from North Carolina betrays such earnest solicitude, are asking that this free-trade paragraph be eliminated from this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If there is anything in the Democratic theory of free trade, or, if you please so to call it, a tariff for revenue, it is in the interest of the consumer. But when the consumer comes to you and tells you that he no longer wants free trade in these articles, if you regard only the interest of the consumer, is it not fair to take him at his word?

That is precisely the case here. Our educational institutions know now that Americans can make just as good chemical apparatus and surgical instruments as the Germans ever could, and they have learned the folly of relying upon any other nation for their supply of those articles which America herself can produce just as well. They learned a bitter lesson when this war came on, because they were for a time cut off entirely from the supply of those articles absolutely necessary to conduct the laboratory, educational, scientific, and industrial experiments and investigations in this country, and they now realize that the worst thing that could happen to the colleges and the educational institutions here would be again to be dependent upon the mercy of Germany for the supply of all these articles. Hence they are asking this House that this industry be made self-sustaining. So all the argument of the gentleman from North Carolina to the effect that we must look after the interests of the consumer and we must protect him against this great monopoly falls absolutely to the ground when the consumers themselves come and ask us to do just exactly what this bill does.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Has there been an objection from anybody to this bill—an objection of any kind or sort?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No. The first and only objection to this bill that I have heard comes from the gentleman from North Carolina. I have not heard in the committee any objection urged to it. I never knew before that the gentleman from North Carolina was opposed to the elimination of this free-trade provision until he took the floor to-day, nor did I ever hear that any other member of the committee was opposed to it.

Now, the situation is that the only difference between this bill and the present is a duty of 15 per cent, the difference between 45 per cent and 60 per cent. The gentleman from North Carolina justifies the duty of 45 per cent as having been made with full information by his own committee. He says that 45 per cent is the exact duty that ought to be imposed, because it will bring in the most revenue to the country. The only point at issue between us, then, is the increase from 45 per cent to 60 per cent.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Does the gentleman think that the increase of duty of 15 per cent would tend to reduce the high cost of living everywhere?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would it not be better, under the gentleman's theory, to put it on the free list? Would that reduce the high cost of living?

Mr. ASWELL. I think it might.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why, then, does not the gentleman offer that amendment? The gentleman has the opportunity now to offer the amendment to cut out 60 per cent and put these articles on the free list. If the gentleman is sincere in asking me that question and if he believes this has anything to do with the high cost of living, it is now open to him to offer such an amendment. I certainly would not vote for it, and the gentleman would not dare to offer such an amendment. I would challenge him to offer such an amendment here to-day, but I know that he would not, because he knows that it is pure bunk. [Applause on the Republican side.] His own leader here has absolutely justified this morning a duty of 45 per cent.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LONGWORTH. No; I will not yield further. Here, then, is the situation: So far as the rate of duty is concerned, the minority of the committee stands for 45 per cent, the majority for 60 per cent. The difference is too insignificant to quibble over. The elimination of the free-trade provision is demanded by the consumers themselves. Honestly, gentlemen, under such circumstances, what conceivable objection can be offered to this bill? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum. I think we ought to have a quorum here on this bill.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has come back. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). The Chair has ascertained that there are 101 Members present—a quorum.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the Chairman how many times did the Chair count the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]? He answered so many times that I do not know whether the Chairman counted him correctly or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. FOSTER. The Chair overlooked the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HEFLIN. I hope the gentleman from Texas will not obstruct the public business any more.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts, who has been recognized for five minutes, asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes in addition to that time.

Mr. TREADWAY. No. I have an important matter concerning the war-risk insurance business that I want to submit to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been recognized for five minutes. He asks unanimous consent to occupy that time out of order. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent in that connection to proceed out of order for five minutes following the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is not in order to make the request in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the request is in order. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for five minutes following the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to proceed out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, my reason for asking five minutes to proceed out of order is to call the attention of members of the committee to a very peculiar situation that has arisen in connection with war-risk insurance matters. As we are probably not to be in session for active business very much in the next week or two, I thought it well to refer to the matter at this time, so that if other similar cases occur among Members of the House in behalf of their constituents those cases can be called to the attention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who have under consideration a bill (H. R. 8074) which I introduced.

The case which I wish to present is this: A soldier who enlisted in the service nearly two years ago has a wife and four

children. He failed to comply with the law to recognize the compulsory allotment under which the wife was entitled to $15 per month of his pay and Government allowance for herself and her children. The department was notified of this compulsory claim and the proper papers were filed as far back as March, 1918. For some reason or other the department failed to get checkage against the man's pay. As a result the matter ran along for more than a year. The man, of course, was overseas and never acknowledged the checkage against his pay. He was discharged in May of this year, has returned to his home, boasts of the fact that his wife never received a cent from him out of his pay, nor did the children receive their entitled allowance. I will not make comment on that man, but my sympathy is with the mother and those children. I took up the matter with the department. It has been before the department for more than a year and brought up to date since the man's discharge. The department now says that because no allotment was ever charged against his pay they have no way of paying this woman what she was entitled to under the law and which she failed to receive through no fault of hers, but through negligence on the part of some employee of the War Risk Insurance Bureau or some officer in the Army. She should have drawn over $1,000 for the support of herself and her four children, but not one cent of that money has been paid. She is an illiterate woman, and the Red Cross of the city where she lives has paid out in support of that family over $1,000, the amount which the soldier should have assigned, both through allotment and allowance to her during this period. Let me read to you a brief extract from the correspondence I have had with the Treasury Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. I called on Secretary Shouse in relation to this matter, and he at once said, "Why, of course that woman has a claim against the Government." He was extremely kind in the matter and gave it his very best attention. Here is what the report to Secretary Shouse says:

The necessary steps as to immediately notifying the enlisted man's commanding officer that checkage should be withheld from his pay for a compulsory class A allotment were not taken, and not until March 24, 1919, was this notice sent.

That was some one's carelessness.

On March 29, 1919, another attempt was made to communicate with Pvt. Beaudry's commanding officer requesting checkage for a compulsory allotment, but no reply has ever been received. In the meantime the enlisted man was discharged from the service.

This is clearly a case of negligence on the part of the bureau to take prompt action in connection with securing checkage in what appears to be a fraud case.

One other sentence:

There appears to be only one course to pursue in this particular, and that is this, that the discharged man be prosecuted in civil courts or else be compelled to pay this allotment. No relief can be had through the bureau since no Government family allowance can be paid unless an allotment of a sufficient amount to warrant has been properly made and paid through this source.

Assistant Secretary Shouse confirms that by saying:

In view of the limitation of the law that prevents the payment of an allowance until the allotment has been paid by the soldier, it would seem that there is no way for the bureau properly to give to the wife of Beaudry the amount which she should have received. Immediate steps should be taken to prosecute the discharged man in the civil courts or else to compel him to pay this allotment.

Of course, prosecution will not bring the money to that poor wife and her four children, and, further, any suit against such a man to compel the payment would be a waste of time and money.

I have therefore introduced an amendment to the war-risk insurance act which provides that in case allotments are not paid, through no fault or negligence of the person to whom the allotment is owed, there shall be a claim against the Government, so that the money can be secured. I trust that if there are other similar cases brought to the attention of the House, Members will notify the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and urge the passage of the amendment to which I refer.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ROGERS. I have had several instances where married men have enlisted in the Army under assumed names, representing themselves to be unmarried. In such a case, of course, the wife can not trace him. The Army officers have no way of knowing that the man's assertion that he is single is incorrect. In the course of time the man is discharged. I am wondering if the legislation which the gentleman proposes would properly include such cases?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it certainly should. The wife should not be a loser when she is not at fault.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, there could have been no better or surer or more certain way of solving the high cost of living than for this House to have taken its proposed five weeks' recess, as it agreed to do last Monday. We are asked to continue in session for two purposes—one to increase the wages of railway employees another $1,000,000,000 and the other to pass upon the shoe problem.

We are told that unless we raise the wages of the railroad employees another billion dollars annually that there is to be a strike on September 1 from one side of this Nation to the other. And by reason of such threats, ipso facto, Congress must provide the increase. By such threats the four great brotherhoods forced the Adamson law upon Congress and upon the Nation. By such threats the four great brotherhoods during the war forced Director General McAdoo to give them an annual increase of wages of $754,811,000.

Were they satisfied? No. But when Mr. McAdoo, honest statesman that he was, held up his hands to those highwaymen and turned over $754,000,000 and walked out, as soon as his successor was appointed the four great brotherhoods, by just such threats, forced Director General Hines to pay over to them $67,500,000 more annual increase. Eight hundred and twenty-two million three hundred and eleven thousand dollars increase annually in railroad wages forced from all the people through threats.

Were the conductors illy paid at that time? Why, a passenger conductor at that time during the war, before the increase was granted, received $135 to $165 a month for eight hours' work, six days in the week, with time and a half for all time over eight hours. What do they receive now? A passenger conductor receives now an average salary of $180 a month for eight hours a day for six days in the week, with time and a half for all time over eight hours a day.

Are his duties arduous? He rides in a comfortable coach, he eats his meals in the dining car at half price. He has porters to wait on him, and even has an auditor to go around and take the tickets up for him. One hundred and eighty dollars a month average, and yet he comes in like a highwayman and says, "If you do not give the four great brotherhoods $1,000,000,000 more annual increase, we will tie up the traffic of the Nation so tight that we will destroy the railway activities and business of the country," and Congress is going to sit here and truckle. I say the time has come for the tail to quit wagging the dog. Congress must have a showdown and go to the mat with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes' time.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I must object to any more speeches not confined to the subject matter of the bill. We are trying to get these bills out of the way.

Mr. BURKE. I hope I shall be given time asked for to reply to the false statements just made here and to answer the false reports appearing in the Journal of yesterday.

Mr. FORDNEY. Can not the gentleman get his remarks under the five-minute rule without asking for special time?

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate has expired, unless gentlemen get unanimous consent.

Mr. CROWTHER. I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

Mr. BLAND of Indiana. I object.

Mr. FORDNEY. We have had 10 minutes' debate foreign to the subject of the bill, and I must object to any further speeches not confined to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 2, insert a new paragraph as follows:
"Watch crystals, 60 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. FORDNEY. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. KITCHIN. I reserve a point of order to the amendment.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen insist on making a point of order, I shall probably not be able to maintain the contention that my amendment is in order, but under the reservation of the point of order I should like to submit a letter which I have received from Hon. Irving H. Chase, of Waterbury, Conn., president of a large manufacturing concern which has gone into the manufacture of watch crystals since the beginning of the war. The letter is as follows:

WATERBURY CLOCK CO.,
WATERBURY, CONN., *July 17, 1919.*

Hon. JOHN Q. TILSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TILSON: I want to bring to your notice the fact that this company is manufacturing watch crystals.

Up to the time of our starting in to produce these goods the United States was dependent upon foreign supply for all that were used in this country.

Efforts at various times have been made to establish the manufacture of watch crystals, but without success.

Watch crystals were made in Switzerland, in France, in Austria, and in Germany, Germany being the largest producer, and the trust or association which has dominated all the European production being controlled by Germany.

We ourselves are large consumers of watch crystals, manufacturing the well-known Ingersoll watch.

At the beginning of the war we realized that the possible shutting off of the supply of crystals would entirely shut off the production of watches, approximately amounting to 4,000,000 per year. We then attempted the manufacture of watch crystals ourselves, and to-day have a fully equipped plant, with complete facilities, including furnaces for the making of the glass itself.

The embarrassment that we foresaw was equally appreciated by the large watchcase manufacturers of the country, but we have been able to meet their demands and have supplied them during the past few years.

In the year 1918 we produced over 14,000,000 crystals.

During the last year we have been confronted with a new, embarrassing, and very discouraging competition, namely, that of Japan, who, during the war, also introduced the manufacture of crystals, and appear as an unexpected competitor. The imports of Japanese crystals in the last 10 months amount to $377,000.

We realize the impossibility of selling our goods in open competition with those made with the low labor cost of the Japanese.

In establishing this industry we were practically dependent upon our own resources for the manufacture of the necessary machinery, and the education of our employees. It being a new industry, there are no skilled operatives that are available.

The hope for a reduction in cost of manufacture following the closing of the war has not materialized, and therefore I ask your interest in our behalf.

Watch crystals have been imported into this country always as "parts of watches." The present duty is 30 per cent, under paragraph 161 of the tariff act of 1913.

I feel that the conditions justify an increase of duty, to give us necessary protection, and would ask that paragraph 161 be amended by the insertion after the words "parts of watches," on the second line, "except watch crystals," and that "watch crystals" be given a separate classification, if necessary, at a rate of at least 60 per cent.

I am hoping that you can consistently indorse my request as justified, and from your position on the Ways and Means Committee have opportunity to further it.

Very truly, IRVING H. CHASE, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, this letter, written by a man of large affairs, tells the story more eloquently than I can tell it and gives clearly the reasons why the protection is necessary. Unless protection is given this industry must fail. It is an industry that has grown up as the result of the war, and therefore comes within the class of industries which has aroused the solicitude of even President Wilson. If gentlemen will not withdraw the point of order and my amendment goes out, I shall at a later time introduce a separate bill, if necessary, and try to get on the list spoken of by my friend from North Carolina of those having bills reported out to protect industries within their own States.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and he ought to have gotten in on the ground floor with the others. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan or the gentleman from North Carolina insist upon the point of order?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order for the reason that this bill relates only to chemical and laboratory glassware. Watch crystals are not part of that industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the figures "60" and insert "45."

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that that amendment will be voted down. That puts the matter back where it is under existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is entitled to the floor.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I have no idea, no hope, no shadow of expectation that the majority will be considerate enough to put in the very just and moderate rate that I have suggested in my amendment, but I am going to give them the opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. FORDNEY. I certainly sympathize with the gentleman's feelings.

Mr. KITCHIN. Very well; let us take a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the demand comes too late.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members present; a quorum. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surgical and dental instruments, or parts thereof, made wholly or in part of iron, steel, copper, brass, nickel, aluminum, or other metal, finished or unfinished, 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr Chairman, I move to amend by striking out, in line 15, the figures "60" and inserting the figures "45"

The CHAIRMAN The Clerk will report the amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out "60" and insert "45."

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the House in any vain attempt to do a very righteous thing. Those figures, of course, ought to be 45. The manufacturers want—not that they say they need—60 per cent, and of course the gentlemen on the Republican side have made up their minds to give them what they want. I ask for a vote.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am ready for a vote. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 40, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That all articles provided for in this act shall not be entitled to free entry under paragraph 573 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out lines 17, 18, and 19 on page 2, and if that very just amendment passes I shall then, in order to make my amendment complete, move to amend, at the end of section 2, by adding the words "except paragraph 573 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out all of lines 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to put back into the law—rather, to keep in the present tariff act—the very provision that has been in every tariff act since 1790, with the exception of three—the tariff acts of 1846, 1857, and 1864–1870. My amendment proposes to preserve as it is in the present act the identical paragraph that was in the McKinley Act, the Dingley Act, and in the Payne-Aldrich Act, and now in the Underwood Act. Paragraph 573 of the existing tariff act, which this bill proposes to strike out, exempts educational and scientific institutions from the payment of import duty on chemical glass and optical instruments. That is, articles of this kind purchased by universities, colleges, and other educational institutions for their and the students' use, are now, and have been always, with the exceptions that I have pointed out, admitted free. This bill strikes that section out. I propose by my amendment to keep it in the law. As I tried to show the Committee of the Whole when I made my opening remarks, this bill will levy a tax upon the students of the chemical and scientific departments of the colleges and universities. It is a tax of $900,000 on the students of such departments, or a tax of $13.33 per annum, on an average, upon each student himself. He must take that out of his pocket to pay the increased cost of the articles he must have in his chemical course, which increase is made by this bill. That does not go to help the Treasury; that goes into the pockets of the glass manufacturers of my friend BACHARACH's district, in New Jersey. If the Republican membership of the House desires to help Mr. BACHARACH's manufacturing institutions to the amount of $900,000 yearly, by taking it yearly out of the pockets of each one of these struggling students in the chemical and scientific departments of our various colleges and universities—to the extent of $13.33 per student—and transfer that amount to the pockets of two or three of Mr. BACHARACH's glass manufacturers, well and good; but you ought to know the fact when you vote it. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] says that he would like to know how I get the fact that it would cost each student $13.33. If Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. BACHARACH will turn to page 25 of the Tariff Commission's report to the Ways and Means Committee of June 3, 1919, on optical glass and chemical glass, they will find that the Tariff Commission wrote to the heads of the chemical departments of 20 different universities and colleges, asking them if the exemption of educational institutions allowed in paragraph 573 of the existing tariff act was repealed and the existing duty of 45 per cent was applied to them, what would the increased cost, by virtue of such repeal, be to each student in their departments.

Let me read what the report says:

The replies of the university men to this question varied. The estimates of increased cost per year per student were as follows: $3 to $5; $5 to $8; $5 to $10; $10 to $20; less than $25; about 25 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I ask for five minutes more in order to get through with this which is the last amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I was simply going to ask the gentleman if he is aware that a large number of educational institutions make no charge whatever to their students?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why, I do not know, because the evidence that they all charge—that is, sell to the student the glass he uses.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I know the gentleman does not know.

Mr. KITCHIN. What college does the gentleman refer to; just name what college the gentleman has in mind that does not charge for these articles?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I simply asked the gentleman if he is not aware that a large number of educational institutions assume the cost themselves and do not charge the students anything.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know any that do.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I know the gentleman does not know.

Mr. KITCHIN. And there is no evidence to that effect and the gentleman from Ohio does not know of any. Here is the evidence——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suggest to the gentleman that while they may not charge the students themselves it is not given away by the college.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Would the agricultural and mechanical colleges, the agricultural experiment stations, and so forth, be affected similarly?

Mr. KITCHIN. All would have to pay. I am calling attention now to the Tariff Commission report about the students' cost alone. Here is what the gentleman from Ohio was thinking about when he asked the question. Here is the evidence: One man only before our committee stated that many colleges did not charge a profit to the students. Not that they did not charge the students for the articles, but that they charged no profits. That is in the evidence.

Now, you will find according to the figures given by the commission in the replies of the universities that the average cost, caused by repeal of the exemption clause, is $10 per student per year. That is at the tariff rate of 45 per cent. Now, if we increase it from 45 per cent to 60 per cent, as this bill proposes, you increase the cost 33⅓ per cent. Thirty-three and one-third per cent of $10 is $3.33, which, added to the $10, makes $13.33 per student per year. The agricultural colleges, the agricultural and mechanical institutions of the various States, must pay this 60 per cent if this bill passes. They are now getting these products free of duty. Gentlemen, you may look at it any way you please, but the evidence shows that this bill levies a tax of $13.33 upon each student in the chemical or scientific department of any educational institution, and it is going to cost the students annually $900,000 extra. How do I get at that? The Tariff Board reports that between $1,200,000 and $1,500,000 of this chemical glassware were used by the United States before the war; that 50 per cent of all used in this country is used by the educational institutions—practically all by their students. That is $750,000 used by the colleges and institutions prior to the war. On that basis under the bill they would pay a duty of 60 per cent, amounting to $450,000. The value and production that is now used in the United States is $3,000,000 or more, 50 per cent of which, or $1,500,000, is used in our educational institutions by the students. Sixty per cent tariff duty, provided in this bill, on this million and a half makes $900,000, practically every cent of which must be paid by the students not to the Government but to the tariff favorites in Mr. BACHARACH's district and a few other districts.

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

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. BACHARACH. I think if the gentleman will read the rest of the statement it will probably give the Members of the committee a little better judgment.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman took the statement away from me.

Mr. BACHARACH. I have returned it.

I want to call attention to the fact that most of the colleges charge from 100 to 200 per cent and, of course, the student has to pay that profit.

Mr. KITCHIN. Here is the evidence. And it—the balance of the report—is exactly as I stated.

Mr. BACHARACH. As a matter of fact, I do not think it cost the student over $5 or $6.

Mr. KITCHIN. I stated that a number of educational institutions, according to the evidence, charge only the actual cost, not as stated by Mr. LONGWORTH that they did not charge the student anything, but they charge only the actual cost. The rest of the report which my friend from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH] asked me to read is to that effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I wish I could have time to read more from the Tariff Commission's report. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Do gentlemen on that side desire any more light and information on the subject? [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Not the kind of light that the gentleman is attempting to give us.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to give the gentleman from North Carolina a little light direct——

Mr. KITCHIN. All right; that will be a phenomenon, and I am ready to accept it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Here is what a gentleman said who appeared before our committee representing the colleges——

Mr. KITCHIN. Who is that man; I am trying to find out?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Parsons. Mr. Sheridan, of the Tariff Commission, in quoting from the manufacturer, states:

Some schools charge net prices, but the majority add from 100 to 200 per cent to the cost, which was not intended by the Government when the law was passed. In other words, a great many schools compel the students to pay the entire operating expenses of the laboratory supply department by adding a profit to the duty-free prices. One large western university pays interest on the equipment of the storeroom and the running expenses of same, including the salary of the purchasing agent, and shows a profit. We do not know of any that charge the actual cost price. The spirit and literal interpretation of the duty-free law has been broken by a great many schools in checking up the apparatus used by instructors and students in allowing the same to be carried away from the institution. Some of the duty-free goods have been disposed of by the laboratories.

Now, the gentleman was asked a question by Mr. HULL of Tennessee.

Mr. HULL. Does your organization represent chemists of the universities?

Mr. PARSONS. Probably every chemical professor and most all of the chemical instructors in all the universities of America. I say probably; I know it; there is no question but that they are all members of the American Chemical Society. And in this organization large numbers of those were present and there was very little dissent among those present as to the desirability of this action.

Mr. COLLIER. You say those connected with these universities and colleges were there and approved of this proposition?

Mr. PARSONS. They were there and favored it; yes, sir. There were representatives from Cornell, Yale, the University of California, the University of Pennsylvania, Columbia University—I can get a list if it would be of any interest. But it is practically the most representative chemical organization that can be gotten together in America, composed of representatives elected by the local sections. We have 55 local sections in America, which are very largely controlled by the colleges and universities.

Mr. COLLIER. And I understood you to say, in answer to a question from Mr. OLDFIELD, this association is in no way, directly or indirectly, connected with the manufacture?

Mr. PARSONS. It is a scientific association which does not make a cent of money from any person, individual, firm, or corporation. It is only a scientific association, the same as the Association of Mechanical Engineers, the Association of Civil Engineers, etc. It is an association gotten together for the development of the chemical science and industry.

Mr. YOUNG. If I understood you correctly, your main purpose is to secure a dependable supply for all time to come in this country?

Mr. PARSONS. That is it exactly.

Now, does the gentleman want any better information than that? The very institutions he is talking about are up here where Republicans live and are not down in North Carolina. Do not feel so badly about it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I wish to say that the star witness you put on was from North Carolina, and Mr. BACHARACH was so proud of it that he spoke in his speech about it, and said that this fellow was from North Carolina.

Mr. FORDNEY. The star witness and dyed-in-the-wool Democrat came here and asked for protection, did he not? [Applause on the Republican side.] He was an intelligent fellow. You have only a few like him.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That all provisions of any act or acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment there.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment.

Mr. KITCHIN. Strike out the period in the last line of section 2 and insert the following:

Except paragraph 573 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to enlighten the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] a minute.

Mr. FORDNEY. Tell us about some North Carolina protectionists.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right. Of course, gentlemen, I do not know what Dr. Herty's politics is, whether he is a Republican or Democrat. Suppose he was a Democrat. Nobody ever heard me say that we did not have some Democrats at some time that were as bad as Republicans are all the time. [Laughter.] I do not know the politics of every man who labels himself a Democrat, but if Dr. Herty came before our committee and advocated "on his own hook" a 60 per cent tariff, with the exemption clause eliminated, he is not a good Democrat, whether he comes from North Carolina or Michigan or New York.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But he is an intelligent Democrat.

Mr. KITCHIN. But you must remember, whether he used to be a Democrat or not, that when Dr. Herty came here and said he did not know anything about the tariff at all, but that he was in favor of the 60 per cent asked for by the manufacturers, he had left North Carolina five years before, and was then living, I think, in New Jersey, in Mr. BACHARACH's State. [Laughter.]

I have told our good Democrats in North Carolina that they had better stay home, because just as soon as they go up somewhere and mix with none but tariff plunderers they are going to go wrong. [Laughter.] Of course, when Dr. Herty got up here and associated with these glass manufacturers and tariff robbers, like my genial friend BACHARACH, he went wrong. [Laughter.]

But now about the colleges. Why, they said, "Here is this fellow Dr. Parsons, that represents all the colleges and all the educational and scientific institutions, and he said he was perfectly willing, and that they were all perfectly willing, to have the exemption clause eliminated." Who is Dr. Parsons? A college man? Oh, No. A university man? No.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. KITCHIN. I have but five minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Just one question.

Mr. KITCHIN. Do not interrupt me now.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to tell you who Dr. Parsons is.

Mr. KITCHIN. He lives in Washington City. He is the secretary of some chemical society. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You can run a fine-tooth comb through all the universities and colleges of the thousands we have and you will find some fellow just as unjust, just as unwise, just as unpatriotic as my good friends and colleagues FORDNEY and BACHARACH are [laughter], and who wants to tax the students 60 per cent, or $900,000 on the glassware they must use for the benefit of some tariff barons. You will find some at the colleges and universities. But most of them are against it.

The Tariff Commission says that it wrote the heads of the chemical department in 20 of the leading universities of the country and asked them whether the repeal of the duty-free privilege would sufficiently benefit the chemical industry as to justify the repeal, and out of the 20 only 8 of them replied that it would be justified, while 12 were against it and stood with my position. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But, gentlemen, while they tell us that this or that man or witness represents the educational institutions and is in favor of the repeal let it be understood that there is not a word of evidence that one of the students, who must pay the taxes, who must take out of his pocket each year $13.33 and turn it over to the pockets of Mr. BACHARACH's constituent manufacturers, has advocated the repeal. Not one of them has come before our committee and urged repeal. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, very briefly let me say that Dr. Herty is the editor of a chemical journal. The gentleman from North Carolina says Dr. Herty went to New Jersey and there became—oh, well, enamored with Republicanism. You say he is a resident of Washington. He is here at the request of the President and is a member of one of the war boards. Did you not know that?

Mr. KITCHIN. I took what was testified to.

Mr. FORDNEY. The President never was known to call a full-fledged, dyed-in-the-wool Republican to his assistance. The North Carolina Democrats had to go to New Jersey for a President.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Further reserving the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say with regard to Dr. Parsons, who has been mentioned, that whether he be or be not, as I do not know, secretary of some chemical society, he is the chief chemist of the Bureau of Mines, operating directly under the supervision of that very fine Democrat, Mr. Lane.

Mr. KITCHIN. You gentlemen do not object to my saying just what Dr. Parsons said? Mr. FORDNEY asked him a question, and he said, "My home is in Washington." Mr. FORDNEY asked him, "Where do you live? What do you do?" He said, "My home is in Washington. I am secretary of the American Chemical Society." He said that. That is all I said.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. KITCHIN. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina demands a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me have just one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, just let me state that on that vote on the amendment exempting students and colleges and educational institutions from the payment of import duty on chemical glass and optical glass and instruments all the Democrats here voted for the amendment and all the Republicans here voted against the amendment and for the tariff tax on the educational institutions and on the students. I just wanted to make that statement to keep the record straight.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it be passed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker resumed the chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to hear the report of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point of order that there is no quorum in the House. We have not had a quorum in the House all day.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman can not make the point in that way.

Mr. KITCHIN. I hope the gentleman from Texas will not insist on his point.

Mr. BLANTON. We ought to stay here; the men who stay here ought to be here. I want to see a quorum here of the men who have been objecting to the recess.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman withhold his point a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I will withhold it.

Mr. TILSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide revenue for the Government, to establish and maintain in the United States the manufacture of laboratory glassware, laboratory porcelain ware, optical glass, scientific and surgical instruments, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reports that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7785) to provide revenue for the Government, to establish and maintain in the United States the manufacture

of laboratory glassware, laboratory porcelain ware, optical glass, scientific and surgical instruments, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it be passed.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] will not insist upon his point of no quorum. I have much the same feeling that the gentleman has about it, but the gentleman would be taking out his resentment upon all these Members here——

Mr. BLANTON. I did not withdraw my point for that. We have been asked to stay here and transact business, and the men who required us to stay here ought to be here.

Mr. KITCHIN. The President is the one who required us to be here. You are not punishing the President at all.

Mr. BLANTON. I believe we ought to have a quorum here, and I insist on my point, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, can we not move the previous question?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. No other business is in order. A call of the House is ordered. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Ackerman	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Sanders, La.
Alexander	Flood	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.
Andrews, Md.	Focht	Lufkin	Sanford
Anthony	Frear	McClintic	Saunders, Va.
Babka	Freeman	McKiniry	Scully
Bee	Fuller, Ill.	McKinley	Sears
Benson	Fuller, Mass.	McLane	Sells
Bowers	Gallagher	MacCrate	Sherwood
Brand	Gallivan	MacGregor	Sisson
Britten	Gandy	Maher	Slemp
Brooks, Pa.	Ganly	Mann	Small
Browne	Gard	Martin	Smith, Ill.
Browning	Garner	Mason	Smith, Mich.
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Mead	Smith, N. Y.
Burdick	Goldfogle	Merritt	Snyder
Butler	Good	Minahan, N. J.	Steele
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodall	Monahan, Wis.	Stephens, Miss.
Caldwell	Gould	Moon	Stevenson
Cantrill	Graham, Pa.	Mooney	Sullivan
Carew	Graham, Ill.	Moore, Pa.	Summers, Wash.
Carter	Hamill	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Casey	Hamilton	Murphy	Thompson, Okla.
Christopherson	Hardy, Colo.	Neely	Tinkham
Classon	Haugen	Nelson, Wis.	Upshaw
Cleary	Hersman	Nicholls, S. C.	Vare
Cooper	Hicks	O'Connor	Venable
Copley	Hill	Olney	Vestal
Costello	Houghton	Osborne	Vinson
Cramton	Hulings	Paige	Walsh
Crisp	Humphreys	Parker	Walters
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Pell	Ward
Dempsey	Hutchinson	Peters	Watkins
Dewalt	James	Platt	Watson, Pa.
Dickinson, Mo.	Jefferis	Porter	Watson, Va.
Donovan	Johnson, Miss.	Purnell	Weaver
Dooling	Johnston, N. Y.	Randall, Calif.	Webb
Drane	Jones, Pa.	Randall, Wis.	White, Kans.
Dyer	Juul	Reber	White, Me.
Echols	Kahn	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Pa.
Edmonds	Kettner	Riordan	Wingo
Ellsworth	Kiess	Robinson, N. C.	Wise
Emerson	Kleczka	Rouse	Wood, Ind.
Evans, Mont.	LaGuardia	Rowan	Woodyard
Fairfield	Lampert	Rowe	
Ferris	Layton	Rucker	
Fess	Lazaro	Sabath	

The SPEAKER. On this call 250 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to the final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KINCHELOE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks for the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twenty-six Members, not a sufficient number.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I ask for the other side.

The SPEAKER. There is no other side. The question is, Are the yeas and nays demanded by one-fifth of those present?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. The Speaker announced 26 Members, not a sufficient number.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order of no quorum present.

Mr. FORDNEY. I make the point of order that that is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting] A quorum is present. The yeas and nays are refused. The bill is passed.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. BOOHER, for 30 days, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. BLAND of Missouri, indefinitely, on account of the illness of his wife.

To Mr. ALEXANDER, indefinitely, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania, for one week, on account of important business.

To Mr. SISSON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BANKHEAD, for two weeks, in order to visit his district.

To Mr. ASHBROOK, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. BRAND, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. HASTINGS, for two weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCLAUGHLIN of Nebraska, indefinitely, on account of important business.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 80 and consider the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of Senate joint resolution 80, to authorize the President to convene a meeting of an international labor conference in Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to convene and to make arrangements for the organization of a general international labor conference, to be held in Washington, D. C.: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be held to authorize the President to appoint any delegates to represent the United States of America at such conference or to authorize the United States of America to participate therein unless and until the Senate shall have ratified the provisions of the proposed treaty of peace with Germany with reference to a general international labor conference.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the treaty now pending in the Senate provides among other things for an international labor conference to be held in Washington in October. The President is anxious to make the preliminary arrangements for that conference, and the Senate resolution now before us grants that authority, with provision, however, that no American delegates shall be appointed to the conference unless and until the treaty of peace shall have been ratified by the Senate.

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

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. Would this resolution, if passed, and if there should be such a conference, authorize Lenin and Trotski to appear as delegates from Russia? If it would, I will object to it.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will have to ask some one else for information on that point.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

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

THREE-DAY RECESSES.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it was the almost unanimous opinion of the Members of the House that the work of the Congress would be expedited by a recess, which was proposed and provided for in a concurrent resolution. That recess would have given the committees an opportunity to proceed with their work unhampered by the necessity of attending daily sessions of the House. Communications received from the President seemed to make it wise and advisable to rescind the action relative to that adjournment or recess. Members, however, prior to rescinding the action which had been taken, had made arrangements to go home for a short time, at least many of them, and they will be very greatly inconvenienced if they can not now proceed upon their journey. I think we practically all agree that for the immediate future the important work before the committees will be expedited and promoted if the House is not held in daily session. I would not suggest that we have any agreement whereby a recess of the House shall be provided for, or agreed upon, beyond the period when the President has suggested that he might present certain matters to Congress, or beyond the time when the committees now acting may be prepared to present matters requiring action to the House. I think it is true, however, that under the circumstances we shall expedite the public business if we can arrange for recesses from day to day or for three days at a time for a short time, allowing the Members to go home for a brief period, at least. I therefore ask unanimous consent for a recess of the House from to-night until next Tuesday, and from Tuesday until Friday, and a continuation of such recesses until such time as the membership may be notified by the floor leaders on either side of the necessity of a quorum; and that in the meantime no business be taken up when the House meets on Tuesdays and Fridays.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield long enough for me to make a request and ask the Speaker for unanimous consent for the consideration——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I am making a request, and it is for any gentleman to object if he wishes to do so.

Mr. IGOE. I simply ask the gentleman to yield to me to submit a request.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will have abundant opportunity to submit a request later. The granting of this request does not take from any gentleman the right to make a request.

Mr. IGOE. Does the gentleman refuse to yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I have the floor only by unanimous consent; I have no right to yield. If I attempted to yield to the gentleman, it would be necessary to yield to other gentlemen who, I have no doubt, would be glad to submit requests of one sort or another. It would not be fair for me to yield to one and not to another.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman include in his request a proposition to have the Speaker sign any bills that may be presented, inasmuch as several bills have passed the House?

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman for calling attention to that, and I desire to add not only authority to sign bills but authority for the Speaker to refer bills and messages that may come in during the recess of the House.

Let me make this suggestion: I do not anticipate that we can expect, if this agreement is made to recess, without a demand for a quorum for more than two weeks. I do not know that conditions would arise in two weeks that would demand a quorum, but I should expect to consult the minority leader and to agree with him to issue a call whenever he believed that it should be done, and I think that we should understand that in view of the suggestions in the President's letters and of the legislation that may arise out of those suggestions that there may be important business before the House in two weeks.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. In fairness to Members who live some distance away, I would like to state to the majority leader that in 15 minutes the train leaves Washington upon which those Members who live in the Southwest in the direction of St. Louis have been expecting to depart. The transportation reservations we purchased had to be turned in three hours before the train left in order to have our money refunded. The railroad situation is in such a congested condition that you can not get new transportation reservations under three days. In other words, you can not get accommodations for the Southwest and Texas under three days' advance. Therefore if we only have an agreement for a recess for the next two weeks and can not leave before Tuesday or Wednesday, what good is it going to do Members who live 2,000 miles away?

Mr. MONDELL. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Texas that I am sure he would not want to remain away——

Mr. BLANTON. I do not understand that there is any provision that we should be given three days' notice, and it takes three days to come from my home here.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Texas and no other gentleman on that side would want to remain at home after the minority floor leader had notified him that his presence was needed.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; certainly not. But the rights and conveniences of Members who live 2,000 miles away, and who seldom get an opportunity to go home and visit their constituents, should be given more consideration when these short recesses are arranged. Until an hour ago I had my ticket and reservation to leave on this 4.50 train, and now can not go. Others are in the same fix. It is quite exasperating.

Mr. MONDELL. I am sure no gentleman on this side would remain at home after he was notified by the majority floor leader that it was deemed advisable to call for a quorum. In that event an effort would be made to give Members reasonable notice. I think they ought to have a notice of three days, if possible.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the gentleman be willing to include that in the request?

Mr. MONDELL. All I can say to the gentleman is that we will give the longest notice possible under the conditions that might arise—three days, if possible.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my understanding of the matter.

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

Md. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

M. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that during these three-day recesses the committees or the subcommittees having charge of the matters to which the President's letters related will have those matters under consideration.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. The committees will be constantly in session, and, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] knows, the committees will be able to do very much better work and do much more work with the House in recess than they could with the House in session.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am sure that is true; and now it is understood when these committees are ready to report, or when the President is ready to make his specific recommendation, or in any other emergency unforeseen, the gentleman and the minority leader will at once give notice to Members to come here.

Mr. MONDELL. That is what I have in mind, and that is what would be done. I want to say that I would give the notice upon our side at any time that the minority leader believes there should be a call for a quorum.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman a question. If it should turn out to be the fact that the President should veto the daylight-saving bill, and that veto message comes here, will it automatically go to the committee, or will it lie on the table, or can it be taken up and considered?

Mr. MONDELL. It would have to be referred to the committee, I assume, to be taken up as soon as the House reconvenes. Of course, a presidential veto might be one of those things that would require a reconvening of the House, although I do not assume that the veto that the gentleman has in mind, if it should occur, to our regret, would make it necessary to call the House immediately in session, but would be pending, to be acted upon within a reasonable time.

Mr. SIMS. That was my thought, that it would go to the committee and not be called up until the House met again.

Mr. MONDELL. Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] that nobody has objected to his resolution——

Mr. IGOE. All I want is one minute.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that anyone will. I shall not, but I can not yield to couple with my request other requests, because a half dozen gentlemen at least would desire to have that done.

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

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. In the event of a veto or vetoes it seems to me the unanimous agreement might be that the message covering the veto should be referred to the committee from which it originated.

Mr. MONDELL. That would be the action taken under the request that I have made, that messages may be appropriately referred.

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

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, all that I have asked all day is permission to ask the Speaker for unanimous consent, and I want the majority leader to agree that I may have that privilege, to consider a resolution authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate the price of shoes. I do not see why anyone should want to object to that. It will take only two minutes to get it through this House.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, nobody has objected. The gentleman has never made that request. It is not my province to say whether the gentleman shall prefer a request to the Speaker. I have made no objection and no one else has, so far as I know. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. IGOE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON], who is in charge of the bill——

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. IGOE. Then I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting resolutions adopted by the Savannah Commercial Club indorsing the league of nations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing therein resolutions adopted by the Savannah Commercial Club indorsing the league of nations. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock meridian Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at noon on Tuesday next.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman arise?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the correspondence with Julius Barnes, president of the United States Grain Corporation, in regard to the administration of the grain guaranty act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing correspondence with Julius Barnes relative to the handling of the wheat situation. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we can not hear what the request is.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Igoe resolution——

The SPEAKER. There is one unanimous consent pending.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is it?

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Ohio to extend his remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am perfectly willing to withhold.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I shall object to it; who is it? I withdraw mine.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Igoe resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia withdraws his objection. There is pending a unanimous consent that the Chair again will state. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing in the RECORD correspondence with Julius Barnes relative to the wheat situation. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a resolution adopted by the Commercial Club of Savannah indorsing the league of nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman extending his remarks in the RECORD by printing a resolution of the Savannah, Ga., club indorsing the league of nations?

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the Igoe resolution about boots and shoes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution about boots and shoes? Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if we have to agree to every resolution anybody wants to pass, in order to get this recess, I think we had better not have the recess.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nobody is asking for but one resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair declines to recognize the gentleman for the present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the regular order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The regular order is putting my request.

The SPEAKER. But the Chair did not recognize the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did not recognize me?

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What went with the request I made that the gentleman from Missouri could call up his resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not obliged to state it unless he desires.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not recognize the gentleman to present a request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did the Chair recognize me or not?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And I made the request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not obliged to recognize the gentleman to prefer a request——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, my understanding was——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is recognized.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer the following report and ask that it be printed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-two gentlemen are present, not a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri and Mr. HEFLIN demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 87, noes 68.

So the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, August 5, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2950) to authorize a preference right of entry by certain Carey Act entrymen, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 219), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1006) granting a pension to James F. Connell, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. SIMS (by request): A bill (H. R. 8157) authorizing the acquisition by the United States of private interests in railroads and transportation properties, and for payment of just compensation; creating a corporation for public service with authority to operate the properties so acquired; and authorizing a lease to such corporation of such properties when so acquired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 8158) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 8159) to amend the act of Congress approved July 17, 1916, known as the Federal farm loan act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 8160) establishing the liability of hotel proprietors and innkeepers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 8161) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and for prior years, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 8162) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Draper, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8163) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Couderay, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8164) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mason, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8165) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Houghton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8166) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Grand View, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8167) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sweden, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8168) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Drummond, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8169) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cable, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8170) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Seeley, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8171) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Phipps, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8172) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Stinnett, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8173) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Reserve, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8174) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Edgewater, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8175) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Birchwood, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8176) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sarona, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8177) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Berg Park, Wis., one German cannon or field piece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8178) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hawthorne, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8179) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Radisson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8180) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of High Bridge, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8181) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mellen, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8182) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Morse, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8183) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Glidden, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8184) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Butternut, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8185) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Solon Springs, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8186) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Gordon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8187) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Wascott, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8188) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Minong, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8189) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lampson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8190) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Trego, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8191) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clayton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8192) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Winter, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8193) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Van Buskirk, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8194) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Carson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8195) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mercer, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8196) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of McNaughton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8197) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Conover, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8198) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clearwater Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8199) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Three Lakes, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8200) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pelican Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8201) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Woodruff, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8202) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Minocqua, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8203) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Welling, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8204) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pine River, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8205) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Osceola, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8206) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Clear Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8207) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Stone Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8208) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Exeland, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8209) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Murry, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8210) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Crane, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8211) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Jerome, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8212) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Conrath, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8213) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sheldon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8214) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kaiser, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8215) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kennedy, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8216) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hobson, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8217) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Roosevelt, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8218) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Woodboro, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8219) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Brantwood, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8220) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Prentice, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8221) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pennington, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8222) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Catawba, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8223) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kennan, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hawkins, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8225) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ingram, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8226) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Glen Flora, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Bruce, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Weyerhauser, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Turtle Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Joel, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Amery, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8232) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Deronda, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8233) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Dwight, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8234) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Nye, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8235) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Foxboro, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8236) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Yellow Lake, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8237) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Webster, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8238) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Siren, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8239) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lewis, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8240) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Frederic, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8241) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Luck, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8242) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Milltown, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8243) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Centuria, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8244) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of St. Croix Falls, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8245) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Dresser Junction, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8246) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Westboro, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8247) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Chelsea, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8248) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Whittlesey, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8249) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Stetsonville, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8250) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Donald, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8251) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Gilman, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8252) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Stanberry, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8253) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Springbrook, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8254) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Washburn, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8255) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hayward, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8256) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Medford, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8257) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Fifield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8258) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Coolidge, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8259) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Worcester, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8260) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Ogema, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 8261) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a farm-produce exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 8262) relative to the pay of regimental sergeant majors, battalion sergeant majors, and first sergeants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 8263) to amend an act entitled "An act to create the municipal court of the District of Columbia," approved February 17, 1909; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8264) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Clarksville, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8265) for the relief of soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VAILE: A bill (H. R. 8266) to amend section 3221 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by section 6 of the act of March 1, 1871; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 172) providing for the distribution to State educational institutions of certain war material; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 173) prohibiting the Alien Property Custodian from disposing of any property pending the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 229) directing the Federal Trade Commission to inquire into the increase in the price of fertilizers and all classes of farm machinery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KIESS: Resolution (H. Res. 230) to print as a House document the prayers offered at the opening of the sessions of the House of Representatives in the Sixty-fifth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Resolution (H. Res. 231) providing for the consideration of House joint resolution 161; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8267) granting an increase of pension to John C. Sample; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 8268) granting a pension to Paul Galbreath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 8269) granting a pension to Samuel Bowen, alias Samuel Deen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 8270) granting a pension to Anton Casper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 8271) authorizing the President of the United States to restore Lieut. Commander J. A. B. Sinclair to the Medical Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 8272) to restore Harry Graham, captain of Infantry, to his former position on the lineal list of captains of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 8273) granting an increase of pension to George W. Drummond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 8274) granting a pension to Mary Watson Smith Maher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 8275) for the relief of John F. Malley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 8276) granting a pension to Homer P. Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 8277) granting a pension to William S. Beachum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 8278) granting a pension to Nancy Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 8279) granting an increase of pension to McHenry Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 8280) granting a pension to John McGee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8281) granting a pension to George W. Studabaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8282) granting a pension to William C. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 8283) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan M. Pyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8284) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Hayden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 8285) granting an increase of pension to George V. Deacon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 8286) granting a pension to Mary A. Sims; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Atlantic City, N. J., advocating the coordination of the Coast Guard Service with the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Savings Banks Association of the State of New York, opposing Government ownership or Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National Tuberculosis Association, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, opposing Senate bill 2099; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Resolution of clerks and carriers of the National Federation of Postal Employees, at Flint, Mich., protesting against the inadequacy of existing wage scale of postal employees, and requesting that they be granted an immediate increase of $500 a year, beginning July 1, 1919, and a substantial increase to substitute clerks, carriers, and temporary help; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McGLENNON: Petition of Tiffany Council, No. 270, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Union Hill, N. J., favoring six months' pay to the discharged soldiers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, relative to cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of John McE. Bowan, opposing Senate bills 2199 and 2202 and House bill 6310; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, of Washington, D. C., by Frank Morrison, favoring an increase in salaries of the postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANDALL of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Federation of Labor of the State of Wisconsin, requesting that steps be taken to reduce the cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., to enact legislation to curb the increased cost of living, and to do away with all combinations which tend to enhance the cost of living, especially the cost of fuel, clothing, and foodstuffs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of John McE. Bowman, of New York City, protesting against Senate bill 2202; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Institute of American Meat Packers, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., opposing the Kenyon bill relating to the packing industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, favoring an increase for the clerks in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SCHALL: Resolution of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota, indorsing petition and bill introduced by Hon. F. F. ELLSWORTH (H. R. 6461); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of Jamestown Commercial Club, Jamestown, N. Dak., protesting against the repeal of the zone system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Joseph & Hoenck, Oliver Denis, Max Stern, A. L. Moody, O. J. de Lendrecie Co., the Black Co., Fred W. Kruse Co., E. A. Ricker Co., and Herbst department store, all of Fargo, N. Dak., asking for the repeal of section 900, subdivision 19, of the internal-revenue law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Resolutions adopted by the Hitt Mountain Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, of Weiser, Idaho, protesting against the transfer of the Forestry Service from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Hitt Mountain Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, of Weiser, Idaho, favoring the enactment of legislation as to public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: Petition of Anderson-Dulin-Varnell Co., of Knoxville, Tenn., for the repeal of the luxury tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Charlestown Lodge, No. 876, of Charlestown, Mass., favoring the establishing of a 44-hour week as the standard of employment for the employees of the Boston Navy Yard; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of F. E. Thompson & Co., for the repeal of the tax on sodas, soft drinks, and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.