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

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

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

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

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

SENATE.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1917.

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

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

SENIOR FROM UTAH.

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

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF UTAH, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, A. D. 1916, William H. King was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of Utah in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1917.

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

DAVID MATTHIAS, Secretary of State.

CALLING THE ROLL.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Brady, Seneca, Utah.
Brogdon, Kenyon, Utah.
Brooks, Deseret, Utah.
Chamberlain, Kirby, Utah.
Clapp, Lang, Utah.
Coulter, Lee, Utah.
Currie, Lee, Utah.
du Pont, McBride, Utah.
Farrand, McCloud, Utah.
Gallinger, Martin, Utah.
Grau, Martin, Utah.
Harding, Myers, Utah.
Husting, Nelson, Utah.
James, Norris, Utah.
Johnson, Mr. President, I announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Cours] owing to illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

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

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

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

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health department," on page 71, line 22, after "$1,200," to insert "serologist, $2,500; scientific assistant, $1,200," and on page 72, line 2, after the word "in," to strike out "$7,480 and insert "$7,740," so as to make the clause read:

Health officer, $4,000; assistant health officer, $2,500; chief and deputy health officer, $3,500; chemist, $3,000; bacteriologist, $2,000; serologist, $2,500; scientific assistant, $1,200; skilled laborers—$720, 1 $600, 2 messengers at $600 each; driver, $1,400; poundmaster, $1,200, at not exceeding $50 per month each, $2,400; in all, $77,740.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

For repairs and alterations to the building located on lot 10, square 32, which was occupied as the desk and office of the property of the United States, in order to make it available for use as a laboratory for the Health Department of the District of Columbia, and for the construction of said District of Columbia authority to occupy said building is granted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be immediately available, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Probation system: Probation officer, supreme court, $2,000; assistant probation officer, $1,200; stenographer and typewriter and assistant, $1,200; judge court—probation officer $1,800, assistant probation officer $1,200; contingent expenses, $550; in all, $7,850.

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

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

The next amendment was, under the head of "Interest and sinking fund," on page 90, line 9, after "$375,405," to insert:

Provided, That any balances of revenue of the District of Columbia remaining to its credit after its share of the appropriations contained herein has been paid, and after its share of any other appropriations to which it is required to contribute on account of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1916, and June 30, 1917, has been paid, shall be credited to interest and sinking fund for application to the funded debt of the District of Columbia, so as to make the clause read:

For interest and sinking fund on the funded debt, payable one-half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and one-half out of the unexpended balance of the Appropriations Act of April 11, 1915, and otherwise appropriated, $473,466; Provided, That any balances of revenue of the District of Columbia remaining to its credit after its share of the appropriations contained herein has been paid, and after its share of any other appropriations to which it is required to contribute on account of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1916, and June 30, 1917, has been paid, shall be credited to interest and sinking fund for application to the funded debt of the District of Columbia, so as to make the clause read:

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Just one word, Mr. President. This amendment provides for and authorizes the appropriation to which it is required to contribute on account of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1916, and June 30, 1917. Does the Senator believe that we can now adopt an amendment to an appropriation bill affecting an item which has already been expended and ended on June 30 of last year?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that the money herein referred to has not been expended, but that it lies in the Treasury, awaiting the day when the money has been collected from the revenues of the District of Columbia, it ought to belong to the District and should be credited to the District and used to pay off the District's debt.
Mr. SMOOT. Then, if we may go back to the fiscal year of 1910, why can we not as well go back for 10 or 12 years and apply the same principle to appropriations which have been made for that length of time?

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Permit me to suggest to the Senator from Utah that the time for the fiscal year in which there was no such balance, but, on the contrary, the District was then indebted to the Government, and the Government loaned the District money at a certain rate of interest. It has only been within a few years that there has been a balance due the District.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am in full accord with the object of the amendment.

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

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

The reading of the bill was resumed.

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

For such additional miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized by the Attorney General for the supreme court and its officers, made necessary by the occupancy of temporary quarters pending the reconstruction of the courthouse, Washington, D. C., including an electrician at the rate of $600 per annum and a laborer at the rate of $400 per annum, $3,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Provided, That the provision contained in the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915 requiring that said hospital be located and erected at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the subhead "Child-caring institutions," on page 90, line 25, after the word "officers," to strike out "1 $1,200" and insert "2 at $1,200 each"; on page 91, line 1, after "$1,000," to strike out "7" and insert "8"; and in line 2, after the word "in," to strike out "$14,390" and insert "$16,480," so as to make the clause read:

For agent, $1,800; clerks-1 $1,200, 1 $900, 1 $720; plumbing and maintaining officers-2 at $800 each; messenger, stationed in six salaried positions, $16,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 12, after the words "cottage," to insert: "to accommodate 25 or more boys," so as to make the clause read:

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

National Library for the Blind: For all and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1729 H Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $126,980.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Columbia Polytechnic Institute: To aid the Columbia Polytechnic Institute, located at 1921 F Street NW., for the erection of one cottage to accommodate 25 or more boys, $16,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Militia," on page 90, line 12, after the word "mililtia," to strike out "$16,000" and insert "$21,200; Provided, That the commanding general of the District of Columbia may, at any time, enter into a contract or contracts for the lease of an armory, stable, drill shed, and warehouse for Cavalry, Field Artillery, Signal Corps, and Hospital Corps troops in one building, or separately, for a period not to exceed five years, renewable at the option of the said commanding general for an additional period of not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not to exceed $10,000; Provided further, That the said commanding general may renew for the fiscal year 1918, or any portion thereof, the building known as 230 First Street NW., now occupied as an armory for mounted and other troops, at an annual rental of $8,300, and the buildings known as 1912 E Street NW., used as stables and warehouses, at an annual rental of $1,800, paying therefor a rental not in excess of the current rentals," so as to make the clause read:

For rent of armories, offices, storehouses, and stables, and quarters for noncommissioned officers of the Army detailed for duty with the militia, $21,200; Provided, That the commanding general of the Militia of the District of Columbia may, at any time, enter into a contract or contracts for the lease of an armory, stable, drill shed, and warehouse for Cavalry, Field Artillery, Signal Corps, and Hospital Corps troops in one building, or separately, for a period not to exceed five years, renewable at the option of the said commanding general for an additional period of not exceeding five years, at an annual rental not to exceed $10,000; Provided further, That the said commanding general may renew for the fiscal year 1918, or any portion thereof, the building known as 230 First Street NW., now occupied as an armory for mounted and other troops, at an annual rental of $8,300, and the buildings known as 1912 E Street NW., used as stables and warehouses, at an annual rental of $1,800, paying therefor a rental not in excess of the current rentals.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

ANACOSTIA RIVER AND FLATS.

For continuing the reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and flats from the Anacostia Bridge northeast to the District line, to be expended for the purposes and under the conditions specified for this item for the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, $800,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it will be remembered by some members that this is the same amendment that I have taken a very great interest in past years and done what I could to secure an appropriation for this much-needed improvement. It is now going on, reluctantly, but my attention has been called by Col. Flagler, in charge of the work, to the fact that the War Department estimated $400,000 for the present year and the bill contains an appropriation of $800,000. I shall not take the time of the Senate, unless I am asked to do so, to read a letter from Col. Flagler touching this matter, in which he says that unless they get more than $300,000 a year it will take
over seven years to complete this improvement, in addition to the time which has already expired; and the work has been suspended, giving the appeal, and it is evident that the work will be necessary during the current year, to have $400,000 inserted in place of $300,000.

I will ask the chairman of the committee if he sees any reason why we should not go to conference with the Senate, to make an appropriation of something over $2,000,000.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will ask, then, that the amendment be agreed to. On line 11, page 101, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$400,000,000." (Amendment agreed to.)

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, in this connection I ask permission to insert the following message from Mr. Osgood Candy, the auditors, showing the items of expenditure and also his reasons for asking for this added appropriation.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1917.

The estimate submitted by this office, which has charge of this improvement, for work during the fiscal year 1918 was as follows: on line 2, page 102, strike out "$400,000" and insert "$400,000,000."

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

The Secretary of War is authorized to effect an adjustment of boundaries and an exchange of lands in the District of Columbia with the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad, in accordance with the plat or drawing on file in this office to the Chief of Engineers and designated D. 12909-631, whereby on the left bank of the Anacostia River said railroad company shall release, relinquish, and convey to the United States the certain lands along the Anacostia River, and the said railroad company shall accept from the United States the lands required for said railroad company's railroad bridge at the Anacostia River and the south line of I Street, South, and from said railroad company any right, title, or claim to certain lands southward of said line, as shown on said plat, and will permit the extension of said company's right of way to include the tracts of land 3262 and 3263 lying at the junction of the railroad bridge and the original right of way of the Anacostia River, the United States shall permit the right of way of the said railroad company for its entrance into the city of Washington, and shall convey to the said railroad company the railroad bridge at the Anacostia River and the south line of I Street, South, and also said railroad company shall immediately release the portion of the coal company's lands required for the purposes of the division line shown on said plat, and the said railroad company shall release, relinquish and quitclaim, and confirm to the United States the title to all land along and through the Anacostia River and the railroad bridge to Fifteenth Street, east, exterior to the portion of the railroad bridge at the Anacostia River and south lying between Water Street and the Commodore Barney Circle, and all the lands embraced in the several areas designated on the plat referred to above, so as to acquire for the right of way as herebefore stated and delineated on said plat.

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

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

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

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

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me, the property that the Government was to acquire was valued by a commission. The figures were confirmed in substance by a different commission, and the award was held up; the property was revalued, and the amounts were reduced to some extent. Private citizens, feeling that a great wrong had been done them—and they have been very bitter in it—the property was restored to the Government and accepted the lower amount. I always thought that a wrong had been done the citizens in that regard. I understand, however, that the buildings to which the Senator from Michigan refers, except the stable, which is owned by the Government, and the old fire house, which has been deserted, belong to a railroad company, and I think the Senator from Michigan refers to that.

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

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; and they have contested it. They say that they are entitled to the amount found in the first
Mr. SMOOT. That is the result of it, and I suppose, under existing law, he gets that to-day.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In the House it was stricken out on a point of order, and $2,500 "went back to" $2,000.

Mr. SMOOT. And Mr. SMITH of Maryland.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We put back the number to three instead of two. So he gets $300.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON. No; I do not.

Mr. SMOOT. Striking out the words in lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 106, will result in no increase to the master mechanic's salary if he only acts as a master mechanic, but if he acts as a member of the board of examiners of steam engineers, then, of course, he would draw $2,500.

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

Mr. SMOOT. That we are striking out.

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

The law is left just as it is.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 108, line 2, to insert:

"(With selection, $2,300; engineer, $2,400; assistant engineer, $1,800; foreman, $1,800; assistant foreman, $1,200, 1 2,100 each, 3 assistants at $1,000 each; chief inspector of valves, $1,600; waterer, $1,200; inspector, $1,200; draftsman, $1,000; clerks, $1,000, 4 at $500 each, stores clerk, $1,500, 1 1,000, 1 900; timekeeper, $900; two redmen at $500 each; 242 in each of $1,000 each; 242 in each of $750 each; janitors, $600; watchmen, $500 each, 242 in each of $500 each; janitors, $500, 1 505; 2 messengers, at $500 each; in all, $91,000.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No, sir.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is the Senator's idea that they should have the same privileges, as they are employed continuously for the Government 30 days preceding the holidays.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

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

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

The SECRETARY. In line 8, strike out "five" and insert "three" before the words "working days." Provided, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, after line 22, to insert as a new section the following:  

SEC. 7. That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 15 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of $480 or less, and for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate of more than $480 per annum and not exceeding $840 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: Provided, That this section shall only apply to employees who are permitted to work, for the first five days of each month for which employment is authorized herein, and that the increased compensation of the employees for whom employment is provided herein shall not exceed 10 per cent of their basic salaries: Provided further, That detailed reports shall be submitted to the Senate of the first day of each quarter of the fiscal year, or such shorter periods as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, to show the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, after line 14, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 8. The Chief of Engineers, United States Army, be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the Women's Titanic Memorial Association for the erection on public land of a memorial appropriate as a lasting tribute to the memory of the many lives lost in the tragic catastrophe of the S. S. Titanic, by the erection of said memorial appropriate as a lasting tribute to the memory of the many lives lost in the tragic catastrophe of the S. S. Titanic, by the act of Congress of the 23d day of June, 1918, approved June 25, 1918, and the Government of Great Britain, to secure authority from the Legislature of the District of Columbia to cause said memorial to be erected.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, after line 35, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 9. Hereafter when any piping or other household fixtures or secondhand goods of any description whatever have been stolen and are sold as dealer in junk, or any dealer in secondhand goods, any person who shall purchase any such goods, who shall purchase any such goods, shall be deemed guilty of a crime, and the act of purchasing any such goods shall be deemed evidence of guilt, and shall be subject to the penalty of the forfeiture of the goods so purchased, and the seller thereof, and all persons concerned in the sale, and the property so purchased, to the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, the committee assumed that these people would receive proper treatment, and that the decisions would be fair. The fact is that there has been a great deal of attention paid to the matter of the Washington, D. C., as to whether or not the property has been stolen. There is an old saying that the man who receives stolen goods is worse than the thief who steals them. There is no doubt that the man who receives stolen goods is worse than the thief who steals them. There is no doubt that the man who receives stolen goods is worse than the thief who steals them. There is no doubt that the man who receives stolen goods is worse than the thief who steals them.
briefly the effect of the previous legislation is this: The whole length of Fourteenth Street north of F Street and south of Pennsylvania Avenue has a width between curbs of 75 feet. In this matter a wrong, and I think something ought to be done. I do not want to work any hardship to anybody; but we felt that something ought to be done in regard to the matter.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with the Senator from Maryland. I think the legislation that was passed last year may not matter what the conditions may be, coal has to be delivered to hotels and the carts have to stand somewhere for delivery. I submit that.

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

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainlly, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In regard to the delivery of coal, it is not necessary. I think this is not general legislation at all. I do not know what the conditions may be, but coal has to be delivered to hotels and the carts have to stand somewhere for delivery. I submit that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not realize that. I submit that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. We thought so. The Senate passed it, and we thought so. But, as I said at the outset, through some strange proceeding—I can not understand just what—this thing seems to have bobbed up like a cork at sea.

No work was done to satisfy the legislation that was passed by the Senate, and the result is that the conditions of that street remain the same to-day as when we agitated the matter last year.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is unfair and unjust to the rest of Fourteenth Street that one block should not be worse than another.

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

Two car tracks, as I say, were there. There was a trolley car on each track. On the opposite side, down toward Pennsylvania Avenue, is an electric car running automobiles. At that time I saw a busy, the driver of which was trying to wind his way through, but finally everything came to a stagnation and a standstill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?
on that space of about 10 feet of sidewalk. All the pedestrian travel is between that point and up toward the hotel. Protests have come to me from property holders on Fourteenth Street farther up asking why this condition should prevail.

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

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

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

Mr. KENYON. I find no concessions granted to any other property owners in the city?

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

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

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. NORRIS. Thirty feet?

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

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes. According to the Senator how much, if any, of the public street has been taken by these people?

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

Mr. NORRIS. Thirty feet?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue on Fourteenth Street?

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Has the Senator been in the vaults? Has he visited them and inspected them?

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

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I know that there is a very considerable amount of machinery there. It is a good deal of a saving to them. But, of course, if that argument is sound, suppose they located it out in the middle of the highway! They come to the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue. Why did they not locate it out in the middle of the space under there, of about 20 feet of sidewalk. All the pedestrian travel is between that point and up toward the hotel. Protests have come to me from property holders on Fourteenth Street farther up asking why this condition should prevail.

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes.
Mr. ROBINSON. Does the existing provision of law, which
this amendment is designed to suspend temporarily, authorize
the arrangement which he himself has just suggested?
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not know that the Senator
has suggested.
Mr. ROBINSON. Then it would be necessary to suspend
this provision or to enact an amendment authorizing the ar-
rangements which the Senator has suggested.
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. To carry out that, it would;
but I say this: Defer this proposition, put it back as it stands
to-day on the statute books, that this sidewalk shall be widened,
and then provide that the Commissioners shall arrange as they
may best.
Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator sees the difficulty about that.
If the improvement which has been authorized proceeds, then
the opportunity to the hotel company the relief which he
has suggested will not exist.
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No.
Mr. ROBINSON. So that it is necessary to effectuate the
arrangement which the Senator from New Jersey has suggested,
and which it seems to me from a casual consideration is not
an unfair one, to insert this provision in the bill, or some other
provision which will for the present suspend the improvement
that has been authorized.
Mr. President, I lived for five years at the Ebbitt Hotel
in the early part of my service in Congress, and I am familiar
with the conditions as they exist in that locality. Fourteenth
Street between F and G streets in Washington, D. C., is a very steep
one now, as every one now knows, with rough stone, called
Belgian block; and the principal traffic on that street is
wagons. There is no great amount of other traffic there, for
the reason that the street is very steep. It would be impossible,
were they paved with asphalt; it would be impossible, in my judg-
ment, for wagons heavily loaded to ascend it. It would be quite
difficult for the public to carry on traffic there; and I sincerely
doubt whether it is advisable, discussing the merits of the
proposition—
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Let me say, Mr. President—
Mr. ROBINSON. Just a moment. I sincerely doubt whether
it is advisable to pave this street with asphalt.
As to the proposition of compelling the hotel company to re-
move its machinery and abandon the vaults that have been
constructed there under some sort of public authority, I want
to point out this fact: It has been proceeding for a great many
years. Any person who visits and observes the excavation that
has been made there and the works that are now operated there
will realize that it will entail a very large expense upon the
hotel company. In passing upon this proposition, I think it is
fair to consider the equities of the hotel company, if I may so express
it, should be considered. The public interest is, of course, the
paramount interest; and I, for my part, would be willing to
have a provision similar to that which has been suggested by
the Senator from New Jersey. If it appears right that the
hotel company should pay a tax—and the suggestion seems fair
to me—to acquire those properties, and if the street was paved
with asphalt; let them pay a tax; but I do think that before requiring
them to abandon those vaults and to incur the expense that is
incident to that, after having at first permitted them to estab-
lish and operate these vaults, we should afford some such relief
as the Senator from New Jersey has suggested; and in order
to do that he himself admits that this provision which the com-
mittee has written into the bill, or some similar provision, must
be enacted. Otherwise, the improvement that has been author-
ized will proceed and it would be impossible to effectuate the
relief.
Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a ques-
tion?
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the
chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Sena-
tor from Iowa?
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield.
Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkan-
sas who is the owner of the Willard Hotel?
Mr. ROBINSON. I have not the slightest idea. I do not
know personally anybody connected with the Willard Hotel;
and it does not make any difference to me that I know of. It
is simply a question of what is right and fair, considering the
public interest and the interests of those individuals, that
have been vested in the hotel company by the public con-
struction.
Mr. KENYON. Whoever is owner of the Willard Hotel is
certainly receiving a concession here which other hotels do not
receive.
Mr. ROBINSON. That is true; and I think, as suggested by
the Senator from New Jersey, that they should be required to
pay for it.
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. They never have before.
Mr. ROBINSON. I have not anything further to state con-
cerning the subject, Mr. President. It seems to me that the
Senator from New Jersey has made the best and soundest argument that can be made for retaining in the bill the
provision which the committee has reported.
Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator
refers to the matter of the Willard Hotel. I am not
satisfied with the language of the committee for retaining the
provision of law which has been suggested.
it does seem that the many property holders on the same street above F Street and the property holders on the other side below Pennsylvania Avenue have some rights that should be considered. We are not going to rush these things.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

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

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

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am unable to answer as to that. I do not know whether it is true or not. I feel certain that it not impartial legislators vote to grant this privilege. You grant it away temporarily, you say; but it may be that this amendment seeks to suspend. Did that of the legislature. You grant it away temporarily, you say; but it may be that it is not true, so that this committee amendment should be stricken out. I think it should remain in the bill.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

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

Mr. WARREN. It is not a very short debat

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

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

Mr. NORRIS. It is a very wide sidewalk.

Mr. WARREN. I have never observed the taking of any distance out of the street in the vicinity during discussion. Both sides of the street have had wide parking space ever since

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

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that my information, so far as the space under the sidewalk is concerned, is that it has not been very nearly or quite impossible to drive a horse over it if it were at all wet or if there were loaded teams. On the other hand, I do not think it would make the street through that block just as wide as it is farther up?

Mr. WARREN. I assume that is the presumption.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I would like to read what the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia said. He came before our committee last year and recommended that this street be made wide enough so that there will be enough space for machinery that is to be delivered on either side of the street and the taxi cabs that wait at the doors of the hotels, uses that street very little, but as to every block there is a great flood of people going back and forth, up and down, and the same is quite as to the street cars. The car tracks have already been taken in there and the street cars have been running for a long time.

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

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

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

Mr. WARREN. I dislike to project my personality into this matter. I have, of course, no interest in the hotel and no interest in anybody connected with it. I do not know very much of the ownership and I do not care, but I lived in the hotel from the time it was rebuilt until three years ago, and my room opened out upon this part of the street about which we are talking. There has been to my knowledge no increase, but I rather than the decreased rather than the increased since the street cars have been running on Pennsylvania Avenue.

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

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

Mr. WARREN. The conditions are not entirely similar. The Willard Hotel on the north end, facing on F Street, is, I might say, and stories below Pennsylvania Avenue is such that first there has to be a distance outside of the house taken to allow air and light to go down. But portions of it are in use for other purposes than storage and machinery. That narrows the street too much. The balance use for machinery that is fitted in there, and the use made for it are such that if it is restricted it simply means that they will have to
I doubt very much whether they would not have to ask permission to go out under the street. It is not at all strange that hotel buildings should use the space under sidewalks, and not only underground, but under the street. Take the Congress Hotel in Chicago. It uses space under the street as well as under the sidewalk. Other hotels do the same. If it is proper to tax more on this hotel than on the others, then it ought to be taxed more. I have such confidence in the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland says is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

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

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

Mr. WARREN. I do not believe so.

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

Mr. NORRIS. T,his argument is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

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

Mr. NORRIS. T,his argument is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

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

Mr. NORRIS. T,his argument is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

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

Mr. NORRIS. T,his argument is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

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

Mr. NORRIS. T,his argument is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the particular neighborhood, more perhaps than almost any other Member of this body, except it be the Senator from Wyoming, who until recently likewise resided there.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I had not the slightest idea of it before, and I believe if Members of the Senate would go there and see it they would immediately find out whether there ought not to be some limit at least. These engines are under there, their boilers are under there, their dynamos are under there, their ice plant is under there, and the whole machinery of that hotel is under there. As to the expense, I am unable to state it; it would probably cost them from thirty to fifty thousand dollars to remedy it. Before we interrupt things of that kind we ought to be very careful and consider the matter thoroughly.
were subjected to what, in my opinion, is an entirely unnecessary action at this time.

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

It is, as I understand it, not merely a question of expense to the hotel; that, perhaps, could be overcome; but I doubt if they are compelled to recede to the extent of 10 or 15 feet of space that they already have available, whether it will be physically possible for them to secure sufficient space for the machinery essential for the conduct of that great structure, and on that account the conduct of the hotel would be seriously curtailed and hampered and greatly interfered with.

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

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if an amendment was proposed, like the Senator from Nebraska has suggested, to suspend it until a certain time instead of suspending it indefinitely, I think we might agree to that. I do not intend now to make any fight against this or any recommendation that is made.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I want to say now I know nothing about who owns that hotel, but what governs me in my course as a member of the committee is not what Tom, Dick, or Harry or even a Senator might say, unless the Senator has made the proper investigation, but very likely the proposed amendment really only means to revive what, in my opinion, is an entirely unnecessary action at this time.

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

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

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

If the law does not work properly we can amend it.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this amendment is strongly urged by the District Commissioners, and especially by Mr. Commissioner Brownlow, who has supervision of the city police. The provision is made in the nature of an emergency act. The police force has now 718 men; 10 years ago it had 718 men; and in 1912 its total strength was 753 men. The force was decreased by Congress, together with the direction to remove a number of the men then stationed at the White House. In the last two years it has become necessary for the protection of the White House to restore these men to duty there, so that instead of 26 policemen at the White House four years ago there are now 49. Extra men detailed on duty at the White House have increased the force, and new ins in the District make it necessary for the protection of the White House to have these men on duty there, and an act of Congress has been passed to increase the number of policemen to 53. I do not think it is necessary to make a further statement in reference to the amendment, and I submit it to the Senate.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that there was nothing presented to the committee, unless it was presented to the subcommittee, to justify the employment of a hundred additional policemen of class 1, at $900 each, to be employed on or after March 1, 1917, $120,000; $90,000 of which shall be immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this amendment is strongly urged by the District Commissioners, and especially by Mr. Commissioner Brownlow, who has supervision of the city police. The provision is made in the nature of an emergency act. The police force has now 718 men; 10 years ago it had 718 men; and in 1912 its total strength was 753 men. The force was decreased by Congress, together with the direction to remove a number of the men then stationed at the White House. In the last two years it has become necessary for the protection of the White House to restore these men to duty there, so that instead of 26 policemen at the White House four years ago there are now 49. Extra men detailed on duty at the White House have increased the force, and new ins in the District make it necessary for the protection of the White House to have these men on duty there, and an act of Congress has been passed to increase the number of policemen to 53. I do not think it is necessary to make a further statement in reference to the amendment, and I submit it to the Senate.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that there was nothing presented to the committee, unless it was presented to the subcommittee, to justify the employment of a hundred additional policemen of class 1, at $900 each, to be employed on or after March 1, 1917, $120,000; $90,000 of which shall be immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this amendment is strongly urged by the District Commissioners, and especially by Mr. Commissioner Brownlow, who has supervision of the city police. The provision is made in the nature of an emergency act. The police force has now 718 men; 10 years ago it had 718 men; and in 1912 its total strength was 753 men. The force was decreased by Congress, together with the direction to remove a number of the men then stationed at the White House. In the last two years it has become necessary for the protection of the White House to restore these men to duty there, so that instead of 26 policemen at the White House four years ago there are now 49. Extra men detailed on duty at the White House have increased the force, and new ins in the District make it necessary for the protection of the White House to have these men on duty there, and an act of Congress has been passed to increase the number of policemen to 53. I do not think it is necessary to make a further statement in reference to the amendment, and I submit it to the Senate.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it seems to me that there was nothing presented to the committee, unless it was presented to the subcommittee, to justify the employment of a hundred additional policemen of class 1, at $900 each, to be employed on or after March 1, 1917, $120,000; $90,000 of which shall be immediately available.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, this amendment is strongly urged by the District Commissioners, and especially by Mr. Commissioner Brownlow, who has supervision of the city police. The provision is made in the nature of an emergency act. The police force has now 718 men; 10 years ago it had 718 men; and in 1912 its total strength was 753 men. The force was decreased by Congress, together with the direction to remove a number of the men then stationed at the White House. In the last two years it has become necessary for the protection of the White House to restore these men to duty there, so that instead of 26 policemen at the White House four years ago there are now 49. Extra men detailed on duty at the White House have increased the force, and new ins in the District make it necessary for the protection of the White House to have these men on duty there, and an act of Congress has been passed to increase the number of policemen to 53. I do not think it is necessary to make a further statement in reference to the amendment, and I submit it to the Senate.
Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]. If my recollection serves me correctly, the number of Capitol policemen was recently increased by 100. This proposed increase for the entire city, relating to all public buildings in the city as well as to the property of the city and of citizens generally, is by the same number that I am demanding from the Capitol police. 

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

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, than ever have had.

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

Mr. OVERMAN. They were increased by 70.

Mr. ROBINSON. By 70.

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

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to say that the Committee on Rules this morning held a meeting to consider the question of an increase in the number of policemen in the Capitol, which is now about 60; but not more than half of the force is constantly available. The President desires that the Capitol police force ought to be increased by 50; and I have been authorized and instructed to offer a resolution providing such increase for the protection of the Capitol Building and of the House and Senate buildings during the session of Congress. I shall prepare an amendment to that effect, if the Senator will accept it, and will offer it to this bill, requiring the entire payment to be made out of the Treasury instead of out of the Capitol fund.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have another amendment to offer.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. 

The Secretary. On page 69, after line 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

'That all the employees of the Metropolitan police department of the District of Columbia shall receive 30 days' annual and 30 days' sick leave, in any one calendar year, in the number of policemen in the Capitol. Which increase, if the increase in the number of policemen in the Capitol Building is to be made, is entirely justifiable.

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

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

Mr. PENROSE. That is all I ask.

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

Mr. PENROSE. Neither do I.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I recognize that the ramifications of an amendment of this kind would be very extensive, and the Senator may object to the entire amendment, but if it is written into the Code, it may go to conference. Of course I do not want the Senator to alter the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. I understand that. I only want to have the amendment considered and inserted on the merits. I am willing to stand in that position. I ask in this connection to have inserted in the Record:

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think it but fair to the Senator from Pennsylvania to say, as this amendment is going into conference, that we must not be expected to uphold it unless we felt after investigation that it was proper to do so.
Mr. PENROSE. Of course, Mr. President, I do not pretend to an expert knowledge of the subject, but I am bound to say that I think the amendment offers us an opportunity to consider a number of these important questions of the day, and I am very much inclined to say that the amendment offers an opportunity of seeing if we are not going too far in the direction of increasing the burden of the people at the present time, and of having the surplus brought about by the surplus of the State brought about by the surplus of the country brought about by the surplus of the world to be used for the purpose of raising the salary of our public servants.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the amendment offers an opportunity of seeing if we are not going too far in the direction of increasing the burden of the people at the present time, and of having the surplus brought about by the surplus of the State brought about by the surplus of the country brought about by the surplus of the world to be used for the purpose of raising the salary of our public servants.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether this amendment was considered by the committee? It provides a more liberal schedule of increases than that contained in the bill now before us.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, Mr. President, I do not pretend to an expert knowledge of the subject, but I am bound to say that I think the amendment offers us an opportunity to consider a number of these important questions of the day, and I am very much inclined to say that the amendment offers an opportunity of seeing if we are not going too far in the direction of increasing the burden of the people at the present time, and of having the surplus brought about by the surplus of the State brought about by the surplus of the country brought about by the surplus of the world to be used for the purpose of raising the salary of our public servants.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the amendment offers an opportunity of seeing if we are not going too far in the direction of increasing the burden of the people at the present time, and of having the surplus brought about by the surplus of the State brought about by the surplus of the country brought about by the surplus of the world to be used for the purpose of raising the salary of our public servants.

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

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

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

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

SEC. 7. That until otherwise provided for, the wages, salaries, or compensation of all persons provided for herein, carried on per annum or per annum or annual increase in wages, or compensation of all persons provided for herein, carried on per cent.

I do not want to withdraw the amendment, but I will ask to adopt a somewhat more liberal schedule of increases than that contained in the bill now before us.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I recognize the difficulties that we have already inserted in the bill an amendment taking care of all employees of classifications by a certain schedule of increases. A number of them would be allowed an increase of 10 per cent. in their present compensation, whereas the Senator from Pennsylvania has provided for a definite increase of 10 per cent. in the compensation of Government employees.

Mr. SMITH. Of course, Mr. President, I am willing to support the amendment submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I believe that it is a fair and equitable amendment, and I hope that it will be adopted by the Committee on Finance.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter referred to is as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Washington, February 7, 1917.

Hon. John Walter Smith,
Chairman Subcommittee on Appropriations.

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

The substitution of an earth viaduct for the bridge which now crosses Connecticut Avenue over the valley would enable the eventual filling of the greater part of the Valley west of the Avenue, thus destroying the line of approaches to Rock Creek Park. For many years the Commissioners have advocated the construction of a bridge over the Valley in its natural condition, and about a year ago held a public hearing at which the proposition to fill the valley was the principal subject of discussion. The hearing was free and open and, except for two holders of vacant land who were desirous of finding a convenient disposal for surplus land, the public was unanimously in favor of the preservation of this valley.

Renewed efforts have been made to secure an appropriation for the filling of this valley as a part of the park system, and condemnation proceedings have been recently instituted to acquire a short connecting roadway between Macomb Street and Rock Creek Park for surplus condemnation purposes which will be wholly unnecessary if the valley is filled as contemplated by the proposed amendment. It will obviously be cheaper to permit adjacent property owners to construct an earth viaduct than to rebuild the bridge at this point—an item of work which will probably have to be done within the next five years. But cost alone should not be the determining factor in a matter of this kind, as the filling of this valley will destroy an important connecting link in the parkway system of the District. It is objectionable to every member of the Blue Arts Club and to those who have homes or have had homes in the vicinity of Rock Creek Park and vicinity.

As to the details of the proposed legislation it has not been possible, in the limited time available, to provide what the Commissioners do not believe the legislation to be seriously considered. It is apparent that an earth viaduct is necessary at this point in the exact limits of Connecticut Avenue—that is to say, the width of Connecticut Avenue at this point, 130 feet, is not sufficient for the construction of such walls or viaducts as to provide the necessary protection of the property owners who have no right to do so. Some provision would therefore be necessary for the construction of such walls, for the acquisition of such land, or for securing the consent of the owners, and in view of the known attitude of a large number of the owners the commissioners feel safe in saying that their cooperation could not be had in any scheme which contemplated the destruction of this beautiful valley. As to the amount proposed to be appropriated for the culvert itself the Commissioners are unable to say, without further study, whether it would be sufficient to accomplish the purpose intended. It would depend, of course, upon the desire of the owners, whether it would be sufficient to accomplish the purpose intended. It would depend, of course, upon the desire of the owners, which must be decided by them in the exercise of their own discretion.

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

Very respectfully,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

By Oliver P. Newman, President.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on this amendment. I have not read the letter of the commissioners which the Senator has just asked to have printed in the Record. I do not know what the letter contains, and had no idea that this amendment was to be offered to this bill. I am perfectly familiar with the proposition that there is no reason why the first amendment ought to be agreed to, and have no objection to it, except that the price named in it, in my judgment, is more than we ought to pay for that land. As I recall, the amount to be paid is $1,000 an acre, because it is on two side hills, and for building purposes it is practically useless. It ought to be a part of the park. I pass it every day when I come to the Sen-
Mr. NORRIS. Kline Valley Creek. The bridge over that ravine on the other side of the ravine. The bridge over that ravine is the same bridge that is to be used in Rock Creek Park. There are slopes on each side, an angle in some instances of more than 45°, running down to a deep valley that is wooded, its sides being covered with very heavy timber. The land on the north side of that ravine is not far from Macomb Street, which is the only street there. There are lots and buildings facing on Macomb Street. Part of of this land to be purchased is on the north side of the ravine is owned by the people who laid out Cleveland Park, as I understand; that is, they laid out the lots fronting along Macomb Street, most of which they have sold, although I presume there are some few that they still own. The slope of the valley on the north comes up to the rear of those lots and buildings, from which it slants down to an angle of at least 45° to the bottom of the valley, where there is already a road. That is an entrance to Rock Creek Park; and you can also go into the Zoological Park from that road.

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

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

I hope, therefore, that the Senator from Arkansas will not insist on this amendment. I do not know how familiar he is with the subject, but I should like to go with him and show him the great amount that the first amendment is adopted, and acquire this land for park purposes, then we do not want to destroy the timber or to fill up this ravine. It would certainly ruin it. It would be of no value for park purposes. If you should fill that with dirt to make a level piece of ground, that would not go any farther than a fill there instead of leaving a natural valley.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I can not agree with the Senator from Arkansas that this amendment shall go out and the last amendment remain. If the first amendment should go out and the last amendment be adopted, it would forever stop the building of a park in that part of the city. It is.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. One side favors one amendment and the other side favors the other amendment.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Very well.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Deeper.

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

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

I am satisfied that Senators would not be for the second amendment under any circumstances if they could see and were acquainted with the situation and the lay of the ground. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMoOT] lives not so far from this locality, and I presume he is as familiar with it as I am. If I am not getting the facts right, I shall be glad to be corrected by him or any other Senator.
that road. We put the road up here on top, instead of 100 feet down. We have got to fill it clear on here. Just as soon as we come to the bridge, we come then to the line of the property that we have passed a law to purchase as an addition to the Zoological Park. In fact, in the act of Congress it says that it gets a little wider and a little deeper and goes on down.

Now, there is a driveway in there. I believe there is no more beautiful driveway anywhere in any of the parks of the city of Washington than that driveway from Klingle Bridge. If the pending amendment is adopted, that will be obliterated entirely. The Government owns the road there. They cannot destroy that. The only benefit will come to the owners of the property on each side of this driveway. Then the property owners are disposing to the Government of the only part of their property that is useless for residential purposes. The Government is getting it for park purposes. It is good for park purposes, and for nothing else, unless it is filled up.

That is the proposition, Senators. I believe that if you could see the lay of the land, no one would support the second amendment. I can see nothing in it excepting, it is true, that it would enable the Senate to speak of the project on the side of this ravine to fill up the ravine, and have the property then for whatever purposes they might wish to use it for, and it would probably make it more valuable for the purpose of recreation and sale purposes. Nobody except the Government owns the road; at least, that has to remain as it is; and this side, at least on the north side, can not be filled up unless the Government agrees to it and permits to be done, because it would destroy public property to do it.

Mr. BRADY. Private property.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I hope the Government will purchase the $8 acres provided for in the first amendment. That matter has been presented to the Senate time and time again. I think it has been adopted in the Senate and always has gone out in conference. But the price I consider exceedingly high, and I might say exorbitant. The amendment carries an appropriation of $87,000 for the $8 acres, which would be $10,000 an acre. I believe if any Senator would go out and look over the land, if he would just walk across the bridge and have pointed out to him where the $8 acres of land is located, and see the characteristic of the land, he would immediately say that $10,000 an acre is altogether too much to pay for the land.

I say what I say at this time because if this matter goes into conference and the House conferences seriously and confers upon the amendment this year, I am not sure, and yet do not feel that they can pay $10,000 an acre for it. I should like very well to have the agreement made to at a reasonable rate and allow the $8 acres to be purchased.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

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

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

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, I understand that.

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. The second amendment need not be considered for a minute if the first amendment is agreed to; and I want to say by no means by the Government, if they pass this first amendment, providing for the purchase of the $8 acres of land, I sincerely hope that the Senate conferences will not agree to the fill as provided for in that amendment.
Mr. NEWLANDS. The land, as I stated, cost 27 years ago, if I recall aright, $5,000 an acre, valley and upland. The cost would amount now, I imagine, to $12,000 or $15,000 an acre or more, if added taxes are added. The road which the Senator from Nebraska refers has been appraised by the assessors for purposes of taxation at the amount recommended by the District Commissioners for purchase. The $87,000 recommendation of the District Commissioners for purchase is the amount at which the assessors of the District have appraised it for assessment and taxation.

The valley land has much greater value than the Senator attributes to it. It is easy to see if the surplus of the upland is cut off and put in this valley all will be equally valuable, and developed land around there sells for from fifty to seventy-five cents a square foot. Fifty cents a square foot would be over $200 an acre and 50 cents a square foot would mean over $25,000 an acre. This, of course, would be the value after a considerable expenditure in leveling, grading, and constructing street and other improvements. It must be recalled also that the purchase of this valley now or not at all. Whatever course the Government sees wise to pursue in this matter, I am content, but I do think that fair dealing between the Government and its citizens requires prompt and decisive action.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. Does it stop at the bridge?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It stops just at the bridge. Mrs. Von Hammett's land, the lady living in Paris, who owns the big bluff just opposite the Zoo Park entrance, also comes down to the bridge. She owns about 7 acres of this elevated plateau and the Chevy Chase Land Co. owns about 25 acres.

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say to that, no. The idea is that filling in the viaduct would only result in spreading out by a slope of 2 to 1 or 3 to 1 on each side toward the east and the west, and that the fill would run out the west within, say, four or five hundred feet of the Connecticut Avenue Bridge, thus leaving a large portion of the valley in its natural state, not interfering at all with the beautiful resid­ual beauty of the lands. Parnassus. In that vicinity, I wish to say that we are very solicitous of the feel­ings and rights of everybody in that neighborhood and are de­sirous of making an attractive development which the contemplated work was done then the bottom of the valley on the road up where the valley now is would be level with the present railroad bridge on Connecticut Avenue.

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

Mr. SMOOT. And toward the east?
Mr. NEWLANDS. And toward the east end that the fill will run out about 500 feet to the present Connecticut Avenue bridge. The whole valley is about 1,500 feet long.

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. That is the idea, then, where that slope runs down dwellings will be put along by the road on the level of the valley.

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

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is it.

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

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

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

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state right here that I think it is quite practicable to fill it in possibly only two-thirds across, and the present moment that it was the intent to fill the valley the those proprietors apparent there, and yet their interests have not been considered in reference to the development of that part of the city. For that reason I sincerely hope that the amendment will be rejected and that the conference committee will insist upon retaining the first amendment that we have just adopted.

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

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

Mr. President, I happen to know of an illustration that strikes me as one of the most remarkable cases of hardship under the government of this District that I have ever come across. Take the Patterson tract on New York Avenue extended across the terminal-station property. There is a tract of 80 acres. It is being assessed at a high rate. New York Avenue was laid off and condemned through it and assessed upon it. Undoubtedly that piece of property was made by the time to time of making any fill in order to increase the value of that property. On the other hand, if we should reject the first amendment and the conference committee should agree upon the second amendment for all time we are securing a park in that part of the city. For that reason I sincerely hope that the amendment will be rejected and that the conference committee will insist upon retaining the first amendment that we have just adopted.

We can dispose of it to-day. If this matter can be taken in conference it will give the Senator a chance of regarding it. The bill is about ready to pass now, and I think that the Post Office appropriation bill will be ready for consideration to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. It seems to me that part of it was before, and it did not get into conference simply because we delayed the bill several days day after day. I think it would be decidedly ineffective to consider the matter longer before the Senate, but let us take it into conference. I have no objection to its going to conference, but it should be certain to have the views of the Senate from Nebraska and all other parties interested there.

Mr. BRADY. I think it entirely of too much importance to be permitted to go to conference without full discussion in the House. I am so unaccustomed to hearing the House pass the second amendment and forever stop our prospects of securing a park in that beautiful valley. I am asking the Senate to do is to send the bill to the conference committee with this amendment in it with instructions, and with the understanding that we are not going to recede from our position, and in that way we will get this park. After the park is secured I do not believe there will be very much trouble in having a compromise made as to the amount of fill that should be made. If we purchase the 8 acres from the private owners we would do to the Second amendment and forever stop our prospects of securing a park in that beautiful valley. I have been endeavoring to get a proper entrance to the valley.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator I do not think there is any disposition of the bill to-day, even if you want to discuss it further.

Mr. BRADY. I do not wish to be misunderstood about my position relative to the bill. I am very much in favor of the first amendment. I am not going to recede from Utah as to the value of the land. I think the statement of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] relative to that matter should be given consideration, for in appraising the land they have a certain system of doing so, based upon the taxes that they have been paying for 27 years. It seems to me that it can easily be decided by the commission that will condemn the land, and it would be much better for us to pay these property owners $87,000 and permit this improvement to go on, rather than to pass the second amendment and forever stop our prospects of securing a park in that beautiful valley.
time the bridge was built what it cost, and I have been more or less about watching it with amazement through the years that have succeeded to see it standing there and never used by reason of the lack of appropriation to fill in the approaches. The cost is

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. The $200,000 that was paid for the right of way and for the fill of the ravine and for the filling of the ravine. That is the same amount of money as was paid for the right of way and for the fill of the ravine. I have been looking at that bridge in that condition for many years, but I have not seen it used. It has been there idle for many years.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I understand that.

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is estimated that it will not pass in continued suspension or in the continued suspension through another term of years.

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

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

Mr. BLINDY. I believe if our committee would insist upon holding the bridge and avenue situation, there is the same thing. The bridge is the same thing.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is just a start.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is just a start.

Mr. BLINDY. What is that bridge and avenue situation?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It is just a start.

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

The Senator from Nevada has made a very good statement of the case. I want to call attention to one or two things that he has referred to. He has called attention to the fact that he and his associates donated the land constituting Connecticut Avenue to the District of Columbia to locate there a bridge across the river. Of course, it is to their praise, perhaps, that all that has been done, although I think it ought to be said that they probably were not moved entirely by philanthropic ideas when they did that.

They have been developing the land around Chevychase and away beyond. It has become a very beautiful and attractive residence section, and they have disposed of lots and lots and lots.

The Senator says that for this land they paid $3,000 an acre 27 years ago. I am not saying, because I am not an expert on values in the District, that that was not a fair price. I presume the Senator from Nevada, when this land was purchased, supposed it was fair, and I just believe that it was much better than mine. Assume that it is fair, does it follow that to take the few acres that it is proposed to take from it would be the same as they paid for the whole tract? Here we have a case in which I think there were 23 acres. It runs up over a hill very slightly. It is not exactly across the street from the entrance to the park, for some woman owns a little strip in there, but it is just beyond that; a beautiful piece of land, if it runs down into this ravine at its north line. When it reaches the hill there is a slope of about 5° on the average; sometimes more and sometimes less. That sidehill is wooded. That is the part that it is proposed in the amendment which is adopted to buy from the Chessy Chase Land Co. That sidehill is not of any use, unless the timber is taken off. In that case it might be useful when there was snow in the winter as a place to slide down hill; but it is not fit to build on; it is not a fine level piece of land in value or in anything, and I do not think it should follow, because the old tract had a certain value, that this is of an equal value. That, however, is a matter. Mr. President, about which I am not particularly concerned.

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

Senators argue here as though the Government was to blame because the Chessy Chase Land Co. happens to own a piece of property on a sidehill that is not valuable unless they can fill in that ravine. God made that ravine and the sidehill; the Government owns the road that runs through the bottom of the ravine, and I do not suppose the owners of this property could fill up that ravine without the consent of the Government on account of the public highway down there. If the Government wants to give its consent to have it filled up, that of course would be all right. It would be very profitable not only to the Chessy Chase Land Co., but to the people of this district on the other side. I am not finding fault with them for wanting it filled up, but I am a little surprised that the man who has always been a leader in the movement for beautifying and decorating Washington and has taken the lead in calling to the attention of Nevada that Nevada has never has, would want to mar the natural beauties, destroy the magnificent trees there, and fill up this beautiful ravine with a lot of unsightly dirt.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President--

Mr. JONES. Mr. President.

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

Mr. JONES. Has this proposition had the approval of the Fine Arts Commission?
Mr. Norris. I think not: and the commissioners, as I understand, are opposed to it. I have not read the letter, which I understand is in Mr. Smoot's possession, but that, I believe, will appear in the letter. I do not believe that the proposition will receive the approval of any disinterested person who will investigate it, though my judgment may be wrong.

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

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

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

Mr. Norris. Elsewhere to it fill it up, to dig off the top of the hill and to put it in the valley, so as to make it all level.

Mr. Lane. Do I come up that roadway many times, and I enjoy the scenery and the beauty of it, more particularly in the hot weather of the year. I know that entrance into the park, and I admire it. I think it is one of the most beautiful places in Washington. We have just such another gulch in my State, which we have turned into one of our city parks. We have done it, and I have done it to make there of an equable and uniform park. We have cut the trees or trimmed the brush. A creek meanders through that park, as one does through this. They are both beautiful parks. That is the finest park we have. We have left conditions which are natural and uniformly attractive. The park is used by countless hundreds of people, for the reason that it is not an artificial park. I should look upon this as the same.

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

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

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

Mr. Norris. It will fill the whole valley.

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

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

Mr. Norris. That is my understanding.

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

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

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

There, of course, that would prevent the owners of property, for instance, from taking the timber off of it if they desired to do so. They would have a right to do that, and nobody would complain.

Mr. Lane. At this time?

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

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

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

Mr. Norris. That has nothing to do with the question that is now pending here, as I understand.

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

Mr. Norris. Congress has already passed a law to purchase one side of Connecticut Avenue north of the Zoological Park. The property which is just beyond, on the west side of Connecticut Avenue opposite the entrance of the park, is owned by a lady who, as I understand, lives in Europe. If she has a property that may be, I do not think it is the subject of this bill.

Mr. Norris. As to whether she ought to be given money to dig that hill away or not is a question on which we are not now passing. Personally I do not believe she ought to be compensated, but we do not have an opinion.

Mr. Norris. Senator from Idaho [Mr. Blandy] has said that, when it comes back out of the Senate, if it is to be done, the amendment left in on the theory that some Senators have advanced, that we ought to do something on the subject.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Lane. I do not understand the Senator's statement about that gulch or ravine being only 1,500 feet wide from Woodley Road to the entrance of the park.
Mr. LANE. It is more than 1,500 feet from the Woodley Road entrance to that point in the outlet to the park.

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

Mr. LANE. But not to the park?

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

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. I think winding with the road.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then, I will offer no objection to
the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then, I will offer no objec-
tion to
the amendment.

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

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
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Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
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Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
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Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
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Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from
Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?
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Mr. BONHAM. Mr. President, I move no objection to that.
Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator let me interrupt him?

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

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

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. I never made any such statement.

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

Mr. JONES, Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

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

Mr. SMOOT. No other.

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. Not under the Maryland law. I will read the law again. If a person has a District of Columbia tag on his machine, then he has a District of Columbia license.

Mr. JONES. The District license is not paid yearly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The average is not $25, but $25,000,000.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We pay $5 a year. That is the law—$5 a year—and our license fee is from $10, up to $25 for a District license. The Maryland license is more than $25 in many cases.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, I doubt very much.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We do, sir.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, well, let us go back many years ago.

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

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. The District license is not paid yearly.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, I doubt very much.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. And every other day.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, not so very many.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Not many.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. He has taken a great deal of notice in the administration of the law; of course he can not go into Maryland without paying for a license there. If I drove from Utah and temporarily came into the District of Columbia I would not have to have a license, but if I only had a Utah license on my machine. But if I am temporarily residing in the District of Columbia and have a Utah license upon the car I am also compelled to have the District license on it, and under those conditions I am compelled to pay a license in the State of Maryland.

Now, if there is going to be any reciprocity, why not have it between the District of Columbia and Maryland? That is all the amendment I have offered.
I know of an instance where a man had a Missouri license; he was a resident of Missouri, but he was in the District of Columbia; and he also had a District of Columbia license on his car. They arrested him, although he had his Missouri license only. He met the test of satisfying the constable that your State has reciprocity with Maryland, in the first instance; and then, as I understand their construction—the constable law, if you please—if you happen to have a District license, that has you from the privilege which otherwise would be conferred by your State license.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Does the Senator mean to say that if a man has a State license, by virtue of the fact of having a District license, the State license is the better good?

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Well, that is exactly what the law says.

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

Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. REED. I say, the Junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEX] said that.

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

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

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

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

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

The fact is, now, regardless of what the law may be when strictly construed, that the construction that has been given to this law by the constables and justices of the peace who immediately enforce the law, if you please—if you happen to have a District license on your automobile, you are thereby barred from the benefits of your State license, now, I question whether that is the law of Maryland.

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. That is the law of Maryland.

Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland why any change of Missouri to whom he referred happened to be a Senator? [Laughter]

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

Mr. SMOOT. This is what the law says.

A person residing in the State of Maryland who shall have complied with the laws of the State in which he resides requiring the registration of motor vehicles or licensing of operators thereof and the display of a license, or registration of such vehicle or license, shall cause the identification number of such State, in accordance with the laws of the State, or any other State, to be displayed on the license plate of such vehicle.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Why, no.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly not.

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

Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. The senior Senator from Maryland and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] stated, in effect, that there is no reciprocity between the District of Columbia and Maryland. The District of Columbia has spent $25,000,000, as I previously said, in building roads. She is to-day taxing her people in the State of Maryland about $800,000 a year to keep up these roads. It is unfair, when we tax our own people, to ask us to keep up these roads and not tax the people of the District of Columbia, who can not give us reciprocity, to expect us to keep up those roads for them to use and to destroy. As I said just now, Judge Peter, of Montgomery County, told me he could not tax his people three-fourths of the usage of the roads of Montgomery County was by the people of the District of Columbia; and it is unfair to ask us to keep up these roads and not tax the people of the District of Columbia as we tax our own people.

If we charge the District of Columbia a tax of $5, which, I think, is more than proportionate to the amount of roads we use in the District of Columbia, which we pay yearly, according to the tax. We pay their tax, and we ask them to pay ours.

Mr. SMOOT. I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I thought possibly I might throw a little water on the fire that seems to be getting up on this subject by relating the experience I have had, which extends now for the four years past.

In the summer time I go into Maryland every day, because I usually live out toward Chevy Chase. During the whole time I go from here to my home in Delaware, and I suppose I have traveled ten or twenty thousand miles on the Maryland roads.

Mr. Thomas, Mr. President—

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

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have been waiting now for half an hour to make this statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thought possibly I might throw a little water on the fire that seems to be getting up on this subject by relating the experience I have had, which extends now for the four years past.

In the sumner time I go into Maryland every day, because I usually live out toward Chevy Chase. During the whole time I go from here to my home in Delaware, and I suppose I have traveled ten or twenty thousand miles on the Maryland roads.

Mr. Thomas, Mr. President—

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

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have been waiting now for half an hour to make this statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thought possibly I might throw a little water on the fire that seems to be getting up on this subject by relating the experience I have had, which extends now for the four years past.

In the summer time I go into Maryland every day, because I usually live out toward Chevy Chase. During the whole time I go from here to my home in Delaware, and I suppose I have traveled ten or twenty thousand miles on the Maryland roads.

Mr. Thomas, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?
Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator say that he has not a Maryland license?
Mr. SAULSBURY. I have not a Maryland license. I have a Delaware license.
Mr. SMOOT. If I may not cross the line from Chevy Chase Circle into Maryland without being arrested, if I were without a Maryland license?
Mr. SAULSBURY. They may not like the Senator's looks.
Mr. SMOOT. That may be true.
Mr. SAULSBURY. I have never had the slightest trouble about it, and during the summer time for months I have used the roads of Maryland, I have done so without a license. The Senator misconstrues what I said. There is absolute reciprocity between Maryland and every other State in the Union. There may not be between Maryland and the District of Columbia, and a license in the District of Columbia costs very little in comparison to a State license.
Mr. SMOOT. If a man has a State license, he can go into Maryland, and if in connection with the State license he has upon his car a District license tag, then he is arrested.
Mr. SAULSBURY. That is exactly what I have done for years. The Senator misunderstood me.
Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator escaped because he was a United States Senator. He is the only person I ever heard of being so favored.
Mr. SAULSBURY. I have just heard from another Senator the same.
Mr. WADSWORTH. Here is another Senator who has not had that same experience. A Maryland constable has $50 of mine now. [Laughter.]
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President.
Mr. SMOOT. That is not a Senator who does not know he can take his automobile and pass through Virginia and never be disturbed if he has a District license, no matter whether he has a Virginia license or not; and it is also known that with the exception of the Senator from Delaware, and probably one other, no, he says, they cannot go into Maryland without a Maryland license unless they are arrested.
Mr. JONES. Mr. President.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?
Mr. JONES. Right in connection with that I want to say a Member of the House has told me that he had an experience like this: That he had the tag of his State and he got the District of Columbia tag and went over into Maryland, and he had such an experience there as compelled him to come back and take off the District of Columbia tag and put it away, so as to have nothing but the State tag.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say in regard to the State of Virginia.
Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will just withhold for a moment, I will be through, because I do not want to take any further time.
Mr. President, there is not a Senator present who does not know there has been a reciprocity plan in the past on the part of certain officials in Maryland to hold up and arrest people of the District of Columbia who happen to pass over the District line. That is understood by everybody, and particularly on Sundays, when they are stationed at every place where a road leads into Maryland from the District of Columbia, and they hide behind trees until you pass and give no warning not to cross the line. I do not know why it should be. I think whatever is right in this matter ought to prevail. The amendment I have offered to the bill will make reciprocity between the District of Columbia and Maryland, and I think that ought to be done.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Of course whatever is right ought to prevail. I assume the Senator from Utah thinks that other Senators feel the same way. I contend that reciprocity with the District of Columbia is not right. I do not mean to say that the officer has a law in our State that they have always done what they should have done; I suspect they have violated the law; but I do say that the people of the State of Maryland do not feel that they ought to be taxed to build roads and keep them in repair, and many of them, from $800,000 to $1,000,000 a year and that the District of Columbia, which can not give reciprocity, should be exempted from paying a proportion of that tax. We tax ourselves and we propose to pay the District of Columbia what their tax is, but it certainly should not be expected of us that we should give them the same right and privilege that we give the States that have roads through the States.
Mr. SMOOT. I want to say in regard to Virginia—I am not sure of what I say, but I have been told that they have two periods in which you can use the roads of Virginia of a week each. I got that from a gentleman who has been there. If you stay there longer than that you have to procure a local license. Without meaning to reflect upon the roads of Virginia, they have not spent money for roads in Virginia as we have done in Maryland, and the people of the District of Columbia do not go there to use those roads. Besides that, every toll is a tax.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We do not charge $40.
Mr. SMOOT. I know they charge $30.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We do not charge $40.
Mr. LODGE. On some the charge is $30.
Mr. SMOOT. I do not think that that is reciprocal. I would put on the same tax they levy on us.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That would not be reciprocity.
Mr. LODGE. Precisely, it is reciprocal; but to charge $40 in Virginia and $10 in Maryland is not reciprocal.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We do not charge $40.
Mr. LODGE. On some the charge is $30.
Mr. SMOOT. I know they charge $30.
Mr. LODGE. I know they charge $30, and I was told that they charge $40. The charge on the motor I happen to have is exactly double what is charged in Massachusetts.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. They charge the same price—
Mr. LODGE. I am not quarreling with that. You have a right to charge anything you choose.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No State has better roads.

Mr. LODGE. There should be the same charge on Maryland people as on District people.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It costs money to build the roads; it costs money to keep them up; and we tax ourselves for it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. JONES. I am going to wait until I get the floor in my own right. The vehemence of the attack has been so great that the defense has hardly a chance to utter a word.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator from Massachusetts will allow me, I wish to give the law with reference to charges in Maryland:

Class A. Fifty cents per horsepower or fraction thereof in the case of all motor vehicles having pneumatic tires, with a minimum charge of $8 for any motor vehicle.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that it should be adjusted in this way. The streets of Washington cost a great deal of money. The parkways of Washington cost a great deal of money. It is paid exclusively by the inhabitants of the District and by the Government. The charge for a motor license in the District is very moderate. That is for them to settle. Of course, Maryland has undertaken, in my judgment, to streamline the business of the District and to make them pay the best proportion. What I would like to see would be precisely the same charge placed on a Maryland motor when you enter the State as on a District motor in Maryland, and vice versa, if he should place his Maryland license on his car, whether he has a State license or not, is to get into trouble when he goes into Maryland. I think it ought to be put on an equal basis with the same charge against an intolerable annoyance. There is no such annoyance from Virginia, but I do not suppose they go there quite as much. It has become an annoyance, and I think a very unjust one. I hope something will be done to equalize it, and if we are going in for a thing of any character, I want to suggest that is a very easy thing for city people to ride out in the country and say, "Why do these farmers have better roads?" It is a very easy thing for a gentleman riding along in a rich, commodious, and easy-going automobile to look upon the acres the farmer tills and the muddy roads he has to use and say, "Why do these people have better roads?"

But it is going a long way farther for gentlemen with big automobiles to come out and say, "We will use these roads just as much as we please and we will not pay anything for the use of them."

Mr. President, an illustration has been used in comparing Maryland with Virginia. I am sorry to say that if a man goes into Virginia he will not find very many good roads; but the very minute Virginia undertakes to tackle this road question and give it the same resolution and practical industry that we have in Maryland the Virginia people will have to make their charges just the same there against those who use and wear their roads in large numbers and through long spaces of time. In Maryland, the people pay a tax of $20, that he has to pay annually. Mr. President, that, as a matter of fact, is a very small tax, because in the country that we have in Maryland the people pay what they use as much or more than we on the annual basis for maintenance that we pay. They have had to bear none of the high taxes we pay for the original building of the roads.

There has been a very good deal of confusion thrown into this debate by the Senator from Utah on this subject as to having a number of tags on a car. Mr. President, the police requirement of the State of Maryland that an automobile should only come into the State with one tag on is a reasonable requirement. If a man comes in from Delaware or Pennsylvania, he must have the Pennsylvania car license. If he has one more tag or two more tags and kills somebody, how can the constable tell where the murderer came from? In such a case the constable would have to look up the license lists and go through the numbers of two or three State automobile license systems to come to a conclusion and endeavor to catch the criminal.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Maryland, a question of Mr. LEE. The Senator knows that every tag on the back of an automobile is usually covered with dust or a certain amount of mud, so that differentiation in color is of little use to the constabulary.

Mr. SMITH OF MARYLAND. The Senator knows that the laws of Maryland required nonresidents to have but one tag. There is such a law, is there, Senator LEE of Maryland. Yes; as to an automobile coming into the State. The provision of the Maryland law has been read by the Senator from Utah.
Mr. NORRIS. I was not in when the amendment was offered. I desire to ask the Senator another question. Suppose, for instance, the Senator from Utah goes into Maryland with a Utah tag on his automobile and also a District tag?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Then he would have offended against that tag?

Mr. NORRIS. How, if he went in there with only a Utah tag on his automobile?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. He would be all right.

Mr. NORRIS. He would be all right?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Yes, sir.

Mr. NORRIS. No matter how long he might be in the District and how often he might go into Maryland?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Precisely.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator, then, if that car had also a District tag on it when it went to Maryland, would not the driver of the car have to stop at the line and take the District tag off?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. For illustration, suppose a gentleman from another State stays in Massachusetts for a longer time than the Massachusetts laws of reciprocity allow and he gets a Massachusetts tag; then he goes to New York and stays there longer than their reciprocity laws allow, and he gets a New York tag; then he goes to Pennsylvania and stays there more than the Pennsylvania reciprocity period, and gets a Pennsylvania tag; and finally he runs over into the Maryland line with three tags on his machine. That is what our law is aimed at. We simply want to have it so that the man who comes from Massachusetts has time to wear out the tags, and the man who crosses beyond the Maryland line.

Mr. GALLINGER. Is there a law to prevent the taking of the District tag?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; in other words, in the little territory of the District he would be required to have two tags, and when he crossed the line into Maryland he would not dare to have but one. If we could have a law that would harmonize that discrepancy, it seems to me, it would be very desirable.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the argument on which the junior Senator from Maryland seeks to rely more than anything else is, it seems to me, contrary to the actual requirement of the Maryland law. He says the purpose is to keep as the number of tags off the machine to prevent that practice. The Maryland law requires two tags on an automobile coming from the District of Columbia. There must be two tags—a District of Columbia tag and a Maryland tag. So that I do not see very much force in that argument. The amendment proposed, if carried out, would meet that situation.

Mr. NORRIS. What does the amendment that is now pending propose to do?

Mr. JONES. As I remember the amendment, it provides that any person who is not a legal resident of the District of Columbia in bringing an automobile in here shall pay the license charge for local vehicles of legal residents of the District of Columbia if the State from which he comes or in which he has his legal residence does not recognize the District of Columbia license tax.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, before we go any further I claim——

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

Mr. JONES. I do not yield just now.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I claim that this is general legislation, and I make the point of order against it.

Mr. NORRIS. The District of Columbia, in order with reference to the provision of the bill as it came here from the House. The House provision might have been subject to a point of order in the House, but it is not subject to a point of order here, and any comment upon it, without question, would be answer to that question, I think, by the mover of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not familiar with the proposal to which this is an amendment, and would
The Secretary. On page 24, after the word “hereunder,” in line 20, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That motor vehicles, owned or operated by persons not legal residents of the District of Columbia, but who shall have complied with the laws of the State of their legal residence requiring the registration or licensing of operators thereof and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles, and the registration or licensing of such vehicles as provided by the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, which is used or operated within the District, the operator thereof shall be required to be licensed or registered or bear other identification numbers, under the laws and regulations of the District, if the States in which the vehicle was licensed or operated within the District, the State of Maryland, the State of Utah does not have such laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is clearly of the opinion—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will hear the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The provision in the bill to which this is an amendment is the House text, and not the Senate text. This is absolutely new legislation. Whilst there was some provision, in the House text regarding this matter, the amendment is not applicable in this case.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate does not hold that the Senate has not the right to amend the House text?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is compelled to overrule the point of order made by the Senator from Maryland, as the proposition is an amendment to language on a cognate subject in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The PRESIDENT pro tempore.

The Senator from Washington still has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, just a moment. We really have been rather resenting the aspersions cast upon our State in this matter of licenses more than we have been debating the amendment of the Senator from Utah. The amendment of the Senator from Utah simply has two effects. It does not affect the Maryland people in the slightest, as I read it. It has no effect on us at all. We simply come into the District and get a license, as we always have done and probably always will do; but it has this effect: It excuses the Senator from Utah from paying license on his car in the District of Columbia and excuses every other Senator in this body from paying a license on his car in the District of Columbia. That is rather a small procedure. I think, gentlemen, you ought to pay licenses.

There is another thing the amendment does that is bad, and that other thing is that the name of the owner of the car is not registered in the District of Columbia, so matter how long the owner has been here during the year with the license of a distant State. I think it is bad policy from a police standpoint not to have the operator or owner of a car register his name and be accounted for by the police by registering his name when he comes into the District of Columbia. I think it is a very bad proposition to admit anyone here from a distant State, with the license tag of that State on his car, with liberty to operate it as long as he likes in the District, without making any police report or having any police surveillance.

Mr. NORRIS. With the permission of the Senator from Washington, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland another question.

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Maryland says it would only relieve the Senator from Utah and other Senators from procuring licenses in the District?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is about what it amounts to.

Mr. NORRIS. That would depend altogether, as I understand the reading of the amendment, as to whether the State of Utah or any State from which a Senator might come, and of which there are not legal residents, had a law that extended the same privilege to the citizens of Utah.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There are very few of them that do not have such laws.

Mr. NORRIS. The State of Maryland does not.

Mr. NORRIS. There is not any State that I know of—I am not familiar with the laws of many of the States in this particular—that extends to nonresidents of the State the right to remain in the State as long as the citizens of the various States have to stay here in Washington if they are attending Congress.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska—

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

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That does not apply to Utah to any extent. The only exception in the entire United States is Maryland, and there they discriminate against the District of Columbia, and this amendment simply seeks to remedy that.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, I do not understand the amendment. I do not see how it does that.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will further indulge me—

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. This amendment does not remedy the situation. A Senator coming into this State with an automobile without a license. I may prophesy that he is not going to come into that State without a license and without paying for it; and for that reason he sees fit to introduce an amendment here that excuses him from getting a license from the District of Columbia. That does not hurt us any.

Mr. SMOOT. That is not the amendment. Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is what the amendment means; it does not mean anything else; and it has the further evil effect of not requiring a foreign car, running under a foreign name and number, from reporting to the police and having the owner at least set down on the records of the police jurisdiction.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Senate committee amendment simply follows the Maryland law. It is designed to secure reciprocity in the State of Maryland and the other States of the Union. That does not apply to residents in the District at all; it applies only to nonresidents. Is that not true? I may be mistaken.

Mr. JONES. That is true.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, does it affect a man who is a permanent resident of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES. It does not affect him unless the State of Maryland will reciprocate, because their citizens must pay the tax in the State of Maryland. If the State of Maryland will have to pay the tax in the District if they would recognize the citizens of the District of Columbia in their State. That is the way it helps the people of the District.

Mr. NORRIS. If the amendment here that excuses him from getting a license from the District of Columbia. That is the way it affects them.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senate has the amendment there, I wish he would read the first part of it.

Mr. JONES. I will read the amendment as follows:

Provided further, That motor vehicles, owned or operated by persons not legal residents of the District of Columbia, but who shall have complied with the laws of their legal residence requiring identification or registration of operators thereof and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles, and the registration or licensing of such vehicles as provided by the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, while used or operated within the District, shall not be required to be licensed or registered or bear other identification numbers, under the laws and regulations of the District, if the States in which the owner or operator of such motor vehicles has his legal residence extends the same privilege to the motor vehicles owned or operated by legal residents of the State of Maryland.
That is the way it affects the people of the District of Columbia, and that is the way the State of Maryland brings about reciprocity between that State and the other States of the Union, and that is the sole purpose of the amendment. Mr. LEE of Maryland directly, may we not legislate for the people of the District of Columbia? We are the only body that can protect them in any way or provide any way by which they may not be discriminated against by other States in this connection? This is about the only method, as I take it, that can be pursued with reference to this particular subject to secure reciprocity between them and the State of Maryland.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to state the case?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am serious about that. The amendment accomplishes. The amendment proposes this:

Mr. SMOOT. The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] says that this will relieve the Senator from Utah from paying a tax in the District of Columbia. It will do no such thing unless there is reciprocity between the District of Columbia and the State of Utah.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Well, there is.

Mr. SMOOT. And I may say there ought to be the same thing with regard to Maryland.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. There is, is there not? Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SMOOT. Just wait until I get through with the statement.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That is the very point. The President pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] has the floor. Mr. SMOOT. I am not trying to get away from the point, I will say to the Senator. Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator now does not. But that is what we want to do is: We know that the people of the District of Columbia have had no reciprocity with Maryland. We know that Maryland is not going to give them reciprocity, because both the Senators from Maryland stand right behind as they have not done it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We can not afford it.

Mr. SMOOT. The idea of attempting to make it appear that I am interested in the amendment for the purpose of getting rid of paying $5 a year to the District of Columbia is ridiculous. Mr. President, that has never entered my mind. I never thought of it at all until the Junior Senator from Maryland mentioned it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will acquit the Senator of having any such purpose; but that is exactly what his amendment accomplishes, and nothing else.

Mr. SMOOT. I say, Mr. President, that that is not what the amendment accomplishes. The amendment proposes this: That if there is reciprocity between Maryland and the District of Columbia, then it will be just the same as any other State of the two, and there will be no more rights granted between the people of the District and the citizens of Maryland than between the citizens of Utah and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. He pays a license fee in the District of Columbia now, does he not?

Mr. SMOOT. I paid it, I think, about 12 years ago. I think I paid it.

The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think I will say what I intended to say.

Mr. NORRIS. Otherwise, the Senator from Washington will forget that he has the floor. [Laughter.]

The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. JONES. No; I do not yield just now. I have just a word or two more to say.

I just want to call attention to the fact to which attention has already been called by the Senator from Utah that the State of Maryland is the only body of the District of Columbia in their law and by the very terms of their law. Apparently they have framed the law for the specific purpose of discriminating against the people of the District of Columbia. The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMOOT] admits this discrimination; and I want to call the attention of those who are here and who probably did not hear the Senator from Utah to the language of the Maryland law itself. They define the word "State." They say:

The term "State" as used in the subtitle, except where otherwise expressly provided, and except in section 116, shall also include the Territories and Federal Districts of the United States.

In other words, the word "State" in this act includes the District of Columbia, except where expressly excluded, and except in section 116; and section 116 is the section that levies the tax and requires the tag. The District of Columbia, as a Territory of the United States, is expressly excepted from the provisions of that section, which provides that where another State reciprocates with Maryland that State's license is good in the State of Maryland. So it is expressly provided by this law of Maryland that the tag of the District of Columbia shall not be good under any circumstances in the State of Maryland. So all District of Columbia motor vehicles must have two tags, no matter how confusing it may be.

Of course this provision will not do away with that unless the State of Maryland sees fit to reciprocate. She has seen fit to reciprocate with reference to other States in the Union. If there is a State in the Union that requires a tax of $5 for automobiles, she makes no question about that; she lets that automobile go through her territory. But if a person in the District of Columbia owns a vehicle and goes there with it he must pay. Then, she may not see fit to reciprocate with the District of Columbia. She may say, "Our citizens must pay in the District of Columbia the $5, or whatever is required there, and the people of the District must pay in the State of Maryland." If she does, of course, this will not bring about reciprocity.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question for information?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. Under the present law of the State of Maryland can a resident of the District of Columbia owning and operating, say, a 40-horse power machine, go through the State of Maryland without paying $30 for the privilege of going through it just once?

Mr. JONES. He can not go through without paying whatever tax is imposed under that law.

Mr. McCUMBER. That tax is $30 under the present system.

Mr. JONES. It is 50 cents a horsepower, measured according to their system of measurement.

Mr. McCUMBER. But they can not even drive once as far as the Cherry Chase Club, three blocks into Maryland, under the present law, without having to pay from thirty to forty dollars for that privilege?

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think we really do need some kind of a change, as long as they can drive with impunity over every road in the District of Columbia. Another thing that the Senator has not mentioned is this: Unless it has been done away with very recently, in addition to paying $30 to go across the State, every few miles you have got to go into your pocket and pay another tax for traveling upon that road, under a toll system that they have.

Several Senators. That has been abolished.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope it has been abolished.

Mr. SMOOT. That is in Virginia.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; in Maryland. I drove from here over to Gettysburg but a few years ago, and there was one of these bars across the road every few miles.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We have bought all those pikes.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—
go down to Harpers Ferry, and I ran onto a little road going across and had to pay tolls every 5 miles, in the State of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think the Senator is right in saying that that condition exists in one portion of our State.

Mr. JONES. That may be the portion I got into.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There may be some tollgates there, but we have been and are buying up all the toll roads in the State in order to abolish tolls. Of course, we cannot do it all at once, but I do not think you will find many tollgates in our State. There may be some in that section of the State. Otherwise there are none.

Mr. McCUMBER. I do not know the extent of the toll roads in Maryland now. Of course, I never heard of tolls until I came down to the Senate. One drove across the State once or a dozen times a year; and they purport to take advantage of that, and therefore they except the District of Columbia from the general law.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not think anybody who wanted to go from the District of Columbia into Maryland one time in a year would get a license at all.

Mr. SMOOT. He would get arrested.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then it seems to be a case of this kind: The people of the State of Maryland see an opportunity whereby, out of the necessities of the case, they can get a very large sum of money from the residents of the District of Columbia, Mr. President, that they want to pay the license on the roads across the State once or a dozen times a year; and they purport to take advantage of that, and therefore they except the District of Columbia from the general law.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not think anybody who wanted to go from the District of Columbia into Maryland one time in a year would get a license at all.

Mr. NORRIS. He would get arrested.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but we are not likely to want to go to pay the license in the State just for tolls alone to drive through that valley, in addition to whatever other expenses there may be.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe there are any toll roads in our State except in this very small section. I want to say that I have been through the State, and I do not know that I have ever paid a toll in the last three or four years. There may be one or two roads of that kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me ask the Senator a question. If I want to drive over to Baltimore once a year at the present time, or on heavy Chevy Chase Circle, with a 40-horsepower machine, I have to pay $80 for that privilege, though I go only once a year. Now, it seems to be some kind of a change so that that injustice would not be imposed upon me?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Well, the Senator has the privilege of going every day in the year. I might want, as many people from the District might want, to cross the State of Maryland once a year. Does the Senator think it is fair that for that privilege a resident of the District of Columbia must pay from thirty to forty dollars?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that that is a pretty excessive price to pay, but it is pretty hard to know how to regulate that. If you have a license, you have the license for a year, and you are entitled to go as many times in the year as you please. I will say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, if his car is licensed in his own State, it is not necessary for him to pay anything.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, Mr. President, I am not speaking for my State. Has not the resident of the District of Columbia the same right, and ought he not to be accorded the same right? If you have a license, you have the license for a year, and you are entitled to go as many times in the year as you please. I will say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, if his car is licensed in his own State, it is not necessary for him to pay anything.

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, Mr. President, I am not speaking for my State. Has not the resident of the District of Columbia the same right, and ought he not to be accorded the same right? If you have a license, you have the license for a year, and you are entitled to go as many times in the year as you please. I will say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, if his car is licensed in his own State, it is not necessary for him to pay anything.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because there is reciprocity with all other States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why should you make a distinction between the two?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because there is reciprocity with all other States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why should not Maryland have reciprocity with the District, then?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because the District has not the same privilege to give us. It has a very contracted area, with very short mileage. The District of Columbia has a population of about 350,000 people that use our roads, which we have spent $25,000,000 in building, and which are now taxing ourselves to the amount of $500,000 to $1,000,000 a year in keeping up. We feel that if the people of the District of Columbia use those roads as we use them, which they do to a very great extent—probably more than we—with only a small portion of the tax they should pay for the upkeep of the roads. Now, the people of the North Dakota would have? Why should you make a distinction between? The President.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because there is reciprocity with all other States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why should not Maryland have reciprocity with the District, then?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because the District has not the same privilege to give us. It has a very contracted area, with very short mileage. The District of Columbia has a population of about 350,000 people that use our roads, which we have spent $25,000,000 in building, and which are now taxing ourselves to the amount of $500,000 to $1,000,000 a year in keeping up. We feel that if the people of the District of Columbia use those roads as we use them, which they do to a very great extent—probably more than we—with only a small portion of the tax they should pay for the upkeep of the roads. Now, the people of the North Dakota would have? Why should you make a distinction between? The President.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because there is reciprocity with all other States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why should not Maryland have reciprocity with the District, then?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because the District has not the same privilege to give us. It has a very contracted area, with very short mileage. The District of Columbia has a population of about 350,000 people that use our roads, which we have spent $25,000,000 in building, and which are now taxing ourselves to the amount of $500,000 to $1,000,000 a year in keeping up. We feel that if the people of the District of Columbia use those roads as we use them, which they do to a very great extent—probably more than we—with only a small portion of the tax they should pay for the upkeep of the roads. Now, the people of the North Dakota would have? Why should you make a distinction between? The President.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Because there is reciprocity with all other States.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to say that the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Maryland is not get over land with it, does he? [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. I do not get over land with it; no. That is pretty good.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state that we have amended that.

Mr. NORRIS. This bill makes it annual, I understand, and that will be a change of the law. So it would not be much of a hardship for the people of Maryland to pay that little license in the District of Columbia, and the people of the District of Maryland. Reciprocity is based on the theory that people coming from one State and going to another are doing that for temporary purposes, but it is different with the use of the Maryland roads by a large number at least of the population of the District of Columbia. It is a permanent thing. On the other hand, they pay but very little for a license in the District of Columbia. I do not know how much, but for a small amount one gets a license for a car that will last during the life of the car.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will state that we have amended that.

Mr. NORRIS. This bill makes it annual, I understand, and that will be a change of the law. So it would not be much of a hardship for the people of Maryland to pay that little license in the District of Columbia, and the people of the District of Maryland. Reciprocity is based on the theory that people coming from one State and going to another are doing that for temporary purposes, but it is different with the use of the Maryland roads by a large number at least of the population of the District of Columbia. It is a permanent thing. On the other hand, they pay but very little for a license in the District of Columbia. I do not know how much, but for a small amount one gets a license for a car that will last during the life of the car.
amendment in the affirmative without excusing ourselves as license taxpayers. We are going to pay the license in the District as we always do, whether a member owns a machine or not. Every other member owning a machine who votes for this amendment, without realizing it, I believe, is simply excusing himself from obtaining a license for an automobile in the District of Columbia while he is here, and at the same time increasing that tax for machine owners in the District and for Maryland.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I call the Senator to order. It is not in order to make an accusation of that kind.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I did not reflect upon the Senator.

Mr. WARREN. I am not talking about reflection upon me, but upon the effect of that tax for the Senators from Maryland—because it excuses them from paying an annual tax. The Senators from Maryland because it excuses them from paying an annual tax for automobile license if he has an automobile license in some other State. That is all it does.

The Senator says he wants to produce a State reciprocity situation between Maryland and the District. This amendment will accomplish another. The amendment simply proposes an awkward piece of legislation which does not accomplish what the proposer seems to have in mind.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the thought has occurred to me that it is passing strange that all these travelers want to go to Maryland. I have not heard anybody asking to go to Virginia or West Virginia. What may be the reason or the cause I do not know. There must be a reason, God knows.

Mr. GALLINGER. We have to go through Maryland to get to New Jersey.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It is worth going through Maryland to get to New Jersey. Then you go to God's country.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not reflect upon the Senator from Utah just now, and I said he was unconscious of that, which was perfectly proper.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as I am concerned, I will state—

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia has the floor now.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that some four or five years ago I secured a license for my automobile. That is all there is to it.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say that "the Senator from Utah" is not under the same construction as the amendment that the Senator from Maryland proposes. He must be mistaken as to what the object is.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I will ask the Senator now if he pays a license tax in the District of Columbia on his automobile?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will pardon a further interruption, I ask him now.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I have asked the Senator a question.

Mr. SMOOT. Wait until I answer that, because the Senator in a few minutes will say I did not answer it.

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. To answer the question.

Mr. SMOOT. I started to tell the Senator before that some 10 or 12 years ago I secured a license tax in the District of Columbia on my automobile.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The same machine the Senator is using now?

Mr. SMOOT. No; not the same machine.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. The Senator is running an automobile with a license he did not get for it.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President, I am not. The Senator from Utah is doing exactly the same as any other citizen of the District of Columbia and every other Senator who resides in the District of Columbia; but the bill provides that hereafter there shall be an annual tax. The Senator from Utah does not expect to avoid paying that tax. He has no intention of avoiding the payment of the tax.

The amendment which I have offered proposes that whatever treatment the other States give to the District of Columbia they shall not be prevented from doing the same treatment to citizens of other States, and I do not expect to get rid of paying any tax. I am glad to pay the tax. In fact, I want to say to the Senator that some four or five years ago the Commissioners of the District of Columbia thought the better course was to authorize the District attorney to collect an annual tax. I was asked to pay an annual tax and paid for that year. The question was taken to the court and decided that the payment of an annual tax was not requisite to the payment of a license tax, and that after the law was passed they could collect an annual tax. I was asked to pay an annual tax and paid for that year. The question was taken to the court and decided that the payment of an annual tax was not requisite to the payment of a license tax, and that after the law was passed they could collect an annual tax. I was asked to pay an annual tax and paid for that year. The question was taken to the court and decided that the payment of an annual tax was not requisite to the payment of a license tax, and that after the law was passed they could collect an annual tax. I was asked to pay an annual tax and paid for that year.
sets [Mr. Weeks] to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankhead] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WALSHE. I transfer my vote with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Lippitt] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Ashurst] and vote "nay.

Mr. CURTIS. I transfer my vote with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Hannah] to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Sutherland] and vote "yea.

Mr. JONES. I transfer my vote with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Swanson] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Fernald] and vote "yea.

Mr. STONE. I have a vote with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Clark], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I move to reconsider the vote (negative). I transfer my vote with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Dillingham] to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Hughes] and will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—y e a s 32, n a y s 21, as f o l l o w s :

YE A S — 3 2.

Borah
Brandegee
Brookes
Broussard
Chamberlain
Clark
Cummins
Curtis
Jones
Chilton
Petter
Brady
Holli
James
Hollis
Kirby
Ashurst
Bankhead
Beckham
Bryan
Catron
Clapp
Cole
Culhenson
Dillingham
Don Fouc

Kenyon
Gooding
Kuykendall
McGhee
Morgan
Nelson
Pittman
Nye
Oluse
Owen
Patton
Robinson
Rogers
Rogers
Scott
Smith
Sloan
Smith
Smith
Smith
Smith
Smith
Smith
Smith
Shafroth
Shapley

N O T V O T I N G — 4 3.

Johnston, S. Dak.
Fernald
Gallinger
Gore
Harding
Harding
Huggins
Husting
Johnson, Mr.

Ashurst
Beckham
Bryan
Catron
Clapp
Cole
Culhenson
Dillingham

Johnson, S. Dak.
Keppel
Lake
Myers
O'Gorman
Oliver
Owen
Pease

Yes, the amendment is considered in the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota is considered in the committee.

Mr. BI R AY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted at the proper place in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey will be stated.

The Secretary. The amendment proposed in the Senate from New Hampshire will be stated.

The Secretary. On page 14, after line 18, it is proposed to insert the following:

Enforcement of child-labor law: For the enforcement of the provisions of the act to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia, approved May 29, 1908, namely, for two inspectors at $2,000 each, $4,000. Provided, That existing provisions of law requiring the detail of two privates of the Metropolitan police force for the enforcement of said act are hereby repealed.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think this item is estimated for, and I shall make no objection to it. Let it go to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is considered in the committee.

Mr. CH L I T ON. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The Secretary. After line 25, on page 103, it is proposed to insert the following as a new paragraph:

For the acquisition, for a public park, of the tract of land known as the Patterson tract, assessed on the records of the assessor of the District of Columbia as parcel 129-2, lying north of Florida Avenue northeast and bounded on the east by the grounds of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, on the west by New York Avenue and the tracks of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., and on the north by Fairview Avenue, containing 81 acres, more or less, $500,000 (or so much thereof as may be necessary). Provided, That said tract of land shall not be acquired by condemnation.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I shall make no objection to the amendment, and it may go to conference so far as I am concerned.

Mr. SEAMANS. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will not be adopted. It does not strike me that this is a very apt time to be purchasing half-million-dollar parks in the District.

We are needing about all the money we have. The Federal Government is needing its half of it, and that matter can be put over to some more convenient season, as was recommended by Senator Paul upon an occasion when the remark was not quite so apropos as it now is.

Mr. CHLITON. Mr. President, I expected some opposition to this amendment. It is a result of the system that we have had in dealing with the District of Columbia, and to which I, at the last session of Congress, briefly called the attention of the Senate, that the half-credit half-accounting system we shall have a half-and-half government of the city of Washington and of the District of Columbia.
What are we doing here to-day? We are putting into effect in practically a manner that I thought the Senate ought to adopt. The question is, whether any one knows that there has been a contest in this city whether we should buy what is known as the Patterson tract in the northeast or whether we should buy the Dean tract in the northwest. The proposition has been to buy the Dean tract for $625,000, instead of buying the $831 acres of the other tract for $500,000. I want them both to go in, and let us further limp along in this uncertain way that we are governing this city. We should be sensible, I think, but I cannot deal with it. I suppose that one or the other, possibly both, will be knocked out in conference. It does seem to me, however, that this great northeast section of the city should have some consideration. Here is a tract of land that is very valuable, and the question is what to do with their property; and this great northeast section of the city should have some consideration. Here is a tract of land that is very valuable, and the question is what to do with their property; and this great northeast section of the city should have some consideration.

Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from West Virginia said or did, nor am I taking exception to the manner in which the remarks have been made, but I was answering what was said upon the floor of the Senate. I shall be glad to have the Senator allow the amendment to go to conference.

The President pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Mississippi made objection to this amendment. This is a simple little appropriation of half a million dollars for the purpose of buying some land for a public park in the city of Washington. It might be a very wise appropriation to make, but the Senate has no information upon which it can authorize the expenditure of such an enormous amount of money for that purpose at this time.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President—

The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. WILSON. I do not know anything about it. Mr. CHILTON. Does not the Senator know that this item has been recommended by the District Commissioners; that it has been estimated for, and has in every way been considered; and does not know that what I said in the beginning of my remarks is true, that the question has been as to whether or not this year we would buy the Dean tract for $625,000, or the 80 odd acres in the Patterson tract in the northeast section of the city for $500,000?

Mr. WILSON. Unfortunately, I do not know anything about it.

Mr. CHILTON. I was informing the Senator.

Mr. WILSON. I do not know if the Senate has considered the reason of this appropriation in a kind of hope or expectation that the conference committee will take care of it and just cut it out.

That is not a commendable way to legislate, as it seems to me. We are not only adopting an amendment which we can act. For my own part, I do not think this is a time when we ought to be spending such enormous sums of money for the purpose of making the public parks, or the use of which is not to exceed the appropriation of $500,000 in a kind of hope or expectation that the conference committee will take care of it and just cut it out.
voting in favor of the appropriation on the grounds that it has been opposed to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. I also want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that we have in this bill already a provision appropriating $500,000 for the bridge, and I believe it would be a mistake to add any further to that bridge. Therefore, if you are going to vote for this appropriation, you are going to vote for a bridge that is already almost $400,000 in cost. If you are going to vote against it, you are going to vote against a bridge that has already been built in the city of Washington something over a million dollars.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I simply say that I agree very cordially with the sentiments expressed by the Senators from Mississippi and Montana. I do not think we should load up a conference committee with items which do not possess the character of being necessary or important to the welfare of our citizens. This bill contains a proposition that is perfectly natural; that is only in the interest of the city of Washington to have these streets go out, and let these people develop their property, and they are being assessed and they are being condemned through their property, and they are being assessed and they are being condemned and not being protected by the taxing of the public. Therefore, it seems to me that this is the time for the expenditure of money in order that the people of this district may have immediate and convenient access across the river.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, as I said, I do not know all of the details of this matter, but I do know that the people who have had it in charge understand all about it. The committees understand the different arguments in favor of these different parks. I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter from Dr. Hall and Mr. Tucker to me on this subject. Then, as far as I am concerned, the vote may be taken.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 9, 1897.

Mr. W. E. CHILTON. United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg leave to call your attention to the inclosed amendment that I feel should be made to the bill No. 19110, commonly known as the District of Columbia bill, now pending before the Senate. I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter from Mr. H. Evans Tucker, of the city of Washington, and I hope that it will receive your careful consideration.

I believe without question that the acquisition of this tract is one of the most important matters in the history of Washington, and I hope that it will receive your careful consideration, and that you can see your way clear to introduce the amendment suggested.

Yours very respectfully,

EVAN H. TUCKER.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, about a year or so ago the Senate passed an act to exempt from taxation certain property belonging to the Daughters of the American Revolution, and made an appropriation to reimburse the tax they had paid. Since then the association have bought some more property with which they intend to combine this tract. Some time ago I introduced a bill to exempt it from taxation; but, in view of the work that devolved upon the members of the committee, instead of pressing the matter before the committee, I let the matter go. Now, in thought of causing an amendment to this bill, I understand that the chairman of the committee will not object; and so, at the proper place, I ask to have inserted the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Should I ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. Of course, the propriety of exempting this property from taxation depends altogether upon how it is to be used. The Senator would not exempt it; he would vote the amendment against it, because the association, because it is conceivable that they might invest in property which was to be used for purposes of profit. How is it to be used? It is not used for profit?

Mr. CLAPP. This is used for their buildings and their engineer buildings. They have purchased this additional ground and expect to enlarge the use of it.
Mr. WILLIAMS. It can not be used for commercial purposes or other purposes of profit?

Mr. CLAPP. Oh, no.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is merely to extend the ground around their buildings?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes; it is simply a part of their plan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The Secretary. It is proposed to insert, on page 17, after line 7, the following:

That the property situated in square 178 in the city of Washington, D.C., described in the bill as lots 4, 5, 6, and 17, inclusive, occupied by Daughters of the American Revolution, be, and the same is hereby, exempt from taxation and I shall not object to it.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, this amendment is in entire harmony with one that we adopted some time ago, and I shall not object to it.

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

That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. In that connection I should like to have inserted in the Record the paper which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, they may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 18, 1917.

Dear Senator Clapp: I am enclosing the statement in regard to the tax on the last lots purchased by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Thanking you very much for what you have and are doing, with much appreciation.

Very truly,

EMMA HAYES DAVIS,

LOTS 4, 5, 6, 7, AND 11, SQUARE 178.


Amount paid by society. 99.19.

$282.99 will be due May, 1917.

[From page 18322 of the Congressional Record of Aug. 1, 1916.]

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator in charge of the bill we have lately passed a law which exempted from taxation some property the Daughters of the American Revolution had bought here in the interest of its members. Mr. Smith, I am interested to explain why they did not pay their taxes, it was suggested that they pay their taxes and if the bill became a law and the bill became a law it would be a very easy matter to have a bill passed to reimburse them for the taxes. The taxation which they paid amounted to $271,76.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the greatest latitude has been shown here to-day on the subject of amendments. This is an amendment dealing with a proposition that is in the bill, and the gate has practically been thrown open, as I understand the rulings of the Vice President, to the discretion of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland say that it has been estimated for?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the greatest latitude has been shown here to-day on the subject of amendments. This is an amendment dealing with a proposition that is in the bill, and the gate has practically been thrown open, as I understand the rulings of the Vice President, to the discretion of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. President, the amendment is in entire harmony with one that we adopted some time ago, and I shall not object to it.

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

That amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. I wish the chairman of the committee would take the bill and make no objection to that amendment.

Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment. I will simply state its effect, and then let it be voted on.

I do not think the license tax on motor vehicles provided in this bill is large enough, so I am going to offer an amendment to the provision in page 292, line 9, to make it $5 for each vehicle over 24 horsepower, and $3 for each vehicle of less than 24 horsepower. I am going to offer an amendment that will make it $5 for each vehicle over 24 horsepower and up to 30 horsepower, and $10 for each vehicle over 30 horsepower.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. On what page is that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On page 24, line 6. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to what I have been told is a mistake in the bill as it passed the House. My attention has been called to this matter of the care of the police committee of the District of Columbia. He thinks it is a mistake, and he thinks it ought to be rectified. I do not know anything about it myself, except what he has said about it.

Mr. President, the chairman of the committee would take the bill and turn to page 65, commencing with the last word of line 17, and he will find these words:

Five police matrons, at $720 each, to possess police powers of arrest.

On page 65, under the heading "House of detention," line 20, we find this language: "Three matrons, at $400 each, to possess police powers of arrest." A member of the House committee tells me that the last three are getting only $600 a year for the same work in performing the duties that are performed by the others who are paid $720.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I grant there is a discrimination, but they will all get an increase under the amendment we put on of 10 or 15 per cent. We started to increase some of these salaries, but the entire committee cut them out and would not put them in.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course under that amendment we could increase the salaries, but there would still be a discrepancy just the same as now.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I grant that.

Mr. NORRIS. I can not see why there should be any difference.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say there are others who are receiving salaries probably not commensurate with the service rendered and probably discriminatory, but when the subcommittee started to make increases the committee deter-
mined to make no increases whatever; but we have agreed to one amendment in the Senate's notice.

Mr. NORGUS. I noticed that.

Mrs. SMITH of Maryland. We have depended upon the increase made by the Senate amendment. We hope after a little while to be able to remedy these discrepancies. I am not going to argue with the Senator that it is exactly fair, but these things will creep in, and it takes a little time to eliminate them.

Mr. NORGUS. Since these police women have the same duty to perform as far as the work is concerned it is exactly alike, as far as I can see, would the Senator object to putting in an amendment equalizing them and let it go to conference, and if there is any difference the conference of course would reconcile it.

There is nothing here with which we can equalize the salary.

Mrs. SMITH of Maryland. I have admitted to the Senator that there is a discrepancy, but there are other discrepancies probably similar to this, and we felt if we started to put up salaries there was no telling where it would end. The entire committee determined that they would not increase any salaries, and let them be subject to an increase by the Senate amendment. We will probably get it in the next time. I think the Senator from Nebraska is right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that the clerks be authorized to correct the totals in the bill. The Chair hears no objection, and it is granted.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, if I may disturb the conversation of Senators I wish to offer an amendment and give fairly good reasons for it.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, it is impossible to hear.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators will resume their seats and preserve order.

Mrs. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that we wish to finish the bill to-night, and I hope the Senate will pardon us for taking a few minutes more in order to get it through.

Mr. LANE. Anyone who has visited the Zoological Park will notice that there is a refusal, perhaps, to many which can be easily remedied and which I may say is inhuman and ought to be stopped.

We have a large collection of animals there, and it is most unfortunate for them to be deprived of their liberty. They are animals that love their liberty, and they ought to have as good treatment as we can give them, plenty of ground to range in, proper food, and so forth.

So I make an appeal for those particularly interesting animals such as deer and elk. They are confined in small paddocks on barren hill-sides, and the feed during the winter and probably the greater part of the summer is dry feed, such as hay and corn. A deer does not eat grass in its native haunts unless under such circumstances that it can not secure anything else. They browse—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, the Zoological Garden is provided for in the sundry civil bill, and there is no estimate made for it here.

Mr. LANE. Then I should like to inquire of the Senator from Maryland about the provision on page 45 for the Rock Creek Park. I think the committee has charge of these matters.

Mr. STONE. The Zoological Garden is under the control of the Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. LANE. There is no provision for it here, but here is an item put in this bill to which I wish to call attention. I consider it to be a part of the duty of this body. It would cost but a few dollars to in part feed those animals properly some green stuff, kale, turnips, and so forth which can be raised on farms, all of which can be produced for little money.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say the matter the Senator speaks of is under the entire control of the National Zoological Park, and I would like to have the Senator withdraw it, and we have no right to consider the matter at all on that bill.

Mr. LANE. If there is no opportunity for them to have green food they are surely confronted with continued hard times.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. There is $100,000 appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. LANE. Not in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not in this bill, because it does not come in this bill. One hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for the National Zoological Park and that pertains to it.

Mr. LANE. Then I withdraw that part of my amendment and suggest the other part, which has to do in certain quarters outside of the park as well as in the park, and it belongs on this bill.

It is a bill pertaining to the District of Columbia, said to be the most beautiful City in the world, and one which we are trying to improve in every way.

If you will go to that park at this time of the day, or a little earlier, you will find all the buzzards from Virginia and Delaware come to Plouthing for something more substantial, though not so odorous, to eat and sometimes get it and sometimes they do not. Then they strike out across the sky in cedro. I think the Senator from Nebraska is right.

Mrs. SMITH of Maryland. I will say that the amount has not been estimated for, and I make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole, except the one reserved, pertaining to the Dean tract. Without objection, the amendments other than the one referred to will be held to be concurred in. They are concurred in. The question now is on concurrent in the amendment which was reserved.

Mr. STONE. That is the amendment proposing to expend $90,000 to buy the Dean tract.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the amendment which was reserved for a separate vote.

Mr. STONE. I hope, and very much hope, that it will not be concurred in.

Mr. THOMAS. So do I. Let us strike it out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurring in the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I shall not urge this matter at all. I merely want to state the reasons why the committee put it in the bill. The tract has been held for about a million dollars for many years. It is now assessed at $625,000. Within two blocks of the Dean tract there are 49 apartment houses and it is one of the most thickly populated sections of the city. It is costing the parties who hold the property about $50,000 a year.

I hesitate to say that if we could buy it in a year hence or two years hence we would not say not to take it now, but from what I can learn I fear that the opportunity for buying the property will not long be had by the Government of the United States, and it is the most thickly populated tract in the Capital District of Columbia. That was our reason for putting it in. Of course if the Senate feels that they are willing to take the chance and knock it out it is for them to determine.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on concurrence in the amendment, made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was nonconcurred in.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8482) to restore home-rule to the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 7757) authorizing a further extension of time to pur-
chase of land in the former Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservation, Okla., within which to make payment, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the disagreement of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15842) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and had appointed Mr. Byrn of Tennessee, Mr. Sissons, and Mr. Good managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. R. 14074. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of Fox Lake, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across both arms of the Fox River where it connects Pistakee Lake and Nippersink Lake, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;
- H. R. 17002. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Polk County, Minn., and Grand Forks County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States;
- H. R. 17710. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Tallapoosa River, separating the counties of Montgomery and Elmore, in the State of Alabama, at a point somewhere between Judkin Ferry and Hughes Ferry;
- H. R. 18329. An act granting the consent of Congress to the police jury of Rapides Parish, La., to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Boyce, La.;
- H. R. 18334. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Parkin, Ark.;
- H. R. 19550. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;
- H. R. 19554. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;
- H. R. 18520. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota;
- H. R. 18725. An act granting the consent of Congress to Krumka Township, Pennington County, Minn., to construct a bridge across Red Lake River;
- H. R. 19239. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Pearl River, Miss., and the fourth ward of the Parish of Washington, La., to construct a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.

At a later date, the bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

At a later date, the bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRIELAN presented a memorial of the Corporation of the Boosters Club, of Atascadero, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COLT presented a memorial of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Cal., remonstrating against the so-called Mondell amendment to the game sanctuary bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

The Senate also presented a memorial of the conservation department of the Governor of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial from Oscar Arneson, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Minnesota, transmitting a resolution of that body remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLT presented a telegraph in the nature of a memorial from the Governor of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FRANKLIN presented a memorial from the Governor of New Mexico, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina: From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes. I desire to say that the Clerk of the House shall submit a report (No. 1021) to accompany the bill at a later date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3771) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Harris, Phineas H. Hult, Susan R. Saltenfeld, M. H. S. Mann, Celia Thayre, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1022) thereon.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of the Corporation of the Boosters Club, of Atascadero, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COLT presented a memorial of the Governor of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial from Oscar Arneson, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Minnesota, transmitting a resolution of that body remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLT presented a telegraph in the nature of a memorial from the Governor of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FRANKLIN presented a memorial from the Governor of New Mexico, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina: From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes. I desire to say that the Clerk of the House shall submit a report (No. 1021) to accompany the bill at a later date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3771) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Harris, Phineas H. Hult, Susan R. Saltenfeld, M. H. S. Mann, Celia Thayre, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1022) thereon.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of the Corporation of the Boosters Club, of Atascadero, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COLT presented a memorial of the Governor of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial from Oscar Arneson, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Minnesota, transmitting a resolution of that body remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLT presented a telegraph in the nature of a memorial from the Governor of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FRANKLIN presented a memorial from the Governor of New Mexico, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina: From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes. I desire to say that the Clerk of the House shall submit a report (No. 1021) to accompany the bill at a later date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3771) for the relief of Alfred Cluff, Orson Cluff, Henry E. Norton, William B. Ballard, Elijah Harris, Phineas H. Hult, Susan R. Saltenfeld, M. H. S. Mann, Celia Thayre, William Cox, Theodore Farley, Adelaide Laxton, Clara L. Tenney, George M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1022) thereon.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of the Corporation of the Boosters Club, of Atascadero, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COLT presented a memorial of the Governor of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial from Oscar Arneson, chief clerk of the house of representatives of the Legislature of Minnesota, transmitting a resolution of that body remonstrating against the proposed reduction of the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COLT presented a telegraph in the nature of a memorial from the Governor of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FRANKLIN presented a memorial from the Governor of New Mexico, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the improvement and development of the national parks, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:
A bill (S. 8196) granting a pension to William Gilmour (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUSTING:
A bill (S. 8193) for the relief of Rufus Meyers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JAMES:
A bill (S. 8194) for the relief of W. F. Tomlinson, administrator of Samuel Tomlinson, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:
A bill (S. 8195) granting an increase of pension to Frank D. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pension.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:
A bill (S. 8196) granting a pension to Jennie L. Sidelinger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:
A bill (S. 8195) granting an increase of pension to Frank D. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pension.

Mr. NELSON presented a telegraph in the nature of a memorial from the National Dairy Council, of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the proposed change in the tax on oleomargarine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.
To the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 8200) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Hickett; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 8201) to amend an act providing mediation, conciliation, etc., approved July 15, 1893; to authorize the President to protect the operation of railways in time of peace, and to take possession of the common carriers and draft their crews and officials in time of war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES.
A bill (S. 8202) granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 8203) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Blankenship; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 8204) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Combs; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 8205) granting an increase of pension to John W. Roberson; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 8206) granting an increase of pension to Minatree Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 8207) granting an increase of pension to George S. Robinson; and to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 17350) to promote export trade, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

COMMISSION ON NAVY YARDS AND NAVAL STATIONS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

The annexed is a summary of the information of the Congress, Report No. 3 of the Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations, dated January 31, 1917.

Woodrow Wilson.

The White House, February 9, 1917.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the report accompanying the message will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs in confidence, as was done with previous reports from the same commission.

INDIAN Appropriations—Conference Report.

Mr. ASHURST. I submit the conference report on the Indian appropriation bill, and ask that it be received and printed.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18433) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Senate of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 39, 55, 56, 57, 58, 62, 63, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 89, 100, 102, 108, and 112.


That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed in-
any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in Arizona, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said tribe of Indians until paid."; and the Senate agree to the same.

The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of $5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of $5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of $5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of $5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following:

"That the sum of $5,000, to be immediately available, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.
the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committees may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of the work of the committee, and the stenographers so employed shall not receive for their services exceeding $1 per printed page."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 49, 50, 95, and 111.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I wish to say that the conferences have not agreed on all the amendments. There are four amendments which are still in dispute.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to make a suggestion to the Senator from Arizona. He does not intend, I presume, to ask that the conference report be printed as a Senate document, but that it be placed on the desks for the information of the committee and to be placed on the desks for the information of the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce: H. R. 14674. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village of Fox Lake, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across both arms of the Fox River where it connects Pistakee Lake and Nippersink Lake, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 17602. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Polk County, Minn., and Grand Forks County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River at or near Boyce, La.;

H. R. 17710. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Tappanaw River, separating the counties of Montgomery and Elmore, in the State of Alabama, at a point suitable to the purposes of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 18591. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Polk County, Minn., and Grand Forks County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Tappanaw River at or near Boyce, La.;

H. R. 18534. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Parkin, Ark.;

H. R. 18565. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18531. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Montgomery, in the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River;

H. R. 18720. An act permitting the building of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at Benld, Il., in the State of Minnesota;

H. R. 18725. An act granting the consent of Congress to Kratka Township, Pennington County, Minn., to construct a bridge across Red Lake River;

H. R. 18293. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Pearl River, Miss., and the fourth ward of the parish of Washington, La., to construct a bridge across Pearl River between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.;

H. R. 19298. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the town of Allegheny, county of Allegheny, N. Y., and other purposes;

H. R. 20674. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county commissioners of Decatur County, Ga., to construct a bridge across the Flint River at Bainbridge, Ga.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANSDELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14777) to provide for the control of the floods of the Mississippi River and of the Sacramento River, Cal., and for other purposes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. RANSDELL. I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement regarding the railroad legislation. There are three bills to which the President has called special attention in a message to the Senate, and the bill from the Senate Committee on Commerce from seven to nine members, and providing that it shall be divided into three divisions, each of which will have jurisdiction over the subjects that now belong to the entire commission.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. OVERMAN. I will yield to the Senator if he yields to me I shall move to adjourn or to take a recess, because I know the Senator can not get his bill up this afternoon. I move that we take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope the Senator will not insist on that motion. We can get the bill up, and then I propose to ask that it be laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of these emergency measures.

Mr. OVERMAN. I know the Senator can not possibly get the bill up this afternoon.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Certainly we can not get it up if the Senate will not permit it to be taken up, but I do not think the management of the Senator from North Carolina settles the question.

Mr. OVERMAN. All right; I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Would the Senator yield to me for a moment? Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana yields to the Senator from Nevada (Mr. NEWLANDS), and he has the floor. Does the Senator from Nevada now yield to some other Senator; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I propose to continue the remarks I was making.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. My understanding is that the so-called water-power bill is the unfinished business. I have no desire to retain that bill before the Senate, but I am a member of the Committee on Public Lands, and the chairman of the committee is not here. In his behalf I make the inquiry.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. RANSDELL. I hope the Senator will not make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. RANSDELL. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion and move a recess. I will accept that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate adjourn. The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m., Friday, February 9, 1917) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 10, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 9, 1917.

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

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

O Thou, who art supremely wise, all-powerful, the essence of whose being is love, quicken all that is purest, noblest, best in us, and help us to eliminate the evil tendencies which lie in wait to destroy; that the trend of our life may be forward not backward, upward not downward, heavenward not hellward; that we may build for ourselves from within a character which shall be an everlasting memorial to our Maker, through Him who might us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LANGLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LANGLEY. To ask unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes in order that I may explain and modify a statement I made in debate yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to address the House for not exceeding five minutes.
Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. LANDLEY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is pension day. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not exceeding five minutes in opposition to the amendment proposing to classify postmasters. It occurred to me that I could cite my experience as appointment clerk of the Census Office in helping to organize that office department, and in charge of the independent civil service as an illustration of how easily a high standard of efficiency can be obtained and maintained when examined by a competitive examination. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HANNAN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETTE] had both just spoken in support of the Senate amendment. I recall that they had both submitted, along with other Members of Congress, their recommendations to fill the quotas allotted to them in that office; and, speaking in a spirit of candidness and of justice, I wish to state what I believe to be the language which was calculated to place those two gentlemen in the position of government executive officers, which are usually correct, show that I said these two gentlemen were among those who made the most consistent appeals for patronage. After thinking the matter over I regretted that I used the language that I did, and would gladly have recalled it. The facts are that we made an allotment of Census Office appointments to each Senator and Representative and notified each of the number allotted to him and requested him to submit a list of recommendations. Both of the gentlemen named did this and my recollection is that the quotas allotted in each instance were filled, but if I am in error as to that I regret it. I want to frankly, and in this public manner, say that as I now recall it there was no effort whatever on the part of either gentleman named to get more appointments than the number allotted to him. Mr. Sharkey, of course, has always been always, and in a candid manner, in their dealing with the bureau in these matters.

During my 10 years of service in this body I have never tried to misrepresent or otherwise done an injustice to any of my fellow Members. I have always been scrupulously careful on that point, and I can not, in justice to my own sense of fairness and in Justice to the two gentlemen referred to, permit this incident to pass without putting this statement in the Record. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to say what I told him privately yesterday, but not publicly, that he did not hurt my feelings any? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANDLEY. I am very glad, indeed, to have my friend say that publicly.

Mr. Speaker, having made this explanation and not having had the opportunity to express myself fully yesterday on the question, I ask unanimous consent that I may state briefly in the Record my reasons for opposing the proposition to classify postmasters and my views on civil service.

Mr. Speaker, is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Niagara power bill.

Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the Niagara power bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on February 8, 1917, approved and signed bills of the following titles:--

H. R. 13106. An act for the relief of the trustee and parties who may be interested in the estate of James A. Chamberlain under the terms of his will; H. R. 13820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Buttnor; H. R. 14572. An act for the relief of Gertie Foss; H. R. 14965. An act for the relief of the legal representative of P. H. Aylett; H. R. 14822. An act to prevent and punish the desecration, mutilation, or improper use, within the District of Columbia, of the flag of the United States; and H. R. 14978. An act for the relief of Ida Turner.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 7333. An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 7435. An act of the relief of Winfield S. Solomon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 7598. An act for the relief of John H. Kidd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4259. An act providing for the examination of the accounts of the late Peter G. S. Ten Broeck; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6251. An act for the relief of John F. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5648. An act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5617. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States district court for the district of Minnesota, to hear, try, and determine the value of certain pine timber; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3589. An act to authorize the appointment of Clarence C. Kress to the grade of captain, United States Army Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 747. An act for the relief of Wilbur F. Lawton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3507. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Marsh Watkins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6854. An act to repeal the last proviso of section 4 of an act to establish the Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, approved January 26, 1915; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 378. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Wadsworth, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6552) for the relief of Agusta Nebecker.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 13619. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 378. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GUILFORD COURTHOUSE BATTLE FIELD.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Guilford Courthouse with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8229) to establish a national military park at the battlefield of Guilford Courthouse.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The bill was passed to the House of Representatives, assigned as the committee of the part of the House Mr. Dent, Mr. Nichols of South Carolina, and Mr. Kahn.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up pension bills on the Private Claims Calendar, and move first the bill S. 7486 in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take up pension bills on the Private Calendar and move first the bill S. 7486 in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill:

A bill (S. 7486) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to increase the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Celia A. Higley, widow of Benjamin F. Higley, late of Company K, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William A. Kelly, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hendrickson, late of Independent Battery H, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and Company C, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron C. Rodgers, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

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

The name of Blanche F. Nash, widow of Guy T. Nash, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Mayfield, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Jarrett, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Richey, late of Company M, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary P. Ross, late of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Isaac E. Johnson, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sada Gleason, widow of William J. Gleason, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Severn L. Parks, late of Company G, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month, the same to be paid him without restriction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments or overpayments of pension.

The name of Ellen Rush, widow of Ebenzer C. Rush, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of George G. Blewett, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George D. Smith, late of Company K, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Craig, late of Company A, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Seventy Independent Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Shapard, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of La Fayette Platt, late of Company H, One hundred and Twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius T. Hain, late of Seventh Company, unassessable Volunteers of the State of New York, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
The name of Charles N. Chatto, late of Company H, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Patterson, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthew Brown, helpless and indigent, late of the U. S. S. Missouri, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lucy E. Sturdevant, widow of Marcus Whitman, and pay her a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George W. West, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Tackitt, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles N. Chatto, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
The name of Edward Neugent, late captain Company A, One hundred and seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Stevenson, widow of Grandson F. Stevenson, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William S. Rowe, late of Company D, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob R. Selby, late of Company F, Twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jennie Jamison, now Beamer, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Reynold D. W. Campbell, late of Company F, Forty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Beets, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Dalton Selby, late of Company B, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew M. Vanover, late of Company H, Sixty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis W. Long, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred F. Kunkel, late of Company C, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Dickey, late of Company A, Thirty-second Regiment New York volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret M. McKeen, widow of Joseph E. McKeen, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Garver, late of Company F, Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

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

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 20827) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the United States and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman calls up House bill 20827, and asks that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Barbary B. Durgin, late of Company K, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barber B. Durgin, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $80 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sidney M. Smith, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment Iowa volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Cornellson, late of the Hospital Corps of the United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Penley, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida C. Willing, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Predmore, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Timothy Welch late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John L. Fisher, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. Gaskin late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Penley, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Cornellson, late of the Hospital Corps of the United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Maybury, late of Company D, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of the John W. Torrance, late of Company K, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George F. Boothby, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas King, late first lieutenant Company F, Ninety-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna C. Stahl, widow of John Stahl, late captain Company K, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Reason D. Evans, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $34 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Penley, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barber B. Durgin, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following bills reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 1374. Aaron C. Rodeheaver.
H. R. 2163. Frederick G. Church.
H. R. 2942. Isaac R. Johnson.
H. R. 3546. Columbus Walton.
H. R. 3823. George A. Blose.
H. R. 3823. Franklin W. Blose.
H. R. 3823. George A. Blose.
H. R. 3823. George A. Blose.
H. R. 3823. Emily P. Hubbard.
H. R. 4853. William W. Pope.
H. R. 4853. William W. Pope.
H. R. 4853. William W. Pope.
H. R. 4853. William W. Pope.
H. R. 4853. William W. Pope.
H. R. 4853. William W. Pope.
H. R. 4853. William W. Pope.
pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving. The name of Joseph L. Terry, late of Company E, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name ofxolo D. Tow, late of Company G, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph W. Espy, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Virginia Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph W. Michigan, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph C. Edwards, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph E. Reilly, late of Troop F, First Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John E. Smith, late of Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Miller, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henry S. Robert, late of Companies E and F, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Abraham H. Barnes, late of Company E, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph S. Johnson, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John L. Packard, late of Company B, Eighteenth United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John H. Fitch, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank F. Collins, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward G. Etch, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles Gifford, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles P. Williams, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas J. White, late of Company D, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward G. B. Gatchel, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James F. Curran, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Henry H. Sherrill, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Wm. C. Johnson, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Josephine Burnett, widow of Richard Johnson, late of Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Orville A. Vanatta, Company C, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John G. Furneaux, late of Company I, One hundred and sixty-first United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles P. Williams, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Orson W. Wallace, late of Company M, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel N. Knapp, dependent mother of Forrest W. Durante, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William D. Edwards, late of Company A, Twenty-third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William B. McCarthy, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John P. Burrow, jr., late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of J. E. Tull, late of Troop E, Ninth Regiment United States Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Allen C. Gabbard, late of Company K, Sixth United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel F. French, late of Fifteenth Battery, United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Luke E. Ford, late of Troop L, Seventh Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. McClure, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jacob T. Vanatta, late of Company B, Second Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Wilson, dependent mother of Michael D. Wilson, late of Troop L, Fourth Regement United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles H. McMahan, late of Company A, General Service United States Army, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jospeh Cantor, late of Company L, Twentieth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles H. Redd, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William Bill, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $24 per month.

The name of William J. Givens, late of Company C, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Jones, late of Company I, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John W. Brown, late of Company D, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Thomas J. White, late of Company D, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John G. Vanatta, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John H. Packard, late of Company B, Eighteenth United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.
The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Kuar of Ohio, a committee was appointed to consider the vote by which the bill was passed, as laid on the table.

NAVY YARDS AND NAVAL STATIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, Report No. 3 of the Commission on Navy Yards and Naval Stations, dated January 31, 1917.

W. Woodrow Wilson.

The White House, February 9, 1917.
OUR RIGHTS ON THE SEAS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record by printing documents relating to our rights upon the seas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print in the Congressional Record as part of his remarks documents concerning our rights upon the seas. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois as to what is the nature of these documents and what is the extent of them.

Mr. FESS. Yesterday I placed in the Record documents pertaining to our controversy with Germany on the submarine question. Now I should like to print the documents relating to our controversy with Great Britain on the question of contraband, blockades, and so forth, separate from the German controversy.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; but what I inquired or tried to inquire was—

Mr. FESS. How extensive the documents are?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. First, how extensive, and, secondly, do these documents come from the State Department?

Mr. FESS. I got a good many from the State Department, but there are some which I get from the New York Times.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman think newspaper reports are sufficiently reliable? Might they not be colored so as to be misleading?

Mr. FESS. My intention is to print nothing except official documents. I do not print opinions or newspaper comments, but simply the documents themselves.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] that these documents are exceedingly valuable to Members of Congress, and it is desirable to have them in a form in which they may be available, and not in scattered newspaper articles, which, as the gentleman says, are very often unreliable. But I take it the gentleman is perhaps aware that the New York Times is publishing these documents, and publishing a current history of the war which is supposed to be as nearly official and as reliable as anything that can be procured. I am sure Dr. Fess will not put in anything that is not desirable and reliable.

Mr. FESS. I will not print any opinions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DIGEST OF CONTESTED-ELECTION CASES (H. REP. 1445).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a privileged resolution, which I ask to have read and considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana submits a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reads as follows:

House concurrent resolution 70.
Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 copies, bound in buckram, for the use of the House of Representatives, of the manuscript prepared by Hon. M. Moore, being a digest of contested-election cases in the House of Representatives, together with a digest of contested elections in the House of Representatives and campaign contributions and expenditures.

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

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. How are these copies to be distributed?

Mr. BARNHART. Through the folding room.

Mr. STAFFORD. The resolution does not make any such provision.

Mr. BARNHART. They go to the folding room unless the resolution provides otherwise.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought perhaps the Committees on Elections might desire some copies of this document.

Mr. BARNHART. There are 5,000 copies. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is the author of the resolution, and I heartily concur in it. At this time, when so many election cases are coming up, I think it is important that this digest be brought down to date.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish it to be understood that I am opposed to this resolution. I am only inquiring as to the method of distribution.

Mr. MANN. That will be through the folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

The SPEAKER. The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

FOX RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Fox River Bridge bill, which was passed by the House yesterday.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Fox River Bridge bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MOORE'S DIGEST OF INTERNATIONAL LAW (H. REP. 1447).

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution which I ask to have considered at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana sends us a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reads as follows:

House concurrent resolution 31.
Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That 900 copies of Moore's Digest of International Law of the House of Representatives be printed, 700 for use of the folding room of the House, 200 for the use of the Clerk, and the superintendents of the said folding rooms are hereby authorized to deliver not more than one copy to each Member of the House and each Member of the Senate, and the rest could be bound in paper.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. What will be done with the balance of the volumes? There will be only one, you say, for each Member, and there are but 453 Members?

Mr. BARNHART. They will be held in the folding room until our successors come in and take them up, one by one.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish the gentleman would make it enough so as to give each Member two sets.

Mr. BARNHART. The difficulty is in the expense, and the extra set would hardly be worth while. Unless we had enough to distribute to those who are asking for them, we would be in a worse situation than if we could say we did not have any for free distribution.

Mr. LANGLEY. The reason that I make the suggestion is that I have in mind one very urgent request from my district for a copy, and I need one myself.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman, being familiar with international law, can give his copy to me.

Mr. LANGLEY. Well, as a matter of fact, I did take a three years' course in international law in the George Washington University, and I have a diploma for that course, with the names of several distinguished legal men on it, and such men as late Justices Harlan and Brewer, of the Supreme Court, and David Jayne Hill. [Applause.] Apparently the gentleman from Indiana did not know that.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I think there is no authority under existing law for documents to be held in the folding room and delivered to Members who come into the House hereafter. Has the committee jurisdiction over that matter? The law requires equal distribution between the districts, and the extra numbers go to the superintendent of documents for sale.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman think that the balance would go to the superintendent of documents after the enactment of this resolution?

Mr. MANN. I do not know; probably the gentleman knows more about it than I do; but under the present law, where documents go to the folding room, there is an equal distribution between the districts, and the extra numbers go to the superintendent of documents for sale.

Mr. BARNHART. There are where there are a few extra numbers left over after an equal apportionment to Members.

Mr. MANN. If there is a vacancy in my district and that vacancy is filled, there is no provision that gives preference to that district in the distribution of documents in preference to another district represented by a Member who remains here.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee had that situation under consideration, and we have specifically enacted that these shall be sent to the folding room and not more than one set be given.
to each Member, and the folding room thereby will hold the balance until they are taken up. The MANN room will have to hold them; but can they ever do anything with them?

Mr. BARNHART. They can give them out in accordance with this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Has the printing of the Monkey International Digest been heretofore authorized?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Then this involves a duplication or an extension.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are the plates in existence?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why does the committee provide a larger surplus for the Senate than for the House? The Senate does not change as often as the House.

Mr. BARNHART. The experience of the committee has been that unless we give to the Senators a proportion of one-third, which they claim as their share, they do not play ball; they let the resolution die, and we need these books.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then it is in consonance with the rule rather than the harmony of the two bodies.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. I do not want to make any statement about the other body that will have to be stricken from the Record, as sometimes happens.

The resolution was agreed to.


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

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) That there shall be printed as a House document 1,500 copies of the Journal of the Fifty-fifth national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1917, not to exceed $1,700 in cost, with illustrations, 1,000 copies of which shall be for the use of the House and 500 for the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 20682, the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. Page of North Carolina in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

Herein are all laws relating to the examination of officers of the Navy for promotion shall be construed to apply to the regular advancement of such officers on the General list, the same as such advancements in rank were promotions to higher grades: Provided, Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as in any way affecting the assignment of officers to the Dental Corps, as provided in the act approved August 26, 1916, making appropriations for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I would like to ask what is the meaning of this?

Mr. PADGETT. In the last naval appropriation bill, in the legislation reorganizing the personnel of the Navy, there was inserted a provision known as the running-mate provision for the Dental Corps—where a man on the Dental Corps would go up with his running mate in the line, the man next after whom he holds his commission. It appears that there is another statute passed some years ago requiring all the officers promoted from the General list, the same as such advancements in rank were promotions to higher grades: Provided, Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as in any way affecting the assignment of officers to the Dental Corps, as provided in the act approved August 26, 1916, making appropriations for the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he thinks they have made ample provision for the personnel of the Navy? That is to say, for the increase in officers and the increase in the strength of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I think that all is provided for in the act of August 23, so far as the officers are concerned. We have it for the first time on a percentage of the enlisted strength, which makes the increase in the line of 2,931, which makes the increase in the line of 2,931, which makes the increase in the line of 2,931.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This section relates to the personnel of the Navy, and the personnel is more important than the matériel.

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. FOSS. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he understands that we have made ample provision here for the personnel of the Navy? That is to say, for the increase in officers and the increase in the strength of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so. That is all provided for in the act of August 23, so far as the officers are concerned. We have it for the first time on a percentage of the enlisted strength, which makes the increase in the line of 2,931.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. That to enable the President in his discretion, etc.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am much obliged to the gentleman for his assistance.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This section relates to the personnel of the Navy, and the personnel is more important than the matériel.

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. FOSS. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he thinks they have made ample provision for the personnel of the Navy? That is to say, for the increase in officers and the increase in the strength of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I think that all is provided for in the act of August 23, so far as the officers are concerned. We have it for the first time on a percentage of the enlisted strength, which makes the increase in the line of 2,931.
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ting all of the ships into commission, which we have never yet been able to do.

Mr. PADGETT. In explanation of that, I can state that we have about 700 officers available from the Naval Militia, and then we have all of the retired officers, and that would more than fill the bill, so that the whole 90,000 would be made up from the Naval Militia and retired officers and still leave a surplus.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the gentleman in reference to the enlisted force. We provide in this bill for 65,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. The authorized strength of the Navy, I think, is 75,000 and something, and the appropriation is made in this bill to take care of an increase up to 70,000 during the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to what Admiral Palmer said on the same page, 599. He said, in speaking of mobilization, if that should occur—and, of course, that is the first thing that will occur if we should get into trouble with any foreign power, which I trust we will not do—we would be short about 8,019 Regulars and 23,330 reserves, after using 9,000 militia and 40,000 feet reserves, and that the shortage would increase for each new ship commissioned in 1917 and 1918, and the three-year program alone would require 29,127 men. Then, over on page 601, there is a preliminary estimate of the personnel required for mobilization plan for July, 1918, which calls for the service, Regulars, to the number of 40,869, and reserves, 45,570. How near does we approach at the present time, or under the provisions of this bill, to these requirements stated by Admiral Palmer, Chairman, in his report?

Mr. PADGETT. The President is authorized in time of emergency to increase to, I believe, 85,000 in the bill of last year, and then we have between nine and ten thousand in the Naval Militia.

Then we have the reserve that was provided and created by the act of August 29—845—a few days ago. Then the others would have to be enlistments which would come in from the 80,000 or 85,000 of ex-enlisted men who were out in civil life, who have gone out of the service and—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause:] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. And, as the gentleman is aware, there is a large number of ex-enlisted men in civil life; and Admiral Blue stated to the committee, I think last year it was, that the department had made a list of addresses of those men which they could be in touch with a large number of those men.

Mr. FOSS. Will all of these men which the gentleman has spoken of, some—

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman will permit me for just a moment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] asked me if the ex-enlisted men can be forced back in time of war, and I said to him, no; but that needs some qualification. Prior to two years, who were in the service prior to that time could not, and in the act of two years ago we had inserted a provision so that ex-enlisted men can be called back into the service.

Mr. HAMLIN. I thought so.

Mr. PADGETT. Where they retire, where they are on the retired list, they can be called back.

Mr. HAMLIN. I thought there was such a provision in a recent bill.

Mr. PADGETT. That is true in reference to the retired list. Now, that does not apply to where a man enlists and serves out his service and goes completely out of the service and severs all connection with the service.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the gentleman, summing up all these different bodies of men to which the gentleman has referred, what would make as our total of enlisted force if they should come in?

Mr. PADGETT. With ex-enlisted men?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. One hundred and twenty-five thousand; something like that, or possibly 120,000. I do not know the exact number.

Mr. FOSS. That would leave, then, a shortage of about 25,000 in the mobilization of our naval forces, according to this statement?

Mr. PADGETT. Taking that statement for the full completion of the three-year program of all ships under construction and those which are authorized for the third year of this three-year program, but you see their third-year program would take several years to be completed.

Mr. FOSS. We are speeding up on the program, and it is necessary to trim men in advance. They ought to have at least a full year's training before they go on the big ships, and if they had two years it would be all the better.

Mr. PADGETT. It would be impossible to complete these big ships in 1917 and 1918, and 1,900 men much short of 90 months under any circumstances.

Mr. FOSS. Then the gentleman feels we have made ample provision in this bill for the personnel in view of the circumstances?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think we need to make more at this time; if an emergency arises, we could authorize.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Considered.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment? I desire to ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes, to ask some questions.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I would want five minutes.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, I will say 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause:] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said in the last two or three days with a view of comparison between what transpired under the Taft administration and what transpired under the present administration in the way of shipbuilding as well as to personnel, and it has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the House that the enlisted personnel under the Taft administration was 65,500, and that the enlisted personnel under the present administration is 77,956—

Mr. PADGETT. That was authorized; neither one of them were up to their full limit.

Mr. BRITTEN. That is just the very point I am coming to, Mr. Chairman. Attempt has been made continually to convey the impression that the Navy to-day was 26,000 better supplied with ordinary seamen than under the Taft administration, referring always to the authorization, when the truth of the matter is—

Mr. PADGETT. But let me say to the gentleman I have stated time and again to the contrary of that, and I think the House understands that that refers to authorizations.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. PADGETT. And not to the actual enlistments.

Mr. BRITTEN. I asked the gentleman a question at this particular moment. I am simply using five minutes of time in making a statement.

Mr. PADGETT. Then, I will not take up the gentleman's time; I thought he was addressing a question to me.

Mr. BRITTEN. No, sir. I want to call attention to the fact that under the Taft administration the enlisted personnel of the Navy was recruited up to 92 per cent of the authorization, whereas we have commission 24 destroyers, and we have two more, the Shaw and the Allen, over 95 per cent completed, which will require 2,000 men. We have commissioned 22 submarines, requiring 630 men, and 3 little destroyers. The total personnel, the total personnel of the enlisted personnel of the ships commissioned during the Wilson administration is 0,107. With a positive increase of but 6,083 men in the last four years, it will be seen the additional requirement on account of new ships makes us just 3,024 enlisted men worse off than when the present administration came into power.
Now, the idea of talking about the Taft administration and referring to the authorization to-day in comparison with what it was four years ago is all poppycock. You can not get away from a deficiency to-day of 24,500 men in the ordinary seamen of the Navy and the disablement to-day is not 15 per cent. It was four years ago. And I want to say further that this accentuates, if it is possible for any accentuate it, the lack of business administration in the Navy Department and the lack of initiative in the Taft administration. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. He said in answer to an inquiry by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], as I understand it, that there was no existence of filibustering. Does it not seem to you that it is an unseemly thing to act as a rubber-stamp clerk, obeying the orders of an individual, or does it mean that every Member of Congress is conscience bound as a man and as a representative of a free people to search his own soul and to utilize all the power of his brain in determining the gravest question that can present itself in the life of a man? And shall Members of Congress permit themselves to be frightened, to be intimidated by bullies, by lip patriots, by ignoramuses, who would terrorize those they can not control? I protest, Mr. Chairman, against this attempt to intimidate the free representatives of a free people from acting as free men. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Navy: For provisions and commuted rations for the seamen and marines, which commuted rations may be paid to caterers at the rates of 90 cents per week for each man: Provided, That the commanding officers, commuted rations for officers on sea duty (other than commissioned officers of the U.S. Navy Corps, chaplains, chief boatswains, chief gunners, chief carpenters, chief cooks, chief pay clerks, and chief sailmakers) and midshipmen, and commuted rations stopped on account of sickness or absence more than 50 per cent in any month, be delivered to the individual where such rations are stopped for the period of the month so stopped; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy be and is hereby authorized to commuted rations for such men on detached duty; subject of members of the Naval Reserve; and for subsistence of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general court-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the services, or the expiration of the sentences in the case of prisoners confined, or that the Secretary of the Navy be and is hereby authorized to commuted rations for such men on detached duty; subject of members of the Naval Reserve; and for subsistence of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general court-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the services, or the expiration of the sentences in the case of prisoners confined; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency supplies, if any, $10,144,945.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in no spirit of criticism of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or of any of the Members of this House, or of the Department, do I say this, but I am simply stating facts. I have read over the facts and figures, the facts and figures, and I am simply asking for these men who have not served with us, that they may, as in the past, receive a full share of the nation's credit, and have 100 per cent of the salary which they have served for.

I have no disposition to criticize these officers, because under the law, as provided by Congress and as I understand it, they have to be retired whenever the plucking board desires to retire them, and when they resign, or when they receive it, because they are not to blame; but I thought it might be interesting to the country to know that there are to-day 900 retired naval officers, men the majority of whom I am satisfied are in perfect physical and mental condition, and who would object to being called "old men" or "broken-down horses," who are receiving from the taxpayers of the country three-quarters of their salary and for which they give nothing in return. In the present bill that would be paid to retired individuals in such amounts as are seen in the bill, and that may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, which shall not in any case exceed $600 per annum for each rated so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency supplies, if any, $10,144,945.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

I have no disposition to criticize these officers, because under the law, as provided by Congress and as I understand it, they have to be retired whenever the plucking board desires to retire them, or when they resign, or when they receive it, because they are not to blame; but I thought it might be interesting to the country to know that there are to-day 900 retired naval officers, men the majority of whom I am satisfied are in perfect physical and mental condition, and who would object to being called "old men" or "broken-down horses," who are receiving from the taxpayers of the country three-quarters of their salary and for which they give nothing in return. In the present bill that would be paid to retired individuals in such amounts as are seen in the bill, and that may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, which shall not in any case exceed $600 per annum for each rated so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Army emergency supplies, if any, $10,144,945.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The present bill provides for the promotion and retirement of naval officers, and this will continue until the people begin to realize what that bill will mean, and day when several distinguished gentlemen, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, found it necessary to defend themselves against an attack contained in a newspaper published in the city of Chicago. What would the American people think if that paper appeared in the city of Chicago? I do not care who the editor of the paper is. I do not know whether he writes his own opinions, or whether he is just an ordinary hiring, taking orders. I do not know whether he believed in what he said or whether he said it because he was ordered to say it. What I regret is that the Members of the House find it necessary to defend themselves against meaningless attacks of this kind. I look upon the foreign policy which has been exploded of as an attempt to intimidate Members of the House from expressing their honest opinion and from acting in accordance with their honest conviction. Only a few days ago we heard abuse heaped upon distinguished statesmen that the country has produced, William Jennings Bryan [applause], and all because he dared advise against war. The Constitution has given Congress the power to do whatever it believes to be constitutional, provided it does it in accordance with the Constitution.
could use it in increased pay for the ordinary seamen who serve on the battleships, and then, perhaps, the shortage of men that the gentleman from Illinois just complained of would not exist.

I simply make these observations.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAWS. I have tried to secure the information, but I am unable to tell the gentleman. I understand that some as young as 45 or 50 years of age were plucked because the plucking board was conducted in such a way that they were temperamentally not fit to continue longer in the service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at the Naval Academy, which is one of the best academies in the country—and I desire at a later time to discuss that proposition—these distinguished, able, patriotic men could be used for the purpose of teaching the young men that we send there for instruction from our various districts. By so doing, Mr. Chairman, they would not only give to these young men the benefit of their knowledge, but also their varied experience. It seems to me that a man who holds a degree from the Annapolis Naval Academy and has had 20 years or more actual experience in the service, as these young men that we are sending there are expected to have, could better instruct these young men than could civilians who know nothing of the service and are simply selected because they are able to undergo a mental examination.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the time is coming when the people of the United States will demand that they be informed as to how and why their money is spent, and that this $7,000,000—a paltry sum to some, it may be—will be spared by Congress to support people on the retired list who are actually unable to serve the Government actively and who now return no service for value received. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TARGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. TARGE. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the opinion of the gentlemen [Mr. SEARS] who has just taken his seat on this matter of retired officers of the Navy. I know of instances, as do other Members of this House, of men who have been retired from the naval service and who have been granted the regular retired pay, but who are just as active to-day as they ever were, except for the few years that have been added to their lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are in the service to-day men who are on the retired list who are acting in the capacity of captains and lieutenants as the officers on the lists. In other words, they are receiving lieutenant commander's pay. As I understand it, there is nothing in the law that permits the Secretary of the Navy to draft an officer back into the service and give him the same rate of pay that he received before he was retired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARGE. Do I understand the gentleman to say there is no authority for the department to call men from the retired list and put them on the active list?

Mr. TARGE. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; the Secretary of the Navy is the President. I believe, can call in any retired officer. But, as I understand it, if a retired officer is called into the service he can be paid only the amount of wage that he received as a retired officer, no matter what he was getting before.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADDGETT. The gentleman is mistaken in that. If he is called to active duty, he gets his full pay and allowances. There is another provision to the effect that if a retired officer requests shore duty he can, at his request, be assigned to some shore duty and get the pay and allowances of a lieutenant commander. If he is called to active duty, he gets his full pay and allowances of his grade; and in time of war every retired officer is subject to be called to active duty.

Mr. BUTLER. In case of an emergency?

Mr. PADDGETT. Yes. And during the war.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it in keeping with the law to put a man on the floor of this House yesterday. Some of the officers in the Navy whom this Government has educated, supported, protected, and pensioned, have not only abused the privileges that have been given them, but they have driven from the service of this Government men with reputation and character superior to theirs.
I have in mind many cases of young men discharged from the Navy who have been ruined by charges of intoxication, and these men who had been driven out were obliged only a night or two before to take the same officer who had preferred the charges and put the officer into bed. I have heard from the Navy Yard district, to whom and cooperated with him in the preparation of this important evidence of the fact that the Honorable Mr. Padgett, my colleague from Tennessee in the House of Representatives, has been adopted since the President delivered his address to both the Houses of Congress last Saturday is the highest and best evidence of the fact that the Members of Congress have laid aside partisan bias, captious objections, and differences of opinion, and are a unit for the proper defense of our common country—are in line and fully determined to aid the President of the United States in his patriotic stand to maintain, uphold, and safeguard the rights of American citizens on the high seas. While I represent a district intensely Republican—not having elected a Democrat to Congress in 60 years [applause], I am sure to voice the sentiments of Republicans and Democrats in the country's interest. Coming from London has been a little more in need of American help than we are; it declared that the American rights had been violated by a country with which we were on friendly terms up to that time. Yet the next day's newspapers announced that the Housatonic was loaded with contraband, and even our State Department declared that there was no occasion for any warlike declaration. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. I rise to make this very brief statement because I do not want the people of this country to be deceived. I am satisfied that most of the people of the country want peace; peace with honor, of course. But they do not want to be forced into a war by the munition makers or the munition users of this or any other land. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. The commandant of the navy yard is a line officer of his choice, but through 15 or 15 different sittings of the plucking board, which would indicate that his character and ability must have been very good.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, now that the House is about to consider those lives which have been ruined by charges of intoxication, I take this opportunity to commend and inshore the great work of the popular, faithful, and efficient chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. Padgett] [applause]. The members of the committee with him, and cooperated with him in the preparation of this important and far-reaching measure providing for an adequate navy for the defense of the honor, the rights, and the interests of the American people. These things asked for to sustain the national laws have been violated have come from London, and London has been crazy with delight since it heard the glad tidings of September last that the President had severed diplomatic relations with Germany. Coming from London has been a little more in need of American help than we are; it declared that the American rights had been violated by a country with which we were on friendly terms up to that time. Yet the next day's newspapers announced that the Housatonic was loaded with contraband, and even our State Department declared that there was no occasion for any warlike declaration. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. Tague. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? Mr. GORDON. There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended for five minutes more. Mr. PAGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am not arguing the point of contraband at all. The gentleman is merely taking my time. I am trying to make a plain statement to the House as to the truth and the facts. The gentleman may be stumped because certain men appear in the newspapers, but I do not think he will demonstrate what fools papers announce that Berlin is in conference with the Germans. The ambassador has been arrested, and forcibly restrained by the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him. The gentleman has worked the story of the American ambassador in the United States. Within a day or two the answer came from both the State Department and the White House that these German ships had not been seized, and that while this Government was taking certain precautions with regard to the German vessels, the ambassador was being arrested, and forcibly restrained by the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him. It is evident that some tall lying was done in this instance for the purpose of irritating Germany under very agitating circumstances. And I think we must remember that we are on the verge of war because some "overt act" has been committed, and the next day the whole thing is denied.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the German vessels, the ambassador being guarded by the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and forcibly restrained by the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be in the case of the Germans? The gentleman has worked the story of the American ambassador, and showed what fools papers appear in the newspapers, and then began to eliminate, and then began to retain reports, and then begin, and then began. But the gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him. The gentleman has worked the story of the American ambassador, and showed what fools papers appear in the newspapers, and then began to eliminate, and then began to retain reports, and then begin, and then began. But the gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be in the case of the Germans?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him. The gentleman has worked the story of the American ambassador, and showed what fools papers appear in the newspapers, and then began to eliminate, and then began to retain reports, and then begin, and then began. But the gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be in the case of the Germans?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him. The gentleman has worked the story of the American ambassador, and showed what fools papers appear in the newspapers, and then began to eliminate, and then began to retain reports, and then begin, and then began. But the gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be in the case of the Germans?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him. The gentleman has worked the story of the American ambassador, and showed what fools papers appear in the newspapers, and then began to eliminate, and then began to retain reports, and then begin, and then began. But the gentleman is not saying to the house what he thinks of the duty of this Government, which has taken charge of and guarded him.
being filled with all sorts of preparedness arguments and misrepresentations as to the present condition of the United States Army and Navy, and the possibility and probability of the United States being attacked by foreign foes. 

"That is the logical and reasonable position of everything in opposition to the wishes of the interests served. The effectiveness of this scheme has been conclusively demonstrated by the character of stuff carried in the daily press throughout the country since last August. If for any reasons it is to anything in commercialize public sentiment and sandbag the National Congress into making extravagant and wasteful appropriations for the Army and Navy under the false pretense that it was a war of defense, thus preventing Congress from doing what it should do, and the people from the situation that confronts us, should take notice. We are dealing with a serious problem that invites the greatest deliberation. We ought not to be made the pawns of designing men in our own country, or abroad. Under the Constitution of the United States, the President has not yet indicated to Congress that the point has been reached where a declaration of war has become necessary. Until the President does come to this body with such information and facts as may well require further action by Congress, it may not be well to aggravate the situation by giving too much credence to the untruthful rumors that have been bandied about with the evident purpose of finding some reason for provoking a declaration of war. At another time I shall extend in the Record, under permission granted to me, certain observations of Mr. Lincoln when he was a Member of the House, with respect to our Mexican complications in 1848. At present I shall content myself by quoting his nerve in the speech made by Mr. Lincoln January 12 of that year, when he said:

When the war began it was my opinion that all those who, because of the loss of California, and the little, or because they got the Philadelphia, which naturally attracted interest in that great city and in the State of Pennsylvania, we found the Philadelphia had safely arrived in port, so that report was also in error. It is unfortunate that they should have been shot up. This colored man, George Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have a resolution before the House, and I am in favor of this paragraph in the Navy appropriation bill, because I think the country ought to be fully prepared for any possible invasion; but I think the Congress ought to be careful about encouraging rumors of war, which war has not actually been declared. Perhaps it would be safe to leave this matter to the President of the United States and to those who have direct knowledge upon the subject. I call attention, however, not only to these false reports that have been received from the different ports in the United States, but I think the President of the United States, when he said:

'The President of the United States, when he said: "When the war began it was my opinion that all those who, because of the loss of California, and the little, or because they got the Philadelphia, which naturally attracted interest in that great city and in the State of Pennsylvania, we found the Philadelphia had safely arrived in port, so that report was also in error. It is unfortunate that they should have been shot up. This colored man, George Washington."

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say it, but we are gradually turning over the business of Congress, turning over all our constitutional rights, turning over our powers delegated by the people, to a lot of editors, theorists, and college professors who are not capable of controlling editors and theorists should not abdicate. Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have a resolution before the House, and I am in favor of this paragraph in the Navy appropriation bill, because I think the country ought to be fully prepared for any possible invasion; but I think the Congress ought to be careful about encouraging rumors of war, which war has not actually been declared. Perhaps it would be safe to leave this matter to the President of the United States and to those who have direct knowledge upon the subject. I call attention, however, not only to these false reports that have been received from the different ports in the United States, but I think the President of the United States, when he said:

'The President of the United States, when he said: "When the war began it was my opinion that all those who, because of the loss of California, and the little, or because they got the Philadelphia, which naturally attracted interest in that great city and in the State of Pennsylvania, we found the Philadelphia had safely arrived in port, so that report was also in error. It is unfortunate that they should have been shot up. This colored man, George Washington."

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say it, but we are gradually turning over the business of Congress, turning over all our constitutional rights, turning over our powers delegated by the people, to a lot of editors, theorists, and college professors who are not capable of controlling editors and theorists should not abdicate. Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have a resolution before the House, and I am in favor of this paragraph in the Navy appropriation bill, because I think the country ought to be fully prepared for any possible invasion; but I think the Congress ought to be careful about encouraging rumors of war, which war has not actually been declared. Perhaps it would be safe to leave this matter to the President of the United States and to those who have direct knowledge upon the subject. I call attention, however, not only to these false reports that have been received from the different ports in the United States, but I think the President of the United States, when he said:

'The President of the United States, when he said: "When the war began it was my opinion that all those who, because of the loss of California, and the little, or because they got the Philadelphia, which naturally attracted interest in that great city and in the State of Pennsylvania, we found the Philadelphia had safely arrived in port, so that report was also in error. It is unfortunate that they should have been shot up. This colored man, George Washington."

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say it, but we are gradually turning over the business of Congress, turning over all our constitutional rights, turning over our powers delegated by the people, to a lot of editors, theorists, and college professors who are not capable of controlling editors and theorists should not abdicate. Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have a resolution before the House, and I am in favor of this paragraph in the Navy appropriation bill, because I think the country ought to be fully prepared for any possible invasion; but I think the Congress ought to be careful about encouraging rumors of war, which war has not actually been declared. Perhaps it would be safe to leave this matter to the President of the United States and to those who have direct knowledge upon the subject. I call attention, however, not only to these false reports that have been received from the different ports in the United States, but I think the President of the United States, when he said:

'The President of the United States, when he said: "When the war began it was my opinion that all those who, because of the loss of California, and the little, or because they got the Philadelphia, which naturally attracted interest in that great city and in the State of Pennsylvania, we found the Philadelphia had safely arrived in port, so that report was also in error. It is unfortunate that they should have been shot up. This colored man, George Washington."

Mr. Chairman, I regret to say it, but we are gradually turning over the business of Congress, turning over all our constitutional rights, turning over our powers delegated by the people, to a lot of editors, theorists, and college professors who are not capable of controlling editors and theorists should not abdicate. Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. DYER. I will state to the gentleman that the Washington Times of today states that the ambassador has been given his passports and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to my friend that he ought to take advice from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and not be misled by frivolous arguments.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a conference at Berlin yesterday on this subject? Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ambassador has been given his passports, and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a “talkfest.” Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.
Last fall the fuel ship Jupi ter got into collision with an Italian bark, and I believe the commander was court-martialed and sentenced to death. In March, the destroyer Ulysses was rammed by the destroyer Roe, at Key West. The commander of the Roe was tried and reduced three numbers in his grade.

The American Navy has had a proud record in the past. The officers have been noted for their gallantry and seamanship, and it is peculiarly unfortunate, it seems to me, that at this particular time we should have to chronicle the loss of two vessels, with so many others.

Some of them, unfortunately, cannot be attributed to anything else but negligence or bad seamanship. We would prefer to turn from such a record to this paper on this point; to recall those errors of American ships which distinguished themselves as the captains of the Constitution did, when he escaped by clever seamanship from a British ship; to return to the time when the gallantry was so distinguished, as it was when a commander of a vessel sinking under the enemy's fire preferred to go down with his ship being saved with the rest of his crew. It is to be hoped that the department will take notice of the condition of affairs, and that a discipline more strict, and a greater efficiency will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, $175,000.

Some act or appropriation shall be expended in the pay of allowances of any commissioned officer of the Navy detailed for duty at the United States Naval Academy, and performed duties which were performed by civilian instructors on January 1, 1910.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk continued to read as follows:

One sword master, $1,600; 1 assistant, $1,400; and 1 assistant, $1,000; 1 headmaster of physical training, $1,700; 1 instructor in physical training, $1,700; 2 instructors in physical training, $1,600; 3 instructors in physical training, at $1,200 each; 1 assistant librarian, $2,400; 1 cataloguer, $1,600; and 1 ship assistant, $1,100; 1 ship assistant, $900; 1 secretary of the Naval Academy, $1,600; 1 assistant, $1,100; 2 clerks, at $1,000 each; 3 clerks, at $900 each; 1 clerk, $1,000; 6 clerks, at $600 each; 1 draftsman, $1,400; 1 surveyor, $1,400; services of organist at chapel, $200; 1 captain of the watch, $1,100; 1 second class watch, $1,060; 22 watchmen, at $253 each; 1 telephone switchboard operators, at $600 each; 1 mail messenger, $1,000. In all, pay of professors and others, Naval Academy, $255,440.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MANN. I reserve it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves the point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, are we treating this bill by sections or by paragraphs?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the recognition of the Chair before.

The CHAIRMAN. By paragraphs.

Mr. SEARS. I asked for the recognition of the Chair before.

Mr. MANN. Then we may have the gentleman's pardon. I did not understand that the gentleman wanted recognition until the end of the paragraph.

Mr. SEARS. Yes; I wanted to speak under the item of pay of professors. That is a paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice this carries quite a number of increases of salaries.

Mr. SEARS. Then I thought I would wait until we got to that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair noticed the gentleman rise.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SEARS. I tried to get recognition for the purpose of discussing the first paragraph.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Florida is slightly in error.

Mr. SEARS. I suggested, and then I saw him sit down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make this statement: The gentleman from Florida did rise and address the Chair.

Mr. SEARS. I said, "Mr. Chairman." I do not know how else I could have done.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman took his seat, and the Chair thought he did not want recognition at that time. I am sorry the Chair did not recognize the gentleman when he rose.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether there is any intention to have a general paragraph, or in reference to increased salaries or not. I do not think it is quite fair to give specific increases and then give the same party the benefit of a general increase where that was not the thought of the committee originally.

Mr. PADGETT. There is no thought of offering any other amendment than what is in the bill with reference to any increases of any kind. We have reported the specific ones here.

Mr. MANN. There was a sort of understanding in the House when we passed the legislative bill that any increase finally agreed upon in that law would probably be carried in other bills at least as to the class of employees.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the Naval Academy appropriation here-

Mr. MANN. Of course almost everything in this bill is in the present Naval Estimate.

Mr. PADGETT. It is in here, and we have taken care of those specifically.

Mr. TALBOTT. The Secretary recommended the increases.

Mr. MANN. So far as the gentleman knows, there is no intention of making a percentage increase in this bill.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. MANN. I suppose this increase in the number of employees over there is necessary by reason of the increase in the number of midshipmen.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I trust the few remarks I shall make will not be misunderstood. It is only in the hope that at some future time some reform may be obtained. I do not care to get in this House the title of watchdog of the Treasury; on the contrary, I desire to assure you I will go to the fullest extent in making any appropriation that is necessary. I am for preparedness when I think preparedness is necessary. As my State extends out into the ocean and the gulf, our citizens realize perhaps more than the citizens of any other State the importance of naval preparedness. But a few moments ago I stated the condition of the Naval Academy at Annapolis as instructors under the present bill in all, under "Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy," there is an appropriation of $420,440 compared to $413,800 last year, or approximately a $7,600 increase. There are at the Naval Academy to-day about 1,200 students. The full quota of 2,780 students. At that rate the instructors, teachers, cooks, butchers, and bakers are paid approximately $233 per pupil, if the entire 1,700 were at Annapolis. There are only 1,200 there. I do not know, but I have been told that the cost of each student at Annapolis per annum is something like $4,500. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in selecting young men to go to Annapolis it has been my pleasure and my pride to select boys who were not able to pay their way through any college, but who as American boys are ambitious to get an education. I believe when you spend upon a boy the sum of $4,500 per annum for his education instead of assisting him in making him a better citizen you come nearer to making him nothing but a parlor-carpenter young man who believes only in wearing gold epaulets and having gold around him; and I do not believe these young men should be brought up in that manner; nor do I believe the young men desire to be brought up in that manner. For four years it was my pleasure to go to a military establishment, and there we did not have to employ watchmen. In this bill 22 watchmen are paid for, which I cannot see.

When I took over this Chamber and at the activity of my young colleague, Uncle Joe Cannon, of Illinois, and my good friend Gen. Surrwaw, of Ohio, it seems to me that these retired naval officers, who have been trained in an open-air life, should at least be active enough at 46 to 64 to keep the Naval Academy at Annapolis as instructors. The report which I hold in my hand it appears that last year 38 additional civilians were employed as instructors at this academy. In the present bill all, under "Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy," there is an appropriation of $420,440 compared to $413,800 last year, or approximately a $7,600 increase. There are at the Naval Academy to-day about 1,200 students. The full quota of 2,780 students. At that rate the instructors, teachers, cooks, butchers, and bakers are paid approximately $233 per pupil, if the entire 1,700 were at Annapolis. There are only 1,200 there. I do not know, but I have been told that the cost of each student at Annapolis per annum is something like $4,500. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in selecting young men to go to Annapolis it has been my pleasure and my pride to select boys who were not able to pay their way through any college, but who as American boys are ambitious to get an education. I believe when you spend upon a boy the sum of $4,500 per annum for his education instead of assisting him in making him a better citizen you come nearer to making him nothing but a parlor-carpenter young man who believes only in wearing gold epaulets and having gold around him; and I do not believe these young men should be brought up in that manner; nor do I believe the young men desire to be brought up in that manner. For four years it was my pleasure to go to a military establishment, and there we did not have to employ watchmen. In this bill 22 watchmen are paid for, which I cannot see.
cause they should be better able to teach them than any civilian.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word merely for the purpose of making a single observation. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sear] said he understood the cost at Annapolis was $4,500 a year for each student. I have had the impression from what the gentlemen have said, that it cost the Government in the United States $50,000, at least, for every man who was graduated from Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. We have some reports on that two or three years ago, and one estimate was that it cost about $15,000 to graduate a young man. Another ran it up to about $18,000 or $19,000.

Mr. MANN. That depends on what you compute.

Mr. PADGETT. That included interest on the investment of about $14,000,000 that is invested in the buildings.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that computation even charges the salaries of the officers who are over there. They go on the theory that they are already in the Naval Establishment.

Mr. PADGETT. That was included as item two.

Mr. MANN. The present authorization runs the number of 800. Mr. DOWELL. Can the chairman give to the committee a statement of what the additional expenditure would be if the number were increased to the capacity of 1,700?

Mr. PADGETT. Perhaps $150,000 more.

Mr. DOWELL. In the aggregate?

Mr. PADGETT. In the aggregate. It would require perhaps a little more than that, say $200,000.

Mr. DOWELL. Of course, there is a greater expense for 1,700 than there is for 800.

Mr. PADGETT. The present authorization runs the number up to about 1,800—I am speaking of the operating expenses and the enlargement of the Naval Academy—we have a provision here for enlarging it to accommodate the increased number.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand, in order to have the 1,700 there must be provision for enlarging the academy.

Mr. MANN. There has to be an enlargement of the academy, anyhow. We built the academy before the census of 1900 was taken. We increased the representation; each Member and Senator only had 1 cadet, and the President only had 10. Now, we have given the Secretary of the Navy a bunch of them, increased the number to the President, increased the representation in both House and Senate, and given to each Member twice as many as he had before.

Mr. PADGETT. Three times as many as it was when I came here.

Mr. MANN. And yet they said when they built the academy that they were making the limit as close as they could. It was not built with the idea of giving each Member of Congress two or three cadets.

Mr. DOWELL. At any rate, from the answers of the chairman, I understand that the fewer the number of cadets at Annapolis the greater the percentage of expense.

Mr. PADGETT. Because capital, it is because you divide the overhead charges by a smaller number.

Mr. MANN. There are no overhead charges.

Mr. PADGETT. There is the interest on the investment.

Mr. MANN. You will have to build accommodations for every new cadet.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the bill we are now appropriating $824,729.20 for the Naval Academy at Annapolis. That alone amounts to $6,873 for each of the 1,200 cadets there.

Mr. PADGETT. Does the gentleman take into consideration that we propose an enlargement of the academy?

Mr. NORTON. How much is to be used for that? I do not know how much amount is provided for that here.

Mr. PADGETT. I have reference to is under public works.

Mr. NORTON. I quite agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sear] that it appears that the system they are practicing at the Naval Academy is the same system carried on by the Army and Navy officers in their work in the field. They do not want a soldier to do any manual labor of any kind be it anything but drill and dress up. That is the policy that is being carried out as I have frequently observed it. It seems to me that in the Naval Academy it is an outrage that it should cost the Government about a year to educate a midshipman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman has made an error of one cipher in his division. The gentleman said it was $8,000 for each cadet, whereas it is $800.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman is right—that makes a decided difference. My calculation made on the total appropriation is that the expenses of the academy, including interest on the $14,000,000 invested, are $15,000,000. In the aggregate?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; including the interest on the $14,000,000 invested, the salaries of the officers, and counting in the year of officers detailed for this duty, it amounts to that in the aggregate. But when you take the operating expenses, you have all that in the bill before you. For 1,200 cadets it would be so much, and for 1,700 cadets it would be less. Of course, if you had 1,700 cadets you would have to increase the number of professors, instructors, mess boys, and cooks.

Mr. NORTON. This appropriation does not, of course, cover all the expenses of the academy. It is fixed or a year for each student. I think he failed in Spanish. He was not the only one who failed; there were 60 who failed to pass the examination. Mr. PAWSON] to say that the expenses of educating a midshipman for four years was about $50,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no; there have been two estimates. One was about $15,000 and the other about $18,000 or $19,000, as I recollect.

Mr. NORTON. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. PADGETT. That is for the four years, and it includes all expenditures of the academy. I understood the gentleman [Mr. PAWSON] to say that the expenses of educating a midshipman for four years was about $50,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Departments of electrical engineering and physics: Three electrical engineers at $1,180 each; 2 mechanics, at $1,180 each; 1 laboratorian, $1,000; in all, $6,900.

Mr. MCCracken. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think there must be something very wrong with the Naval Academy. About one year ago I appointed a young man to take the entrance examination, which he passed after he had made preparation here. He went to the Naval Academy and he was dismissed and was told that he had failed in one or two subjects of the semiannual examination held last month. I think he failed in French and also in Spanish. He was not the only one who failed; there were 60 who failed to pass the examination. I asked him what the real trouble was. He said that there was a certain man there who was a teacher of a foreign language, the man being a foreigner himself, and the boy said the only reason he failed was because this foreign teacher had a prejudice against him. I think that is entirely wrong. Here is a boy who has gone to considerable trouble and expense to make his preparation. He had prepared here in the city of Washington for at least a year. He passed the entrance examination about a year ago; was admitted to the Naval Academy and served for something like eight months and is now dismissed. I am satisfied, after making the examination of this boy, that he has been wronged, and I would like to know from some one—Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Did the gentleman appeal to the academic board of the Naval Academy?

Mr. McCracken. I have not had time. The boy has been dismissed and was told to go home.

Mr. BUTLER. When was he dismissed?

Mr. McCracken. Just about 10 days ago.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is it not a conditional dismissal, and will he not have 60 days within which to prepare himself to take the examination over in those subjects in which he was deficient?

Mr. McCracken. No; it is an absolute dismissal, because he has passed the age of 20 years, and he can not be admitted to another examination.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Can he not make up those conditions in those subjects?

Mr. MCCracken. No; not at all.

Mr. Butler. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I have a young man in the same position; although he served through his fourth class and was in his third, he failed in three of his studies. It is within the power of the academy to send him back to a lower class. In this case, they refused, but I have the privilege of appointing him again to take the examinations held in April, which I am going to do. Fortunately he is not 20 years of age, but I want to say to the gentleman, none of these boys were discharged. Every one was given the privilege of resigning, which they did.

Mr. McCracken. Let me explain right there that I asked in regard to this so-called resignation and find that it is a forced resignation.

Mr. Browning. That is true.

Mr. Butler. That is true.

Mr. Browning. But they were not discharged. In the Military Academy they are discharged outright.

Mr. McCracken. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. Browning. Oh, no.

Mr. Butler. I am sorry the gentleman did not know of the remedy which the gentleman from New Jersey suggested. That boy might have been put back in the next class and his graduation postponed a year longer, which often occurs.

Mr. McCracken. But he has passed the age of 20 years.

Mr. Butler. That would make no difference, because he was admitted to the Academy when he was 19. There is no time limit for graduation; it is for admission. The boy was already admitted there, and I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in an awkward situation. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. Fess. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. Fess. I was about to suggest that my candidate met with the same result, but I am not ready to state that it was not his fault. He was appointed at a competitive examination. He held, and he made very high marks upon the entrance examination. In my opinion, he was not inferior to the professorial force. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. Fess. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. Fess. I was about to suggest that my candidate met with the same result, but I am not ready to state that it was not his fault. He was appointed at a competitive examination. He held, and he made very high marks upon the entrance examination. In my opinion, he was not inferior to the professorial force. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. McCracken. Let me explain right there that I asked in regard to this so-called resignation and find that it is a forced resignation.

Mr. Browning. That is true.

Mr. Butler. That is true.

Mr. Browning. But they were not discharged. In the Military Academy they are discharged outright.

Mr. McCracken. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. Browning. Oh, no.

Mr. Butler. I am sorry the gentleman did not know of the remedy which the gentleman from New Jersey suggested. That boy might have been put back in the next class and his graduation postponed a year longer, which often occurs.

Mr. McCracken. But he has passed the age of 20 years.

Mr. Butler. That would make no difference, because he was admitted to the Academy when he was 19. There is no time limit for graduation; it is for admission. The boy was already admitted there, and I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in an awkward situation. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. Fess. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. Fess. I was about to suggest that my candidate met with the same result, but I am not ready to state that it was not his fault. He was appointed at a competitive examination. He held, and he made very high marks upon the entrance examination. In my opinion, he was not inferior to the professorial force. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. McCracken. Let me explain right there that I asked in regard to this so-called resignation and find that it is a forced resignation.

Mr. Browning. That is true.

Mr. Butler. That is true.

Mr. Browning. But they were not discharged. In the Military Academy they are discharged outright.

Mr. McCracken. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. Browning. Oh, no.

Mr. Butler. I am sorry the gentleman did not know of the remedy which the gentleman from New Jersey suggested. That boy might have been put back in the next class and his graduation postponed a year longer, which often occurs.

Mr. McCracken. But he has passed the age of 20 years.

Mr. Butler. That would make no difference, because he was admitted to the Academy when he was 19. There is no time limit for graduation; it is for admission. The boy was already admitted there, and I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in an awkward situation. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. Fess. Mr. Chair, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCracken. Yes.

Mr. Fess. I was about to suggest that my candidate met with the same result, but I am not ready to state that it was not his fault. He was appointed at a competitive examination. He held, and he made very high marks upon the entrance examination. In my opinion, he was not inferior to the professorial force. If he consulted the Secretary of the Navy, there might yet be a remedy.

Mr. McCracken. Let me explain right there that I asked in regard to this so-called resignation and find that it is a forced resignation.
my recollection, although I am not so sure about that. If a man is going to study medicine, he will go through high school. He will not leave high school by the time he is 16. He will go through college, and he will not leave college now by the time he is 20, and then he will go through a medical school, and he will not leave before he is 25, and then he has to hang around in a hospital for two or three years, and after that he has got to go out and hang a shingle out and do a lot of work for nothing, before he is really ready to go into medical work, and yet we suppose that a second lieutenant in the Navy is competent to man a vessel, and often he is required to do so; to know how to keep the country out of international difficulty and to know how to man a vessel. No wonder we have had a lot of naval vessels on the rocks.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes as I indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

[After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Emerson] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of this committee a question. He made a statement a few minutes ago that we had three mildshipsmen there.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not say you had them there, but I said that you could appoint them.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not know. Maybe he did not appoint from my district.

Mr. PADGETT. Whomever you succeeded had the places filled. There are three appointments for each Senator and for each congressional district.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Did we not create a new cadet during this present Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. And I was it. I was given favorable consideration from Mississippi. Did not the gentleman from Ohio get that appointment? A new cadet was authorized for each Member at this present Congress.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not got even that. There was an additional one created in the last session for each Member.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not an appointee under that.

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman is entitled to it.

Mr. EMERSON. I did not get it. I have called at the department and I have not gotten it.

Mr. KELLEY. My impression is, and it may be an explanation in the case, that if there was an appointment at large by some Member from your State In that district, that that would count from your district.

Mr. BUTLER. No; it would come from the State at large.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Your Republican colleagues might have gotten away with the appointment.

Mr. EMERSON. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Humphrey] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman. I have had some experience in the appointment of these cadets at Annapolis and have had several boys graduate from there, but I want to say that there is one thing about the Naval Academy I do not understand. Perhaps it is imaginary, but I know from experience that I have never named the son of an officer that he was not admitted, and always they were permitted to graduate. I believe from the man for this nation the charge that is frequently made, that the sons of naval officers receive additional help at that institution that permits him to graduate. I do not know of any one, but I have never had a boy fail who was an officer’s son, and I have appointed some of them. When it comes to West Point, perhaps I have been unfortunate. It may be I am unfortunate in the young men that I have in my district; but I have been a Member of this body for almost 14 years and I have never yet had a man graduate at the Military Academy. Never have I been able to get a boy in West Point that they did not find something the matter with him, usually a physical defect.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, can I have one minute, that I may raise my voice in this experience meeting?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Florida. Yes. Mr. chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington if he would have his boys come to Florida and stay a while, I think we would give them a physical make-up that would enable them to get through.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, if you did, I think you would do something with the efficiency of the Naval Academy rather than the boys.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Representative in this House I presume I have named 12 boys to Annapolis, and have never had one fall after admission. I have appointed them directly, with but very few exceptions. They are prepared in advance. I have never heard one of them say that they were suspicious that the son of an officer had better treatment and better advantage than the son of a civilian. And the boys I have named, with one exception, have all come from civil life—have been the sons of men in civil life.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentlemen yield for a moment there?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Is it not a fact at the present time the headman of their teams down there—the president of the class—is from the enlisted force?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; he comes from the enlisted force.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Department of secretaries: Two coxswains, at $459 each; 3 seamen, at $434 each; total, $2,229.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EAGLE. If any of the gentlemen of this House have ever had any gratification, any satisfaction, in the matter of appointing cadets to West Point and to Annapolis, I congratulate him. I have had nothing but disappointment from beginning to end.

When the matter arose of selecting young gentlemen to the Naval and Military Academies, I concluded to give the civil-service plan a fair and impartial trial in my district. I have had 10 young gentlemen, first and last; write me requesting that I designate them either to West Point or to Annapolis. I had 178 persons write me separate and distinct letters to this effect.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And with one of them.

Mr. EAGLE. You are right. I had 23 vacancies at West Point and three at Annapolis. The candidates must be so many years old, weigh so many pounds, have flawless eyes, fine intelligence, a good education, and good health, and hence the Civil Service Commission, in determining qualifications, and so I got the Civil Service Commission to hold the examination recently. I am not complaining about its work; I am talking about how the civil-service plan has worked in this matter.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You have.

Mr. EAGLE. Here is what happened: The civil service held such examination in my city of Houston, at the post office, beginning at 10 o’clock in the morning on January 10, 1917. Three weeks before that time, in order that everybody might have information concerning the examination, I had copies of instructions made on the multigraph, setting out the requirements of the Navy Department for admission to Annapolis and the War Department for West Point.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You had.

Mr. EAGLE. Having done that—and it filled an entire page—I mailed a copy to each newspaper in my district, a copy to each of those 10 young gentlemen, and a copy to each of those 178 persons who written to me extolling the virtues of those 10 young gentlemen; and with the notice thus duly given, the time fairly stated, and the place duly set, when the commission properly constituted sat to pass upon the qualifications of all the applicants, the two young gentlemen came to take the examination, and one of them made 60 and the other 75 per cent. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. What should I do about it? I do not know.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Appoint them! [Laughter.] Mr. EAGLE. Appoint whom? Appoint the two? The other three did not even apply, and were evidently not willing to stand the necessary examination. And now I am having many letters from some of those young gentlemen and their friends urging their selection, notwithstanding they were not willing to un-
dern an examination to test their fitness. It would seem that the public and our constituents will not let us divest ourselves of the plague of patronage even when we earnestly try to divest ourselves of it.

What are you going to do about it? We can not have an efficient army corps and we can not have an efficient naval corps based on my preference when I do not know, or based on the examination, nor can I know, the physical, educational, moral, and mental qualifications of applicants or candidates. You can not decide it sensibly at random. It is a pure guess.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman could reappoint him. I may have misled the gentleman. Within the last two or three years I have endeavored to assist by appointing directly from among boys whom I have known, and I have asked the Bureaus we are criticized, that is not my method of procedure.

Mr. FESSION. My familiarity with young men as students leads me to know how often the first examination does not establish the ability of the applicant. It appears, to say the least, a single examination is not enough, but that a committee of Bureaus must be appointed to give to the public service the best of energy and talent we possess.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the result. I do not know what to do about it. If any of you gentlemen have solved the problem, I would be thankful to your gentlemen.

Mr. STAFFORD. If you gentlemen have solved the problem, I would be thankful to your gentlemen. Would you allow me to read a paper which I have written to the House of Representatives, as a member of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. FESSION. I am much obliged to my friend. My colleague [Mr. MADEN] and Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman could reappoint him. I may have misled the gentleman. Within the last two or three years I have endeavored to assist by appointing directly from among boys whom I have known, and I have asked the Bureaus we are criticized, that is the result. I do not know what to do about it. If any of you gentlemen have solved the problem, I would be thankful to your gentlemen.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman could reappoint him. I may have misled the gentleman. Within the last two or three years I have endeavored to assist by appointing directly from among boys whom I have known, and I have asked the Bureaus we are criticized, that is the result. I do not know what to do about it. If any of you gentlemen have solved the problem, I would be thankful to your gentlemen.

Mr. FESSION. My familiarity with young men as students leads me to know how often the first examination does not establish the ability of the applicant. It appears, to say the least, a single examination is not enough, but that a committee of Bureaus must be appointed to give to the public service the best of energy and talent we possess. There is no excuse, because the people's way of conducting their own Government. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESSION. Mr. Chairman, I have no fault to find with the Naval Academy, although I have heard a great deal of criticism of it. I am inclined to think that the failure of our applicants is due more to themselves than to the authorities of the academy.

But I am interested in knowing how a man like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] can in 20 years make appointments and never miss them by having every applicant succeed. Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESSION. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. I take the chance of criticism by selecting the boy. That boy is usually selected by me two years in advance. When he is prepared and admitted he never fails, and I think five or six of my boys have graduated near the head of their class.

Mr. FESSION. How do you select them?

Mr. BUTLER. By my personal knowledge. I select boys that I know—rich or poor, it matters not to me, so that the boy can stand up—and have the boy's parents and neighbors, in a sense, in part responsible for his success.

Mr. FESSION. I am much obliged to my friend. My colleague here from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says he has not had a failure, and I am glad to say they have not.

Now, I have only one ambition in reference to Annapolis and West Point, and that is to get good sailors and good soldiers. I have tried to select them by competitive examination, believing the best way to secure the best, and I have the chance this year what would be called the "star" applicant whom I recommend is out, I suppose, by a forced resignation, which is a great misfortune. As I just remarked, I have no fault to find with the authorities over there, understand. I suppose my method of procedure is at fault.

Mr. BUTLER. I think it is not a good one. I think the gentleman's knowledge of the candidate would be much more useful to the candidate when that knowledge is more than what he could get through a competitive examination.

Mr. FESSION. There is another question I would like to propose to one who can answer me. One of the candidates that I have very anxiously asked a question of Mr. BUTLER I happened to know his parents, and they are not wealthy, and this is a very promising as well as deserving young man—was also a candidate for Annapolis. He failed to enter; that is, he failed on the entrance examination. Then I took it up to see whether I could get him a retrial, and I was denied it, but was told there was a certain boy, of whom I have heard. The Bureaus notified me that he was not included in the list recommended for another examination. I applied to the academic board and was politely informed that the case was carefully considered, after which the board decided to deny him permission to appear to take another examination.

Mr. BUTLER. I fear I may have misled my friend—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. FESSION. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman could reappoint him. I may have misled the gentleman. Within the last two or three years I have endeavored to assist by appointing directly from among boys whom I have known, and I have asked the Bureaus we are criticized, that is the result. I do not know what to do about it. If any of you gentlemen have solved the problem, I would be thankful to your gentlemen.

Mr. FESSION. Mr. Chairman, there is one question upon which I would like to have the attention of the House for a minute. There is a matter that has been presented to the educators of the country that I think the House ought to consider. I do not refer to the exact items discussed in the Senate yesterday, but to one other phase of similar character. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] referred a moment ago to the curriculum of colleges. We wish for the high school. Then we set up certain standards for entrance to college. We require four years' work in the high school to make it of first grade. Then we fix a certain number of units—what is called"credit"—in order to qualify for college. In a few years, by the munificence of Mr. Carnegie, there was organized in the country what is called the Carnegie Foundation. Among other things it has attempted is a standardization of colleges, in which it has published what it calls the standard requirement for college entrance, as well as the requirement of a college degree. Most of the colleges have adopted its recommendations. These requirements are not confined to scholarship, but extend to financial rating. It happens to be that at the head of an institution which, while it meets the requirements of that foundation in all respects, is not the Carnegie Foundation fixes the requirements for a standard college, as I have just suggested, not alone upon educational qualifications but in addition upon a minimum number of professors who must not only be on the faculty but must confine their teaching in the college—that is, they must be free from teaching in the academy. In addition to that the size of the endowment that the college possesses is a third condition of standardization. A college, under these circumstances, of an endowment of $10,000,000, for example, if it does not meet these two financial items—(1) number of teachers, (2) size of endowment—it's rank will be unclassified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the limit—

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the committee itself.

Mr. FESSION. I should like to take two minutes more.
Mr. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes. The gentleman says that will be sufficient.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. PADGETT. There is no objection to the gentleman's presence in the House, because I want to get this matter before the body. I repeat that this unofficial mentor names three elements that enter into the requirements to make up what is denominated a standard college. The gentleman in scholarship for entrance is equivalent to graduation from a first-grade high school of four years' work, and then graduation after four years in college. But, in addition to scholarship, there must be a certain number of salaried professors, and the Carnegie Foundation even suggests minimum salaries upon the ground that a small salary can not command the ability demanded by a standard college.

Mr. PADGETT. There is nothing of that kind which applies to the Naval Academy or to West Point. Mr. FESSION. No; nothing whatever. I have no reference to either Annapolis or West Point. I simply call the country's attention to a tendency in education.

Mr. PADGETT. I have had several young men enter Annapolis right from our high school.

Mr. FESSION. Yes. Another qualification required by the Carnegie Foundation is that there must be an endowment, the minimum of which is $1,900, and if the college does not meet this requirement it is only fair to that financial standing, no matter what the character of work, it can not be regarded as a first-rank college, and its diploma amounts to that of an unclassified institution.

While the Carnegie Foundation is not official, yet it is rapidly fixing our standards of education, since I may say, unfortunately, the colleges of the country have adopted its standard as their standard, and when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] suggested that a professional career demands four years in the high school, and then four years in a college, before one begins his special work for his profession, if you want to enter a law school, that means four years after the four years in college, or if you want to enter a medical school, it is four years after the four years in college. While I do not find fault with these rigid requirements, I do question the wisdom of specific tendencies. It means that some of the most worthy educational institutions in America that are built, not on money but upon the sacrifices of men who are willing to teach at a small salary, as well as colleges: that requires four years in a standard college, which means that an outlet for ambition, that is necessary, is not given, and that ambition is being crowded out by this college.

Mr. FESSION. There is nothing of that kind which applies to those either matriculated in or graduated from institutions that require four years in a standard college, which means that an outlet for ambition, that is necessary, is not given, and that ambition is being crowded out by this college:

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman says his time has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to have read in my time a telegram from a Rhode Island institution breathing patriotism.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet and asking the indulgence of the committee, and hoping that my time will be extended just for a few minutes, I wish to sympathize with my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. Eagle], who has had so much difficulty in the selection of young men for Annapolis and West Point. I think the discussion under this bill is very timely, for the reason that the selection of proper men for Annapolis and West Point lies at the foundation of our preparedness program. [Applause.] Although I am very resolute in adhering to ideas and principles, going so far yesterday as to upbraid the President in his recommendation that postmasters in first, second, and third class offices be selected under civil-service rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed the limit.

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. Then I will indulged another Member, and I am asking the same privilege.

Mr. PADGETT. To show no preference, I will ask that the gentleman have four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island be allowed to proceed for four minutes. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. I voted for the President's recommendation, believing that these men should come from the ranks of the employees, and that an outlet for ambition, energy, and efficiency should be given to the employees who have given their lives to that service. Still in choosing men for Annapolis and West Point I feel that I will have to diverge from my own views on the civil service, so far as that branch of the governmental service is concerned. I believe it absolutely necessary that in appointing cadets and midshipmen we should have an interview with the men who are going to serve their Government in those capacities for the purpose of that test which only a face-to-face meeting can disclose. In my opinion you can not make a wise judgment of a bookworm or civil-service examinee opening up these places to those who may be mentally qualified and perhaps physically so is not the supreme test.

I believe that the foundation of the application should be a vigorous, resolute, hardy manhood. [Applause.] First of all, a man who, when he is called upon, will give no regard for sacrifice, but will be willing to stand any test, no matter how supreme, no matter how severe. It has been a pleasure to me to appoint young men to Annapolis and West Point after I have interviewed them myself, and when I have had an absolute, hearty handclasp from a fellow who looked me plumb in the eye, I have said, "By the eternal God, there is a man that will make a good soldier or a good sailor." [Applause.] Back of all qualifications there should be numbers and I would respectfully commend my theory and my practice to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Eagle]. And when I speak of men being physically qualified I do not refer to mere bulk, which must not be confounded with strength. Deep down in a man's heart must be a wholesome love of country and a willingness to serve. I trust that subject will receive greater attention at the hands of Congress. I feel very much concerned when I hear of a man going to these institutions and fail. I would respectfully recommend a rigorous examination to which they are subjected, and I fully believe that a thorough examination at the time of their entry by the Congressmen who has the privilege of sending them there will remove a great many of these difficulties and add to the service of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet and asking the indulgence of the committee, and hoping that my time will be extended just for a few minutes, I wish to sympathize with my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. Eagle], who has had so much difficulty in the selection of young men for Annapolis and West Point. I think the discussion under this bill is very timely, for the reason that the selection of proper men for Annapolis and West Point lies at the foundation of our preparedness program. [Applause.] Although I am very resolute in adhering to ideas and principles, going so far yesterday as to upbraid the President in his recommendation that postmasters in first, second, and third class offices be selected under civil-service rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed the limit.

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. Then I will indulge another Member, and I am asking the same privilege.

Mr. PADGETT. To show no preference, I will ask that the gentleman have four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island be allowed to proceed for four minutes. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNNESSY. I voted for the President's recommendation, believing that these men should come from the ranks of the employees, and that an outlet for ambition, energy, and efficiency should be given to the employees who have given their lives to that service. Still in choosing men for Annapolis and West Point I feel that I will have to diverge from my own views on the civil service, so far as that branch of the governmental service is concerned. I believe it absolutely necessary that in appointing cadets and midshipmen we should have an interview with the men who are going to serve their Government in those capacities for the purpose of that test which only a face-to-face meeting can disclose. In my opinion you can not make a wise judgment of a bookworm or civil-service examinee opening up these places to those who may be mentally qualified and perhaps physically so is not the supreme test.

I believe that the foundation of the application should be a vigorous, resolute, hardy manhood. [Applause.] First of all, a man who, when he is called upon, will give no regard for sacrifice, but will be willing to stand any test, no matter how supreme, no matter how severe. It has been a pleasure to me to appoint young men to Annapolis and West Point after I have interviewed them myself, and when I have had an absolute, hearty handclasp from a fellow who looked me plumb in the eye, I have said, "By the eternal God, there is a man that will make a good soldier or a good sailor." [Applause.] Back of all qualifications there should be numbers and I would respectfully commend my theory and my practice to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Eagle]. And when I speak of men being physically qualified I do not refer to mere bulk, which must not be confounded with strength. Deep down in a man's heart must be a wholesome love of country and a willingness to serve. I trust that subject will receive greater attention at the hands of Congress. I feel very much concerned when I hear of a man going to these institutions and fail. I would respectfully recommend a rigorous examination to which they are subjected, and I fully believe that a thorough examination at the time of their entry by the Congressmen who has the privilege of sending them there will remove a great many of these difficulties and add to the service of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause.]
Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Some estimates were made a few moments ago as to the cost of maintenance of a cadet at Annapolis. I would like to have the chairman of the committee tell me the cost of maintenance of one enlisted man.

Mr. PADGETT. For an enlisted man in the Navy, I think the ration the past year was 39 cents.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I do not want the actual cost of maintaining the Navy, but the cost to the country of each enlisted man in the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not taken that matter up.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I assume that it would be at least the cost of one soldier in the Army.

Mr. PADGETT. I would think so.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is estimated that one enlisted man costs at least $1,200 a year. The chairman of the committee says that it costs about $4,000 a year to maintain a cadet at Annapolis. Gentlemen raise their hands in holy horror at the tremendous waste of money in giving a young man an education so that he will be competent to command a battleship, and yet eventually he will command a thousand men whose cost of maintenance is $1,200 a year each. Will any man on this floor say that these expense at Annapolis compete to command a battleship is not worth at least four times what an enlisted man is?

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. The gentleman thinks that the Government ought to pay that difference while he is obtaining that knowledge?

Mr. LONGWORTH. How could it be eventually have the knowledge unless he obtains it at Annapolis? The value of an education at West Point or Annapolis can not be estimated in dollars and cents.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in reference to this matter of Annapolis and West Point appointments. We have had a discussion on Annapolis and West Point examinations annually ever since I have been in Congress, and I desire to repeat briefly the method I have in some success; that is, the Rhodes scholarship method as nearly as it can be applied. I hold a competitive examination, or rather two examinations, a mental and physical examination, take the two sets of marks and add them together and then divide them by 2. Then take into consideration participation in school athletics, and the character and manhood of the boys the same as they do for the Rhodes scholarships. That is the only standard we have according to which we pick out an all-around boy that I know of. It requires a district, of course, in which you can get a number of candidates. It does not work very well if you have only two or three candidates, but if you get a dozen candidates for examination so that you can have some chance of getting an eligible list from your mental examination on the regular Annapolis or West Point requirements, conducted by the civil service—I think that is the word, sir?—and that those who pass these examinations have been examined and found to be very well by local school authorities—and then have a physical examination on a competitive basis of the boys who stand highest the result is going to be that you will get a pretty good all-around boy. And I want to add that such a test usually appeals to the boys themselves and attracts more candidates than you can get for a competitive examination confined to the mental side.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will there be any change in the system which has been in operation here for the last two years?

Mr. PLATT. There are two changes; one is that we are going to have a more thorough examination of the boys who enter the Naval Academy, the whole test now is not book knowledge and his ability to pass the examination.

Mr. PLATT. No; there is a vast amount of physical training, we give a good man broken down under the physical training both at West Point and Annapolis. After the boy gets in has the capacity to study, but the great trouble is that our grammar schools and high schools are not thorough. There is not a background of the kind that they ought to be grounded in. Boys fall largely in the grammar-school subjects. I have had a boy pass an examination with minus 90 in algebra and geometry and fail in history, which he ought to have been taught in two weeks so as to pass. The boy I have in mind did so well in mathematics in a competitive examination that I made him an al­ ­

Mr. McCracken. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. McCracken. Does not the gentleman feel that he is reflecting on the teachers of the high schools in the country when he says that the boys have not been trained to study?

Mr. PLATT. I am reflecting on the high schools and the grammar schools, too. I have had boys from both kinds of schools, and they have not been trained thoroughly in either. The idea of the usual school is to pass as many boys and girls as possible to higher grades, so as to give the school a good showing to the effect that all the schools work all over this country. They are rarely thorough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. Sabath. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not the floor. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Sabath. But I moved to strike out the last two words because the gentleman secured the floor, and the Chair recognized me.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman whether two minutes would satisfy him.

Mr. Sabath. Mr. Chairman, I replied that I would not use more than two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

Mr. Padgett. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. Sabath. Mr. Chairman, I object. I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not the floor. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Sabath. But I moved to strike out the last two words because the gentleman secured the floor, and the Chair recognized me.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. Sabath. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sabath. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. The statement has been made by some gentleman upon the floor this afternoon that the sons of officers, as a rule, succeed in passing the examinations before boys who have been appointed who are not relatives of officers. I myself have suspected that, because whenever I appoint the son of an officer he always passes, but whenever I appoint some one else who is not connected with the military or naval service he has his own troubles. For that reason I would like to ask the gentleman if he can give the Chair any information as to the percentage of boys who are now in the Naval Academy who are the sons or relatives of officers.

Mr. PLITT. Mr. Chairman, I can not; and I cannot give the gentleman that information, because what I have heard here this evening is about all I have ever heard upon this subject. I want to say to the gentleman that perhaps it might be accounted for by this fact; if an officer has a son in the academy and that officer is there at the academy, he would have...
the boy in his home and would be likely to give him instructions. I do not know, though, that there is any foundation for these rumors. I have had young men enter the academy from the high schools without preparation and I have had other young men who had special preparation who failed. I have never seen any evidences of favoritism. They have treated me just as they have others. When my boy failed they kept him out, just as they have kept others out.

Mr. SABATH. That is the opinion of the gentleman that these examinations are honestly conducted and without any preference being given?

Mr. PADGETT. As far as I know, they are absolutely and honest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have read in my time a telegram from Dr. J. H. Kellogg, one of the foremost scientists of the country and the head of a very great sanitarium, which telegram I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

BATTLE CREEK, Mich., February 5, 1897.

Hon. J. M. C. SMITH, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

America ought to set an example to the whole world by finding means for settling the controversy with Germany without war. The war will remain settled by economics rather than military force. It is not for us to direct the course of events. We find America big enough to be patient and pioneer the way to better things.

J. H. KELLOGG.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee on Manufacture. One chief cook, $1.200; 8 cooks, at $600 each; and 12 assistants, at $360 each; 1 steward, $1.200, and 1 assistant, $1,050; 1 head waiter, $540; 3 assistants, at $600 each; 4 pantry men, at $420 each; 1 chief baker, at $1,200; 5 bakers, $480; 5 assistants, at $540 each; and 3 assistants, at $480; 1 head butcher, at $720 each, and 1 butcher's helper, at $480; 1 baker helper, at $360 each; 65 waiters, at $200 per month each; and 4 waitresses, at $16 per month each, $20,280; 4 coffee men, at $300 each; 4 dish pantry men, at $300 each; 4 firemen, at $300 each; 4 utility men, at $500 each; 4 porters, at $300 each; 2 stewards, at $300 each; 6 clerks, at $300 each; in all, $4,620.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have some amendments which I desire to offer for the purpose of making some clerical corrections.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 46, line 18, strike out the figures "$29,280" and insert the figures "$28,680." Page 46, line 22, strike out the figures "$34,620" and insert "$33,620." Page 46, line 26, strike out the figures "$851,175.20" and insert "$790,075.20."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inform the gentleman that the paragraph to which the last amendment offered has not yet been read.

Mr. PADGETT. That is correct. I will ask for a vote on the other two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the paragraph ending on line 22, page 46.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word "and" and strike in the word "or" of the amendment presented by the gentleman as to the word "invention". Is there any regulation or rule or law which pertains to men in the active service of the Navy war, but to stand back of the Nation in everything that may be necessary. In that district, at least, everybody knows that the war conditions are the result of the unwise policy that governs trade and commerce—the privilege that has been given to a few in this world to make industrial slaves of the rest of us. With one proper act of Congress the world could be changed—conquered by the force of the collective demand of all mankind—when the way is pointed out that would make it sure that the industrious and intelligent in all the fields of useful life can command success for themselves by their industry instead of having it serve to make a few of the specially favored successful. That would result in a peace-loving people everywhere. Let one nation act wisely—really wisely—the rest will follow with even more speed than the unwise acts have been followed by one nation after another. There need be no war to establish and enforce our rights on the high seas. If we adopt the economic law under our own Government we shall control the world, not by drenching it in blood but by fair means, and the people of the Atlantic world will be forced to follow with even more speed than the unwise acts have been followed by one nation after another. There need be no war to establish and enforce our rights on the high seas.
Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In reference to the discussion had a few moments ago in regard to the fact that some midshipmen were dismissed on account of failure, my belief is that the age limit for admission to the Naval Academy is not 16 years. Any recollection is one can not be admitted over 30 years of age, and I think that is a great mistake. Most of the applicants who go to the Naval Academy go from high schools, and at 20 years of age they have not got the education or the maturity to enable them to stand the course that they have to take at the academy. I recommended applicants by a competitive examination before they went before the board, but a number of them failed, and I think it would be wise to increase the age from 20 to 25 years. I think the chairman, if he would think over the matter, will do that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, in reference to that I want to say that the naval officers for several years have appeared before the committee urging that the age be reduced from 16 to 20 to 15 to 18 and Members of Congress have come to me personally to the age that we could get them was just as young as possible, and the committee has refrained from taking either one of those. In England, I understand, they take them at 12 years of age instead of 18, as we do here. So that we are standing on the 18 to 20, and you ask here the higher age, and the department is wanting it put from 15 to 18. The English have them admitted at 12 years of age.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. I think in England they get a longer course or else the course is not so hard as in the United States Naval Academy, because they could not possibly stand a course here at 12 years of age. Very few can stand it at 20 years, and last year—I am not sure whether it was the Naval Academy or the Military Academy—30 persons in the academy were dismissed because of failing to pass the examinations. They have not the maturity of age to enable them to stand the course.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not the age question, but if the gentleman will go down to the academy he will find it the boy does not apply himself.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Oh, no.

Mr. PADGETT. The great bulk of them, the younger boys themselves who enter at 16 years, a larger per cent of them graduate than those who enter at 20 years of age.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. If the pupil in the high school will be regular he will finish his fourth year and will graduate from the high school that he attends two years sooner after finishing in the best high schools in the country, so I rather agree with the chairman that the age limit is not too low.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the age limit is very satisfactory.

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. It simply gives the boys who have parents who have the means to send them to advanced schools an advantage over the boy the son of parents of moderate means, and I am opposed to it. Our rural high schools are becoming better year by year, and I am against giving the graduate of the rural high schools an equal chance with the city boy.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. PADGETT. The Clerk will report it.

The Chairman. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Department of Buildings and Grounds: $500; 45 building attendants, at $40 each, $1,800; in all, $2,300.

In civil establishment, $381,173.20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Chairman. The amendment is adopted.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I fear my original statement made me appear to think that I was in favor of increasing the age limit. I do not believe that on page 30 of the present bill under the head of "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," in which is included the Naval Academy, together with other places, there is an appropriation in the sum of $1,121,740 for medical supplies, and so forth. I also find in the bill, heading "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," on pages 30 and 31, in which is included the Naval Academy together with other places, an appropriation of $291,680 for the purchase of one motor-propelled vessel, and so forth, and for naval medical supply docks, sick quarters at Naval Academy, and so forth. I do not know how much of the above amounts go to the Naval Academy.

My colleague from Ohio, Mr. Lemon, wanted that because a soldier in line received $1,200 it was unjust to criticize a boy who received for his services in the shape of education and supplies and maintenance, $4,000. I think the comparison is hardly fair, because the boy at college is securing for himself an education and is preparing himself for a life position at a salary commensurate with the services he is to render, while the poor fellow in line, who is willing to die for his country, can never hope to get more than the $1,200, and has no educational advantages.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I will.

Mr. PADGETT. A great proportion of that $4,000 that the gentleman refers to is the interest, the maintenance, and over-head charges in keeping up the plant there. We have $14,000,000 invested in that plant, and in making up that we count the interest on that, the repairs to building, and the salaries of officers, and all that.

Mr. SEARS. If this Government of ours, when it can borrow money at 2 per cent, is paying this enormous amount because of a policy which the Government can not stop it, and we can not do it by increasing these appropriations.

I have no complaint to make about the young men I have sent to Annapolis. They have been true to the trust I have had in them and they are making good. Along that line I have no complaint. Nor would I object to the payment of any salary to any professor commensurate with the services he returns, but the House seems to have gotten away from the original point.

Mr. SNYDER. A moment ago you stated that the enlisted man was ready to die for his country. Do you expect that the young man you appointed to West Point would not be ready to die for his country?

Mr. SEARS. I certainly would expect him to die for his country if the same became necessary. The point I make is that you are paying the young man in the Army $1,200 per year for his services and it is costing the taxpayers about $4,500 per year to educate a boy at Annapolis. I do not believe it should cost so much. However, we have gotten away from the original proposition under which I trust we have said will not be taken in a spirit of criticism, and I have brought the various matters mentioned in my remarks to the attention of the House in order that we might discuss them and that we might discover really what is being done. I have hope for results this year, and I have taken up the time of the House solely with the hope that some reforms may be accomplished.

The question under discussion was not how a young man should get into the academy or how he should get out of the academy, but I contended then and I contend now, Mr. Chairman, that because of omission or neglect on our part or through oversight the Naval Academy at Annapolis is costing the people of this country more in proportion per man, 1,200 students, than any other college in the United States; and as one of the Representatives of the people I felt it was my duty to bring it to your attention and let you deal with the matter as you saw fit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order that I may save time by not again addressing the committee on the question, I want at this time to say that in the paragraph I just read about 62 additional men will be employed next year. I do not know whether they will be employed after the quota is increased to 1,700 or whether they will be employed under the quota of 1,200.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that the estimate for next year is that we shall not be less than 1,000, an increase of 300, at least, over the present number in the academy.

Mr. SEARS. Well, then, with that increase they certainly ought to have butchers, chief butchers, assistant butchers, and so forth. But, Mr. Chairman, that was not really the point I was objecting to. As I said, I believe it is costing too much, and I think the public ought to know that the public pays for those officers who are not suitable for the academy. I think retired naval officers should be used, as far as possible, as instructors at the academy, and I can not bring myself to believe they would object to such service.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman,
Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Davis] to have 5 minutes, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stafford] 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Davis], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stafford]. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair has the floor.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just before the gentlemen began I would like to make a request. A great many gentlemen are asking that we expedito this bill. I am trying to do so. At the same time I too do not want to be unfair. I will ask the membership of the House to please cooperate with me, if they can, and let us cut out some of this debate.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have been mum during the discussion of this measure until the present. I am not in favor of going wild over a great system of Army and Navy expenditures in line of preparedness. But I am in favor of having a most efficient and competent set of men educated to direct our sea warfare; and they are educated, in technical and expert, special, and should be thorough. And I am one of those that believe a fine investment is made even if you double the cost of the ordinary college in turning them from our war colleges a man who is able to take charge of a division of the Army in any part of the battle line that we may have anywhere on earth. I am one of those who believe that the money is well expended that will make not only a good fighter, but a man who can understand the hydrography of the earth wherever his ship may be and be ready to direct his forces safely and accurately anywhere, and make a seadog, so to speak, of the boy, prepared to live a life of active service in the defense of his country anywhere his ship may be. And I am not bothered about the special extra cost. I want the knowledge complete and thorough. I would be glad to leave off a few cents and have the officers in charge of thorough and competent men. [Applause.]

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to what I consider to be a grave defect in this bill. The bill as originally drawn provides for hundreds and millions of dollars for ships and ammunition. We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.

We have a deficiency already in the personnel of the Navy in the enlisted men of more than 20,000. We can not send out our commissioned ships. Of what avail will it be to us to expend additional hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships and more ammunition? We have had amendments brought in here because of the emergency that will add millions more. But there is no provision in this bill and there is no emergency amendment offered to provide for an increase in the personnel of the Navy and the personnel that is gravest defect in the bill that is existing in the Navy. It is the gravest defect now existing in this bill.
Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield me a moment to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?
Mr. TOWNER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.
Mr. GARDNER. May I ask it in the gentleman's time?
Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.
Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Tennessee says that when we passed the law last year the enlisted men in the Navy were 51,500.
Mr. PADGETT. No; I said that was the authorized enlistment.
Mr. GARDNER. They were enlisted up to that amount?
Mr. PADGETT. They were a little over, and we had a provision enacted legalizing the three or four hundred enlistments over that number that had taken place.
Mr. GARDNER. And now on the 1st of February I find the number is up to 53,456.
Mr. PADGETT. Yes.
Mr. GARDNER. As against 52,000 in August, in spite of all your inducements.
Mr. PADGETT. And during the month of January we added a net gain of 1,344.
Mr. GARDNER. Yes. And not January always the chief enlistment month of the year?
Mr. PADGETT. Not always. It is one of the good months.
Mr. GARDNER. That is when the snowbirds all come in.
Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the rest of my time. The gentleman has said even in this bill the committee will do something to increase the pay of the enlisted men. At least that ought to be tried in this emergency. I find on page 734 of the hearings that Lieut. Commander McCandless says that the base pay of the first class is $22 down, with $24 a month of second class, $30 down, with $19; of seamen of the third class, $22 down, with $16 a month; that for messmen it is $60 down, with $16 a month. In other words, for the class of seamen that we have added, the pay is now $16 a month. It occurs to me, gentlemen, that it would be not only wise but a frugal policy as well, an economical policy as well, if we should raise the pay of these seamen to at least decent wages in order that we may secure numbers sufficient to fill the Navy. Sixteen dollars a month will not tempt many desirable young men to join the Navy, even in times of emergency; and we should have them now. It takes a year to train a recruit how to handle a gun on board ship. What folly it will be to be compelled, in case of emergency, to tie our battleships to our wharves until we can train men to handle them; $16 a month is too small a wage to secure men in such times as these.
Mr. PADGETT. The figures that the gentleman read were the base pay that was provided by statute years ago. There was a subsequent statute that added 10 per cent to that, so you should add 10 per cent to these figures.
Mr. TOWNER. One dollar and sixty cents a month?
Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Academy: Text and reference books for use of instructors; stationery, blank books and forms, models, maps, and periodicals; apparatus and materials for instruction in physical training and athletics; expenses of lectures and entertainments not exceeding $1,000, including pay and expenses of lecturer; chemicals, philosophical apparatus and instruments, stores, machinery, tools, fittings, apparatus, and materials for instruction purposes, $41,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to obtain some information as to the policy pursued by the committee in increasing the salaries of the personnel at the Naval Academy. In the prior paragraphs there has been quite a general increase of salaries. In some instances ranging as high as $300, most of them only a reasonable increase of $100. Did the committee have any general policy in making these increases?

Mr. PADGETT. No horizontal increase or anything of that kind. We took up each case and dealt with it with reference to the character of men required, the character of the service to be performed, the duties of the office, and the general standard of requirements.

Mr. STAFFORD. In all these instances were these increases recommended by the department?

Mr. PADGETT. These were recommended by the management of the academy and approved by the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any instances where the committee declined to follow the recommendation of the department for increases?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any.

Mr. STAFFORD. So the committee virtually adopted the recommendation of the department in every instance?

Mr. PADGETT. Virtually. I believe where the department had recommended an odd figure we may have made it an even figure.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee, following the recommendations of the department, did go so far into each case, as to whether it was based on merit or not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; we did.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume they took the word of the department, and followed it without much further investigation.

Mr. PADGETT. We had some of the officers of the Naval Academy before the committee—the superintendent and some of the other officers—and we inquired of them as to the character of the service to be performed, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was there any instance where the committee declined to follow the recommendation of the department so far as increases of salary are concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was the policy of the committee to accept the recommendations of the department so far as increases were concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. If we approved it at all. We may not have given some that the department recommended, but where we gave them we usually followed the recommendation of the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. The committee is rather acquiescent, in so far as increases of salary are concerned.

Mr. PADGETT. In the Naval Academy, and in the reorganization under the bill of last year, the whole thing is under the control of the department, and the recommendation of the department where they accorded with the administration of the academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may be in error, but I do not recall any instances where the department recommended an odd figure as such general increases in salaries in the personnel of the Naval Academy.

Mr. PADGETT. No; we have not for years, because the bill of last August authorized a complete reorganization. Last year we gave the Secretary a lump-sum appropriation, $73,000, and this year it is being apportioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. For these specially enumerated officials who are carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Professors and instructors, and so forth.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the discretion granted to the Secretary what is the pay as finally fixed compared to the pay in other educational institutions?

Mr. PADGETT. He has not consummated his arrangements yet, and we have not got his report. The thing is undergoing reorganization now. He got his authority on the 26th of August and the school year began in September, and he has not had time to put into effect the reorganization. It is being worked out in the department.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand, in some instances naval officers who have been engaged in professorial work have been dismissed and civilian professors substituted in their stead?

Mr. PADGETT. That is contemplated as to some of them. Whether it has actually been done or not in the present session I am not prepared to say, because there had to be a very large increase in the number of professors and instructors in the aggregate, and they have been trying to get them, but there are certain matters, for instance, foreign languages and literature and things of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the information that the gentleman has gleaned after many years of service on the committee, can he inform the House whether there have been any instances where teachers in the Naval Academy have left to go to other institutions because of a difference in compensation between that of the academy and the private institutions?

Mr. PADGETT. Teachers of the Naval Academy have insisted very strongly that they were underpaid. A few years ago it was recommended by the prior Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Meyer, that the civilian instructors be dispensed with altogether and that their places be supplemented with naval officers. We never had such a propaganda come to the committee as we had then, with the insistence that they should be let alone. They had the presidents of the various universities serum letters—I remember receiving several of them—urging the importance and insisting on having civilian instructors remain in the academy. They showed a very great anxiety and an intense interest to remain in the academy, notwithstanding
prior to that time they had been urging that they were underpaid.

Mr. STAFFORD. They manifested as great an interest as public officials do to retain office?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. They liked their berths very well?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there have been no instances of leaving the Navy as a result of dissatisfaction why?

Mr. PADGETT. There may have been individual instances, but there has been no heigh.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Does the gentleman think that in case of war or an emergency we could get all the volunteers for the Navy needed?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I think so, with the authorization we have had and the 10,000 from the naval service and the reserve we are building up in a satisfactory way, and from the 30,000 or 35,000 ex-enlisted men who are in civil life.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Is it not a fact that the young men do not enlist in great numbers because they do not like to be perpetual soldiers?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy has been having satisfactory enlistments until the abnormal conditions arose in manufacturing, and even now, since we amended the act last August giving additional advantages and preferences, it is coming up again. A year ago we had a fairly long list for enlistments in the Navy.

The pro rata amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows: In all, Naval Academy, exclusive of public works, $824,729.20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to correct a total.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerical error: page 48, line 20, strike out the figures “$824,729.20” and insert “$824,729.20”.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In the present bill a great many increases in salaries have been made. I have no objection to these increases because I like to be consistent. I have stated several times, I believe in paying a man what he is worth. I have always made that fight, even when I asked for an increase in salary for myself. I voted for the District Increase. I voted for the $10 and 10 per cent increase every time it came before the House. The House let all the others go through, and this has gone through, and meets with my approval.

But I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that when it came to the Post Office bill which related to the boys back home receiving less than $1,000 and less than $1,800 a year we were unable to secure for them any increase. I want to be consistent and state that I voted for the other increases because I believed they were entitled to it, and because I thought those back home would receive the increase they were also entitled to. The high cost of living at home is just as high cost of living in Washington. If the amounts which I have to pay for supplies are any criterion to go by, I hope the House will see its way clear to allow the postal employees throughout the country receiving less than $1,000 a year the same increase in their salaries as allowed other employees. In order that they may meet the present high cost of living.

I want to say in this connection that if more talk had been indulged in in an effort to reduce the high cost of living rather than indulging in talk to secure raises in salaries there would have been better results throughout the country. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

MARINE CORPS.

Pay, Marine Corps: Pay of officers, active and reserve list: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for all officers on the active and reserve list, including clerks for assistant paymasters, also $1,598,666.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I believe this item carries the pay of all the officers in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; except on the retired list.

Mr. MANN. All on the active and reserve list.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. How are the officers in the Marine Corps appointed in the first instance?

Mr. PADGETT. By passing the examination, and under the law the Secretary may assign cadets from the Naval Academy or from the Military Academy. Then they are taken from civil life, and those in civil life must pass an examination. If they pass satisfactorily, they are nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are appointed for a probationary period of two years before the commission becomes permanent.

Mr. MANN. How do they become eligible for examination?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary has advertised generally and anybody that makes application can take the examination.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, one of the most remarkable things I have ever seen or heard of in connection with such matters, under the gentleman's statement, is the list of officers or citizens named for a probationary period of two years by the President of the United States. On January 10 last, the President sent in the nomination of 10 citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps for the probationary period of two years. Among those names I find the following:

Louis W. Whaley, of South Carolina.
John M. Arthur, of South Carolina.
James F. Jeffords, of South Carolina.
Thomas P. Cheatham, of South Carolina.
William C. James, of South Carolina.

Of course, they make only 5 out of the 10. It may be that they are more enterprising in seeking these advertised-for examinations—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Not yet. I would like to use a little of my own time first.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. No. I will give the gentleman information, if they do not have it; and if they do have it, let them keep quiet until I get through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on February 8 the President sent in the names of 22 citizens for the same position of second lieutenants for a probationary period. Among those names I find the following:

Charles P. Gilchrist, of South Carolina.
Karl I. Buse, of South Carolina.
John R. Martin, of South Carolina.
Samuel A. Woods, Jr., of South Carolina.
David H. Owen, of South Carolina.
James K. Bolton, of South Carolina.
James T. Moore, of South Carolina.
William C. Byrd, of South Carolina.
George B. Reynolds, of South Carolina.

There were altogether 32 names in the two lists. Thirteen of those come from South Carolina and 8 from Virginia. Three come from all of the Northern States. Of course, I am assuming that it is because the citizens of South Carolina are either more enterprising in answering these advertisements or else they are more capable in passing the examinations. Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It is such a peculiar circumstance that I think it is perfectly proper to call attention to it. Of course when I see the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. PADGETT] now standing in the center aisle just in front of me, I can understand how they can pass a better examination than the citizens from any place else in this country.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes; for an explanation or an apology, either one.

Mr. PADGETT. I should have stated that under the provisions of the law the graduates of military schools of a certain type and character are entitled to and are considered for the appointment, and upon inquiry I was told that most of those, or many of them, were graduates of these schools.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, there is no such law; and, in the second place, it is ridiculous for any gentleman, either by way of explanation or apology, to say that when you come to take the schools of the country, South Carolina, as to a competitive examination, would have a percentage of 15 out of 32.

Mr. PADGETT. Under the law the Secretary made regulations recognizing certain schools.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; he makes regulations that take care of South Carolina.

Mr. PADGETT. But all of these men were not graduates of South Carolina schools. They were graduates of schools of other States of the Union.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is seeking now to convey to the House the impression that if you scatter South Carolina students all over the country, no one else has an even chance to compete, and this is the reason; and then, Mr. Chairman, I admit that South Carolina is a great State and that its people are the smartest in the United States, if not in the whole world. I make that admission, and will not require
Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is so obsessed with the idea that South Carolina is going to get something that even in the case of filling these appointments, where the men have accepted commissions and have gone to the front in Santo Domingo, where they are now doing duty as marines, he can not even stop chiding my State for sending these men to the front. South Carolina may not be as large as Illinois, but you will go to Santo Domingo, South Carolina, where the soldiers are on duty, you will find that the number and the service of those from South Carolina will compare very favorably with the soldiers from the State of Illinois. I want to say to my respect[ed] appointments, in so far as the Citadel is concerned, that men from the North recognize it as one of the honor schools of this Government, one of the honor military schools of the country, and when I learned that these appointments were to be made under regulations I wrote to the commandant of that school and asked him to give me the names of all of the graduates who were permitted to compete for the appointment. He wrote me in reply, to read the names, and the commandant wrote them letters, and it is because of that fact that they came here under the regulations and stood the examination. If, forsooth, there are more men from that small State of South Carolina than in the State of Illinois, I think it is because our country’s need who apply to go to the front to fight her battles and protect her flag, it seems to me, if I were the gentleman representing that State, I would not want to call attention to it. The positions they have sought, and to which they have been appointed, are not sinecures. They are not swivel-chair positions, not places where they can hang around Washington and wear parade uniforms, but these men have to go and serve wherever the gentleman himself, they have to go wherever the Marine Corps is ordered to go. But surely, when these young men are willing to devote their lives to their country’s need, you will not turn and give them the chide and great a man as the gentleman from Illinois to stand on this floor and chide this Government for accepting their services, or my little State for offering them, in this hour of the country’s need.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I sometimes have regretted that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Ragsdale] himself had not been admitted to the Marine Corps, so that he would not be a Member of the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am quite sure the gentleman would like to lose just a few more from the Democratic side, because he will be badly in need of them before he is Speaker.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to be satisfied about this. I am not crediting citizens of one State with having more patriotism than those of another, but it will be interesting to have all the gentlemen designate some of the States that reached the Marine Corps. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Navy Affairs to say it was by reason of some naval regulation. If these young men from these two States, after taking a competent examination, had gotten a better average than the young men from other States, I have not any criticism, but if the school from which they were graduated was selected as one from which its graduates were not required to take an examination, then I do take the exception, and ask the chairman to answer the question and put the inquiry at rest. There is a great deal of criticism and unfavorable talk upon the large proportion of appointments from these two States of the Union. Nineteen out of thirty-two appointments to the Marine Corps have been selected.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that the Secretary has a list of schools in a number of States, and has placed them upon the same basis, and he takes the graduates from any and all of these schools and puts them on the same basis, where they have a certificate of graduation from the school of a certain standard; and if they pass that examination, and then they have their physical examination, they are entitled to be nominated. That applies to any school in any State that has the requirements of the standard prescribed for this character of military training.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know the character of the schools? Can he tell us one of these schools?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] would tell us of the schools.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The Secretary of the Navy has a list of a number of schools over the country where they accept their certificate in lieu of the examination that is required.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina has a list of a number of schools over the country where they accept their certificate in lieu of the examination that is required.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, of course the Secretary of the Navy will be pleased to give us this regulation, but I do know of a number of young men from the State of Pennsylvania who have been studying here one year and were compelled to take a hard competitive examination before they received a commission in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. I know of a number from Tennessee who did some some passed and some failed.

Mr. BUTLER. It is open to criticism and it is open to unfavorable comment that 19 young men out of two States of the Union should be selected to fill 32 places and without examination and without competition.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. Mr. FESS. I do not just this minute recall, but will the gentleman tell me the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs in another body?

Mr. BUTLER. I can not at this minute recall. [Laughter.] Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Tennessee points out the fact that young men are admitted to the academy at West Point without examination, an academy where they are to be taught and from which they must graduate before they become second lieutenants direct without examination. Is not that very different from admitting young men as second lieutenants direct without examination?

Mr. PADGETT. If they meet the standard which is involved in the examination to be held at that time, and if they do accept the standard, that is equivalent to the requirements of their examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a minute or two.

Mr. PADGETT. And I want to say it is a probationary appointment for two years.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. I have made no criticism of the administration of the department, but I do think that the method by which these men are selected is not fair toward other applicants, and, for one, I propose to find out how it has been done.

I do not believe it is just to ambitious young Americans generally to have any institution or one and one institution from one of these States to give him a certificate in lieu of the examination. It does not seem right to me that these young men be admitted to the Marine Corps and then be required to go through the same examination that the other young men have passed. It is open to criticism and unfavorable comment upon the large proportion of appointments from these two States.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]

Mr. BUTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Is it not a fact that we have a number of schools throughout the United States where we detail officers as teachers?

Mr. BUTLER. We have many of them.

Mr. CALLAWAY. And where they are supposed to get the same instruction as at West Point.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not hear the gentleman distinctly, and so my colleagues inform me that my answer was not responsive. Military education would not be developed at the institutions.

Mr. BUTLER. I think there must be 60 or 80 such where young men are taught military duties, and they should have a fair chance with other young men.
Mr. CALLAWAY. Do they not have a fair chance?
Mr. BUTLER. I do not know whether they do or not. It does not seem so to me. The gentleman from Texas knows as well as I do that other educational institutions in the United States.
Mr. CALLAWAY. Why all this discussion without any further facts than just saying here that a few more come from one State than another.
Mr. BUTLER. Three appointments, as the gentleman from Illinois said, out of 32. Three from the Northern States.
Mr. CALLAWAY. How many stood the examination?
Mr. BUTLER. I do not know; but there were 32 appointed. Of the 32, as I understand now, 10 were appointed without examination.
Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The argument of the gentleman from Tennessee is entirely unsound. He says that these young men were required to show a definite standard before they could be commissioned second lieutenants in the Marine Corps. By whom was the standard judged? By the teachers at this school in Charleston, S. C., known as The Citadel, or by the teachers at some other school. That standard was not reviewed by anybody in the employ of the United States. The Navy Department took the judgment of those teachers in those schools, and yet unquestionably they must be prejudiced judges. The gentleman compares this exemption from examination with the exemption from examination accorded to certain candidates who can point a graduation certificate from certain chosen schools. The cases are not parallel. It is a fact, I am sorry to say, that boys are admitted to West Point or the certificate of certain schools at which they prepared. But before those boys can be commissioned in the Army, Uncle Sam does not depend on the word of any schoolmasters on earth except his own schoolmasters. There is the distinction between the two cases. In one case young men without any examination are given commissions in Uncle Sam's Army on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters. In the other case they are admitted to West Point to study for a commission which the Uncle Sam's Army on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters, but they do not get any commission until Uncle Sam has found they are qualified to receive it.

Now, another thing. There has been some talk to the effect that these young men from these southern schools are perhaps better prepared than boys from northern schools. Mr. Chairman, we have what is known as the appointment law in the civil service. The reason for the enactment of that appointment law is that candidates from the Southern States for the Federal civil service do not get as high passing marks as candidates from the Northern States. The argument which the Civil Service Commission makes in defense of that appointment law is that candidates from the Southern States for the Civil Service do not get as high passing marks as candidates from certain chosen schools. The cases are not parallel. It is a fact, I am sorry to say, that boys are admitted to West Point or the certificate of certain schools at which they prepared. But before those boys can be commissioned in the Army, Uncle Sam does not depend on the word of any schoolmasters on earth except his own schoolmasters. There is the distinction between the two cases. In one case young men without any examination are given commissions in Uncle Sam's Marine Corps on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters. In the other case they are admitted to West Point to study for a commission which the Uncle Sam's Army on the say-so of their own private schoolmasters, but they do not get any commission until Uncle Sam has found they are qualified to receive it.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out of the amendment the words "and of the Navy," so that it will apply only to officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. The Clerk will report the proposed modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strikethrough the amendment the words "and of the Navy."
Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is perfectly fair. Mr. HICKS. With that understanding, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Paid of enlisted men, active and reserve list: Pay and allowances of noncommissioned officers, seamen, privates, as prescribed by law; and for the expenses of clerks of the United States Marine Corps traveling under the provisions of this act, additional compensation for enlisted men of the Marine Corps regularly detailed as gun captains, gun point men, cooks, messmen, signalers, or holding good, conduct medals, pins, or bars, including interest on deposits by enlisted men, post-exchange debts of deserters, under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe for gratified travel allowance of discharged enlisted men and for prizes for excellence in gymnastic exercise and target practice and for pay of enlisted men detailed as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks, both afloat and ashore. Provided, That the provisions of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stats. 417, 418), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stats. 550), are hereby extended to authorize the designation of enlisted men of the Navy or Marine Corps as Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks with expeditionary forces on shore. In all, $4,560,522.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to draft the provision of the law authorizing naval mail clerks, assistant mail clerks, so to enable the enlisted men on our battleships to have the privilege of a better mail service. I wish now to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee what modification of that law is carried in the paragraph under consideration.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not modify the law that now exists. This simply makes it apply to the Marine Corps. It already applies to the Navy, but does not apply to the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps for the service that does the expeditionary work, as in Haiti and Santo Domingo and Nicaragua, where they go out in advance work. This is simply giving the same privilege to the Marine Corps that is now provided by law for the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not the purpose to have an extra man or seaman on each battleship to take care of the mail of the marines on that battleship.

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all. It is simply to allow a man to be designated to perform that duty, one of the enlisted men, so that he may have an official status. It does not involve any pay, except the pay already due to that man or anything of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the original law, I beg to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there was extra compensation provided for those who performed the work of mail clerks and assistants.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember as to that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes. We granted them a small additional compensation. We thought it no more than right, in case they were doing this extra work, to give them a little compensation for that, and registering mail, and, I believe, issuing money orders, that they should be compensated for that service, in the main not to exceed $200, it the memory serves me that.

Mr. PADGETT. This simply extends to the Marine Corps the same privileges as are now extended to the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is for that service on land in connection with expeditionary forces, and not in connection with their service on the vessels?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman explain how this mail service is handled? Under this method we would have the naval forces of the United States permitted to drop a letter into the mail box on board a ship or here on land anywhere in the world, and then it is transmitted here and a 2-cent stamp is put upon it or a 2-cent stamp put over there. Under this method are members of the naval forces of the United States permitted to drop letters in a mail box on board ship or on land anywhere in the world, and a 2-cent stamp put on it, or is a 2-cent stamp put on it over there?

Mr. PADGETT. The bill would be under the general postal law and subject to the requirements of that act. It is simply to allow a man to act in the capacity of a mail clerk. It does not affect the law or the postage.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. PADGETT. No. That is what I understand that to be. Mr. STAFFORD. Supposing a man in the marine service mails a letter in Shanghai, what postage does he pay?

Mr. PADGETT. As I understand it, he pays the same postage that anybody else would pay under the law regulating that.

Mr. MANN. What is that?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then why is it deposited in the United States post office at Shanghai?

Mr. PADGETT. The gentleman from Tennessee said he would pay the same as anyone else. What is that? The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. MANN) is right; he pays the same.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MANN. What is the postage from Shanghai to the United States?

Mr. STAFFORD. Two cents.

Mr. MANN. To everybody?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is; and the same from or to the Philippines. The United States has a branch postal station at Shanghai, and the rate of postage is the same, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. DAYIS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, I have received a number of letters from my son, who is superintendent of agriculture in the Philippines, and he says that there is always 4 cents on his letters. I do not know what the rate is.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is because the gentleman's son is very considerate and writes him long letters which weigh more than an ounce.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARDNER: On page 50, line 8, strike out "$4,560,522" and insert "$5,500,522".

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, that amendment would not accomplish anything.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I should like recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee said he anticipated that the gentleman was going to make a point of order. If not, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who offers the amendment, is entitled to recognition.

Mr. GARDNER. No point of order lies against this amendment. Mr. Chairman. A point of order would lie if I were to offer a clause which in terms would raise the pay of the men of the Marine Corps. However, that clause will be inserted in the bill if this amendment increasing the amount of money available for Marine Corps pay is adopted. The amendment which I now offer increases the amount of money available for Marine Corps pay just enough to enable the Navy paymaster to put the enlisted men $2 per month more each. However, this amendment will not be adopted. Yesterday you voted down a similar amendment which I proposed for increasing the pay of enlisted men $5 per month per man. This amendment is proposed only for the purpose of emphasizing my view that men of the Marine Corps, as well as men in the Navy, ought to have their pay raised $5 per month per man. The gentleman need not reply, because I expect the amendment to be voted down, and I offer it merely for the sake of uniformity.

Mr. PADGETT. I simply want to state that the pay of the Marine Corps is fixed by the Army appropriation bill. The law provides that they shall receive the same pay as is provided by the Army bill, and to appropriate this additional amount would not accomplish anything.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman realizes that if it were not for the point of order which might be raised everywhere which we desire could be accomplished in this bill. It makes no difference what the law says at present. If the gentleman raises no point of order and the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union choose to so vote, we can make the pay of members of the Marine Corps $100 per month per man, irrespective of the present law.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly; but there is no necessity for it, because in August we authorized an increase in the Marine Corps of 5,000 men, and I understand they have gotten some- thing of that sort, and the law is quite liberal.

Mr. GARDNER. That is perfectly true. The increased pay is not needed in the Marine Corps, as it is in the Navy, in order to secure men. We can get men to go into the Marine Corps, because it is the choice branch of the service. That is no reason why Uncle Sam should have to pay more than he is now accustomed to pay.
Mr. TOWNER. Is it not a fact that the pay of the Navy has been fixed not by statute but by departmental orders, the only exception to that being the increase that was made by statute last year, when 10 per cent was added to the pay which they then received?

Mr. PADGETT. That 10 per cent was added in 1908.

Mr. OLIVER. It was added in 1908, and the pay now is $17.60 a month by statute, though the gentleman is correct as to the origin of the legislation.

Mr. TOWNER. It was increased by statute 10 per cent over what it was at the time the statute was passed; that is, $16 per month.

Mr. TOWNER. And that was fixed by departmental order.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has referred to certain appointments in the Marine Corps from the States of Virginia and South Carolina. At the time that that statement was made I had no information on the subject, so I undertook to call the Secretary of the Navy's office. I found that the Secretary was absent; but in conversation with Gen. Barnett, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, I have secured some information, which will be supplemented in a few minutes by a written statement from Gen. Barnett, and which I ask permission to read, as part of my remarks.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Gen. Barnett states over the phone that last year he called the gentleman's attention to the selection, made by the Secretary, and that the Secretary called the different bureaus together to consider the suggestion which he—Gen. Barnett—made, and as a result of such conference 12 or more distinguished schools, widely scattered, were written to for a list of graduates answering certain requirements.

Gen. Barnett conducted the correspondence, and informs me that from some of the schools no responses were received. The names submitted by the presidents of these different schools were carefully considered, and from such lists the selections were made. He assures me there was absolutely no discrimination, and that every name submitted was considered; and, so far as he knows, no complaints have been registered, either as to the method of selection or the young men selected.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman inform us whether any inquiry was made as to the nature of the examination given at these schools?

Mr. OLIVER. My understanding is that there was a full inquiry made by Gen. Barnett, and that a certain standard was fixed which all applying for admission were required to meet.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I ask whether the examination papers as conducted at the school reached the Marine Corps here for its official recognition?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the graduation certificates were sent and also the grades made by such graduates.

Mr. MANN. May I inquire of the gentleman who gave him this information?

Mr. OLIVER. Gen. Barnett himself. He is just back from Haiti, and informs me that he is now preparing a written statement to be sent me on the subject.

Mr. OLIVER. It will not change the queerness of the situation.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Will the gentleman from Alabama also put in the names of the 12 colleges? I am interested in that.

Mr. OLIVER. I will. In reply to the remark of the gentleman from Illinois, I think all who are familiar with Gen. Barnett will fully appreciate his splendid efficiency as an officer and his high character as a man, and I am sure that any recommendations whatever, having heard that a great many of their graduates had gone into the Army.

Each graduate authorized to appear for physical examination was required to present his graduating diploma together with a letter of recommendation from at least two members of the faculty, unless otherwise as to moral character and general standing in the community as determined by the University. Most of the distinguished colleges in the United States, at which any young man who made application or made known his desire to appear before the board was allowed to appear, and out of the total number examined (86 in all) only 29 successfully passed for entry into the Marine Corps from civil life. In the selection of these young men from the 12 colleges there are 1,400 letters to young men all over the country who had in any case requested information as to how he might get a commission in the Marine Corps. In this 1,400, which is the number recommended for appointment from any source.

The young men who have been commissioned from these distinguished military schools, they have been ordered to duty at once under Gen. Luke, at Santo Domingo, and the Marine Corps posts in these countries developed the fact that these young men from 18 months before they had been commissioned from the different institutions, including the United States Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy, and wish to unhesitatingly state that in my opinion it is the best possible means of procuring second lieutenants, excepting graduates of the United States Naval Academy and West Point.

In accordance with the above procedure we have secured altogether 39 graduates of these institutions, and so far as I have been able to obtain the authorized number, which, as I stated above, is 60. Thanking you for your interest in this matter, and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

George Barnett,
Major General, Commandant.

Hon. William B. Oliver, Speaker of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MILITARY COLLEGES DESIGNATED AS "DISMEMBERED COLLEGES".

University of California, San Francisco.

University of Illinois, Urbana.

Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan.

University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

University of Missouri, Columbia.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Cornell University, New York.

University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

The cases of all were transferred to the Army, and it is quite certain that if they had not been commissioned when they were commissioned, they would have been graduated from certain of the United States Naval Academy.

I remain, etc.,

George Barnett,
Major General, Commandant.
I do not take the floor to argue Carolina. Which he now sectionalism is raised, anyhow. This institution, I may say, is fifty-odd students at that institution. Lieut. Garey, of the Regulation stated that they had a list, that they had sent to every retired officer a designation of a specific duty and a specific assignment that was required of him if an emergency arose or if war was declared, and that every one of these retired officers in his possession instructions which, of course, are confidential, as to what designation and what assignment he would have, the moment he was notified of the necessity of his service, and he would go directly and report for that duty.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. I will not say it could do any injury to make a statement as to the number of those officers who might be used in active service. I asked whether the gentleman had any such computation.

Mr. PAGETT. No; I have not the number. I have what is declared to be the status of the matter, that they have all of these officers assigned and that they have their instructions where to go. I can not give the gentleman the number.

Mr. MANN. We have complaint all of the time that they have not enough officers in the Navy, and we are requested to increase the number of officers. Why do we not know, so far as this emergency is concerned, how many we will have?

Mr. PAGETT. The statement was made here this afternoon. The list of retired officers is published in the Navy Register.

Mr. MANN. I know, but many of them can not possibly go to sea.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAGETT. I do not know the number, I can not tell how many out of the 900 could be assigned to active duty.

Mr. MANN. I doubt very much whether the Navy knows; but if they do we ought to know.

Mr. PAGETT. I presume the Navy does know, and I shall try to find out and give the gentleman the information in the morning.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pay of civil force: In the office of the major general commanding:

1 chief clerk, at $2,000; 1 clerk, at $1,500; 1 messenger, at $971.28.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee how many officers we have actively engaged in the Navy at this time. He said there were 900 upon the retired list.

Mr. PAGETT. There are something over 4,000 at the present time. I think it was something over 3,000, counting the line and the staff, last year, and that, if I remember correctly, the number of men of the class at Annapolis last year, and I think there were something like 150 or 160 in that graduating class.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Can the chairman give the exact number on the retired list?

Mr. PAGETT. It is published in the register, if the gentleman will look at it.

Mr. MANN. I want it in the record.

Mr. CALLAWAY. So I will not give the gentleman that. Somebody stated here this afternoon there were about 900. I have not looked it up myself.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how many of these 900 are admirals and how many admirals we have actually got engaged in active service.

Mr. PAGETT. Counting the extra numbers, there are somewhere between 25 and 33. I do not know. The gentleman can get that from the register.
Mr. CALLAWAY. Will the chairman please put in his statement in reply to this question how many rear admirals are on the retired list? If the gentleman will just turn to the Navy Register he can get it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I would rather have it from the chairman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I intended to make an inquiry about the paragraph preceding the one which has just been read. This is one of several items for pay of the civil force in the office of the major general commandant—one chief clerk at $2,000, and so forth.

Mr. PADGETT. What part is the gentleman reading from?

Mr. MANN. At the bottom of page 50 and the top of page 51. I looked around the Chamber when this item was read and wondered I did not see some member of the Committee on Appropriations make a point of order on it and claim jurisdiction. Are these employees engaged in the office of the commandant general here in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. They are in the office here in Washington, and they have always been carried in this bill.

Mr. MANN. The paymaster is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The adjutant and inspector is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. The quartermaster is in Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. These are all here in the department, but some of these are-

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Appropriations has been very energetic lately insisting upon jurisdiction over items of this character so that I am surprised they do not take charge of it now. However, it was my sympathies to these men which caused me to make this inquiry. If these employees were cared for on the legislative bill, those who draw salaries under $1,800 a year would probably get an increase, certainly would get an increase if the salaries were under $1,000. There might be some at that rate, I think there is one carried in this bill, but as it is they will get no increase of salary at all. This will be one time when the clerks will want to be carried in the legislative bill. However, they have wanted to stay in this bill, and they have stayed in this bill, and the result will be they will have to be a little more economical the next fiscal year than the other clerks under similar circumstances.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I was called out of the Hall a moment ago and just as I entered the Hall I understood the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Panmure] and other gentlemen were discussing the proposition as to how many officers were on the retired list who the Navy Department could call to the colors.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman this question: Whether or not the law now requires the Secretary of the Navy to have men who are on the retired list and yet able to do considerable work to be examined from time to time and be assigned to duty?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. COX. Now, what earthly objections could there be to such laws as that?

Mr. PADGETT. The law provides that men upon the retired list can be called into active duty and receive active pay in the case of emergency. They are subject to call in times of any emergency, upon their application, the Secretary of the Navy may assign them to duty and they receive the pay not exceeding what they received as a full-pay lieutenant commander, unless it is their own retired pay. If their own retired pay exceeds that of a lieutenant commander, they receive their own retired pay.

Mr. COX. Now, if the gentleman will yield further. Evidently there is some necessity, for the gentleman from Virginia in the last year's Army reorganization bill reported in the bill this provision, except in the Army bill it applied to Army officers only. If the retired list is incorporated into a law, it would apply to officers of the Navy on the retired list.

That the Secretary of the Navy shall make a list of all officers who have been placed on the retired list for disability and shall cause such officers to be examined at any place designated by the Secretary as may be advisable, and such officers as shall be found to have recovered from such disability or to be able to perform service of value to the Government, shall be assigned to such duty as the Secretary of the Navy may approve.

Now, will the gentleman explain what earthly objection there would or could be to incorporating a provision like that in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think there is any necessity for it. It is getting along very well.

Mr. COX. I do not know whether it is getting along very well or not. We are appropriating money here.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I can not yield now.

In response to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Callaway], who made the inquiry a moment ago, I have gone to the Navy Yearbook, and I want to put some figures in the Record here. There are men on the retired list of the Navy Department—captains, average age 55, 16; commanders, with an average of 50, 19; lieutenants, with an average of age 45, 25; lieutenants, 27; lieutenants, 27. There are men on the retired list and where they are able to do some work in private employment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to a question? Why is it that a person of 45 years of age is put on the retired list?

Mr. COX. You can search me. I do not know why. I can point out to the gentleman here in the city of Washington a man on the retired list, a graduate at Annapolis, who is now drawing $3,000 a year in the active practice of medicine, and there is another man, a graduate of Annapolis, who is now drawing $3,000, retired pay, and at the same time drawing a salary from the Government of about $1,400 a year in the United States Subtreasury at Philadelphia. If I had time I could enumerate case after case like that.

Mr. COX. Yes; and they get well mighty quick after being placed on the retired list. They are able to do a good day's work in private employment.

Mr. TALBOTT. These people are not placed on the retired list until after they are examined.

Mr. COX. Yes; and they get well mighty quick after being placed on the retired list. They are able to do a good day's work in private employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. TALBOTT. These people are not placed on the retired list until after they are examined.

Mr. COX. Yes; and they get well mighty quick after being placed on the retired list. They are able to do a good day's work in private employment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. On the retired list.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. TALBOTT. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects,
Mr. STAFFORD. I do not like to have that compliment paid to me and to be asked to address a committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not want to slight the gentleman. I simply want to get through with this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in connection with the retention of these clerks included in this appropriation bill. I realize, and everybody else realizes, that it is in consonance with good legislative practice to have all the clerks in the departments here in Washington included in one bill. It is the only method that can be pursued in order to deal fairly and equitably with all concerned. I think it would be even better in the interest of good parliamentary procedure and for legislative convenience if the clerks for the Agricultural Bureau, with the department included within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Last year it was brought to our attention during the consideration of the Army appropriation bill that there were some departmental clerks in connection with the office of the Secretary of State that are utilized here in Washington.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was some understanding that they should be included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. We attempted that this year, not with a definite appropriation, but with the sole purpose of having one rule applicable to all the clerks in the department. But when we did that this year the Committee on Military Affairs strongly recommended that policy and came into the House and objected for their inclusion, and, on a fine technical parliamentary point, they were eliminated from the bill.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Naval Committee whether there is any difficulty in having these clerks connected with the departmental offices here in Washington included in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman in reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] before the gentleman replies, that I think we have all the arguments they bad. These arguments are of the same character. The same difficulty that you have is applicable to all the clerks in the department. But when we did that this year the Committee on Military Affairs strongly recommended that policy and came into the House and objected for their inclusion, and, on a fine technical parliamentary point, they were eliminated from the bill.

I would like to inquire of the chairman of the Naval Committee whether there is any difficulty in having these clerks connected with the departmental offices here in Washington included in the naval appropriation bill?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not. I think they ought to be under the control of the Naval Committee and in the naval bill, because they perform naval service, and they are under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, and therefore in the offices performing largely naval service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Wherein are they more under the naval officers than the clerks carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill?

Mr. PADGETT. These are of the same character. I do not want to put them up just alike. Mr. MANN. Have they not learned yet how to construct barracks without making new plans for them?

Mr. STAFFORD. They need the man there, and this man was a railroad man, and they have had him for ten years.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly he is a competent man, but have they not discovered yet how to construct ordinary barracks without requiring new plans each time they put up a little building?

Mr. PADGETT. They do not always put them up just alike.

Mr. MANN. Why do they not?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because the necessities are different. Mr. STAFFORD. In Nicaragua they may require a building slightly different from a building up in Alaska, but I should think by this time they would have all types. These are not elaborate buildings, or they ought not to be, when they are constructed for the benefit of a few officers, and I doubt even then whether they ought to be very elaborate.

Mr. PADGETT. The barracks are for the accommodation of the men, and they are built for the accommodation of 500 marines.

Mr. MANN. The barracks accommodate both men and officers.

Mr. PADGETT. I know, but they are the barracks we build for the enlisted men, with a capacity to accommodate 500 men, and that is what we have been providing.

Mr. MANN. Certainly by this time they must have discovered types of buildings, and they must have plans and specifications for them so that the case anyhow, or they could not get along with only one draftsman.

Mr. PADGETT. This is the only draftsman they have in the Marine Corps, and they certainly need one. He is a very valuable man.

Mr. MANN. I think they need that many for ornament, so I withdrew the point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the point of order. Do I understand that the committee advanced this man's salary $400 to the maximum that he could obtain in private employment, and that was the only reason for advancing this salary more than any other advancement carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. It was represented to us that he was worth it, that he was a valuable man, and that he had been offered $2,200, and the Marine Corps did not want to lose him.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLEY]. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLEY] objects to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, another department of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that only strengthens my position. I think the Bureau of Yards and Docks has more need for draftsman of this capacity than the Marine Corps. Therefore I make the point of order.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order against the figures $2,200, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Did the gentleman say that he would not object to $2,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. Upon the information furnished by the gentleman from Michigan that this man is really needed in another branch of the service, I will insist on having it $1,800.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting the figure $1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 9, insert the figure $1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the assistant quartermaster, Philadelphia, Pa.: One chief clerk, at $1,860; one messenger, at $440.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman a question. Why do you allow a messenger a $540 for Philadelphia and not one at San Francisco?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know just the work that is required there. This is not a new item. At Philadelphia they have a larger establishment, and they manufacture outfits under the Marine Corps.

Mr. SEARS. At San Francisco they have a chief clerk with no messenger, but at Philadelphia they have a chief clerk with a messenger.

Mr. PADGETT. They do not need one at San Francisco.

Mr. SEARS. The chief clerk at Philadelphia has a messenger, and the chief clerk at San Francisco has not, and they both have the same pay.

Mr. PADGETT. The work at San Francisco is not of so diversified a character.

Mr. SEARS. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, pay Marine Corps, $7,133,027.78.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction of $400 in that total. The Clerk has heretofore been given authority to change the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the Clerk has been given authority by the committee to correct the totals.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provisions, Marine Corps: For noncommissioned officers, musicians, and privates of volunteer regiments, detachments of officers, and messengers of board and lodging of applicants for enlistment while held under observation, recruits, recruiting parties, and enlisted men where it is impracticable to supply ordinary subsistence, or in lieu of board, commutation of rations to recruiting parties; transportation of provisions, and the employment of necessary labor connected therewith; ice machines and their maintenance where required for the health and comfort of the troops; and for offices and preservation of rations, $1,676,000.

Hereafter no law shall be construed to entitle enlisted men to any commutation therefor other than such as are now or may hereafter be allowed enlisted men in the Army. Provided, That when it is impracticable or the expense is found greater to supply provisions on shore duty in the island possessions and on foreign stations with the Army ration, such men may be allowed the Navy ration or commutation therefor.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. This paragraph carries an appropriation for food or provisions, commutation of rations, and so forth. Is the gentleman from Tennessee able to tell the House the various places outside of the United States where the Marine Corps is now in service?

Mr. PADGETT. At Haiti, San Domingo, Nicaragua, some in the Philippines, some in Guam, some in Hawaii, some in Alaska, and a few in China.

Mr. MANN. Any other foreign countries that the gentleman now recalls?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall any at this minute.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman recall how many are in Nicaragua or Haiti or San Domingo?

Mr. PADGETT. Quite a number in Haiti and San Domingo, but not so many in Nicaragua.

Mr. MANN. Any enlisted men in Haiti or San Domingo?

Mr. PADGETT. Quite a number.

Mr. MANN. We gave authority for the officers to recruit a local force there.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but there are quite a number of enlisted men there in addition to those provided in the legislation that the gentleman refers to, to form a constabulary.

Mr. MANN. If I may judge from current reports, the Marine Corps and the officials are doing excellent service?

Mr. PADGETT. It is so reported, and I have noticed in the press that they are rendering magnificent service.

Mr. MANN. As to Nicaragua, I do not feel quite so sure about it.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not much information about that.

Mr. MANN. In one South American State they had a revolution the other day. Which one was that?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not recall, they come so often.

Mr. MANN. I think it was in one of the States along next to Nicaragua, probably the result of our course in Nicaragua. We have not sent the marines into Costa Rica to restore the Government there that was thrown out? Not yet, as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard of any.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order. Does not the gentleman think it is time for the President to Pick? Mr. PADGETT. I would like to have the Clerk read a few more pages, down to the increase of the Navy.

Mr. MANN. We can easily finish the bill to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. We want to finish the bill and then pass the pension appropriation bill to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. I think it will be hardly possible to do that.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

The following Members were given leave to extend their remarks in the Record: Mr. SEARS, Mr. TAGUE, Mr. FESS, and Mr. MOON.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having assumed the chair, Mr. Page of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 26632, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GALLIVAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for four days, on account of attending the obsequies of a friend.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ALLEGHENY RIVER, CATAWABAS COUNTY, N. Y.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed House bill 1928, a bridge bill, where an identical Senate bill (S. 73) had previously passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which we passed the House bill, and then I will ask the House to agree to a resolution to recall the bill from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill H. R. 1928 was passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. And I ask to have the resolution passed recalling the bill.

The SPEAKER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed House bill 1928, a bridge bill, where an identical Senate bill (S. 73) had previously passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which we passed the House bill, and then I will ask the House to agree to a resolution to recall the bill from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill H. R. 1928 was passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. And I ask to have the resolution passed recalling the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River in the town of Alleghany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 1061. An act to allow additional entries under the enlarged-head deed act;

S. 2222. An act for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard;

S. 5663. An act for the relief of Aquila Nebere;

S. 5293. An act for the relief of Gardner L. Eastman;

S. 1533. An act for the relief of Peter Kennedy; and

S. 3743. An act to reimburse John Simpson.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported the following bill they have presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following joint resolution and bills:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution authorizing the National Society United States Daughters of Eighteen Hundred and Twelve to file its historical material in the Smithsonian Institution and to make annual reports to the secretary thereof;

H. R. 1099. An act for the relief of S. L. Burgard;

H. R. 6732. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings;

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report upon the bill H. R. 18453, the Indian appropriation bill, for printing under the rules.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1448).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to the Houses of Congress as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment numbered 30 and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same as an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided that the Secretary of the Interior shall be authorized to make such surveys or resurveys as may be necessary to complete said investigation and report;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided, That $5,000 of the above amount shall be used for an investigation and report on the merits of the claim of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon to additional land arising from alleged erroneous surveys of the north and west boundaries of their reservation as defined in the treaty concluded May 26, 1855 (12 Stats. L. p. 963), and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such survey or surveys as may be necessary to complete said investigation and report;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,000,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, $400,000: Provided, That of this amount $200,000 may be expended for the acquisition of the entire water right and right of way across the lands of private individuals, for the purpose of running a pipe line from a certain spring or spring water or springs near the Sioux Indian Agency buildings in South Dakota, to said buildings, the purchase of such water right to include sufficient land for the construction of a small cement reservoir near such spring or springs for the purpose of storing water required. Provided further, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service who are furnished quarters necessary heat and light for such quantity of fuel, charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: And provided further, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum authorized for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "$475,000, of which sum not less than $75,000 shall be used for the employment of additional field matrons;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided, That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert "$50,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "$400,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$75,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment numbered 24 and the following language appearing in lines 10 to 14, inclusive, on page 19 of the bill: "That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall have the power to authorize any superintendent, clerk, or other employee in the Indian field service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties." And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment proposed, after the word "Interior," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "reimbursable to the United States, there first placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in Arizona, to remain a charge and lien upon the lands and funds of said tribe of Indians until paid;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "That section 3 of the act of January 12, 1801 (28 Stat. L. p. 712), entitled "An act for the relief of Mission Indians in the State of California," be, and the same is hereby, amended, so as to change the words "said the President" to the words "the President shall deem it for the interests of the Indians affected thereby, to extend the trust period for such time as may be advisable to the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Indians of the State of California;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "IOWA:"

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay to the enrolled members of the Sioux Tribe of the Mission Indians of the State of Iowa, entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, the sum of $10,384.96, together
with the interest which has or may hereafter accrue thereon, remaining in the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the State of Iowa, from the sum of $42,982.23 transferred to the credit of those Indians under the provisions of the act of June 2, 1860, of $10,284.90 to be apportioned per capita among the enrolled members of said tribe.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 of the amendment strike out the following: "for setting out trees, $500;" and in line 7 of the amendment strike out the figures "$74,177;" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$74,675;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the word "on" after the word "bridge" and insert the following: "across the Mississippi River on the;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the amendment, after the word "services," strike out the words "unreimbursable under the act of June 2, 1860;" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "heretofore erroneously stricken from the rolls and reinstated prior to the passage of this act;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "Washington," in lines 21 and 22 of the amendment, insert the following: in line 21, "in lieu of the figures "$52,100," and in line 22, "in lieu thereof insert the figures "$52,490;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the following: "in all, $3,000;" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "in all, $3,000, for payment of the expenses of the简直就是; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the amendment strike out the figures "$52,100," and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$52,490;" and in line 2 of the amendment strike out the figures "$50,100," and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$50,490;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the figures "$90,100," and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$90,490;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "For the construction of a steel bridge across the San Juan River in the territory of New Mexico, at the best and most available location west or southwest and near to the town of Farmington, in said county and State, $25,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and to be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed in the Treasury to the credit of the Navajo Indians in the State of New Mexico."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "That the sum of $3,000, to be immediately available, be and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any funds of the Chickasaw Nation, not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Douglas H. Johnston, governor of the Chickasaw Nation, for extraordinary expenses incurred in the performance of his duty as chief executive of the Chickasaw Nation and principal chief of the Chickasaw Tribe of Indians during the period covered between the years 1907 and 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make such payment from the funds of said Nation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of the proposed amendment, after the word "Congress," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay each and every duly enrolled citizen of the Creek Nation who has not been allotted land in said nation and who is not included in Senate Document No. 478, Sixty-third Congress, second session, the sum of $84,191, for the allotment of land in said nation. Said sum of $84,191 to be paid to each and every person out of the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Muskegon Creek Nation; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of the amendment strike out the following: "$40,000;" and in line 8, "$162,200;" and insert "$30,000;" in all, "$152,200;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 12 of the amendment, after the word "prescribe," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That the application of this provision shall not interfere with any rights guaranteed by treaty to any allotted Umataki Indian or Indians;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following: "Sec. 21. For support and education of 365 Indian pupils at the Indian boarding school of the Chickasaw Nation, $82,955; for general repairs and improvements, $8,000; for new barn, $3,000; in all, $87,955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Sec. 26. That until the meeting of the Sixty-fifth Congress, those members of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives, not less than five in number, who are Members elect to the Sixty-fifth Congress, are authorized to conduct hearings and investigate the conduct of the Indian Service, at Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, and the sum of $15,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available and remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated for expenses incident thereto. The said committee is hereby authorized and empowered to examine into the conduct and management of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all its branches and agencies, for the purpose of determining the need for, and the advisability of, any new legislation, to examine all books, documents, and papers in the said Bureau of Indian Affairs, its branches or agencies, relating to the administration of the business of said bureau, and shall have and is hereby granted authority to subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, administer oaths, and to demand any and all books, documents and papers of whatever nature relating to the affairs of Indians as conducted by said bureau, its branches and agencies. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance, including stenographers, as said committee may deem necessary in the proper prosecution of its work: Provided, That no stenographers be paid for their services exceeding $1 per printed page."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 48, 50, 95, and 111.

Jno. H. STEPHENS, C. D. CARTER, H. L. MYERS, Managers on the part of the House.

H. M. ASHURST, D. C. CARTER, Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The bill as it passed the House carries appropriations as follows:

**Gratuity**

7,152,808.67

**Treaty and funds available**

845,300.00

**Total**

16,995,506.67
The bill as it passed the Senate carried appropriations as follows:

- **Gratuity**
  - Total: $8,305,146.67

- **Reimbursable**
  - Total: $3,157,906.09

**Treaty**

**Total**: $11,326,052.76

The bill as agreed upon in conference carries appropriations as follows:

- **Gratuity**
  - Total: $7,778,176.67

- **Reimbursable**
  - Total: $2,963,506.09

- **Treaty**
  - Total: $348,390.00

**Total**: $11,121,672.76

The above figures do not include amendments Nos. 90, 95, 112, which are in disagreement.

The estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, were $12,280,556.67. The bill as agreed upon in conference, exclusive of the amendments above enumerated on which there is a disagreement, is $701,320 less than the estimates of the department and $866,071 less than the bill carried when it passed the Senate.

The Senate conferees have receded on the following amendments: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 51 in per diem expenses when actually employed on duty in 17, 1892, as follows:

- **No. 15**: Provides for three warehouses in the Indian Service instead of two permanent warehouses in last year's law.

- **No. 17**: Makes $5,000 of the $135,000 appropriation for general expenses of the Indian Service immediately available.

- **No. 41**: Permits the six Indian Service inspectors an increase of $1 in per diem expenses when actually employed on duty in the field.

- **No. 23**: Requires land purchased by the United States for daily school or other administrative purposes to be sold to the highest bidder when any sale is made as contemplated by the law.

- **No. 25**: Amends the act of March 11, 1904, so as to permit of temporary rights of way for pipe lines across Indian lands for the purpose of transportation of oil and gas.

- **No. 37**: Provides for the erection of a new school at the Fort Bidwell Indian school, California, and appropriates $12,000 therefor; also corrects the totals.

- **No. 41**: Removes the requirement of the act of June 17, 1892, on the Klamath Indian Reservation for the purpose of the road service.

- **No. 43**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 44**: Grants an increase of $2,000 for general repairs and improvements at the Indian school, Kickapoos Reservation, Kansas.

- **No. 45**: Appropriates $8,000 for the purchase of additional land at the Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich.

- **No. 47**: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to accept the application of Richard Daley to enter 14 acres of land as assigned by Evangeline Gallagher, and to issue patent to Daley on his complying with the requirements of the law relative to making soldiers' additional homestead entries.

- **No. 52**: Amends the act of March 11, 1904, for showing the quantum of Indian blood in the roll that is being prepared of Chippewa Indians.

- **No. 53**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 54**: Does not increase the appropriation, but provides that $1,000 may be used for the purchase of two automobiles at the Flathead Indian Reservation, Montana.

- **No. 65**: Increases the appropriation to the amount estimated by the Department of the Interior for the irrigation systems on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Montana.

- **No. 57**: Increases the appropriation for the support and civilization of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewa Indians in Montana.

- **No. 59**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 61**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 64**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 67**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 68**: Corrects the section number. Also, provides for 10 additional pupils, an assembly hall and gymnasium, and additional land for a school at the Indian school, Cherokee, N.C., in accordance with the department estimates.

- **No. 69**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 70**: Provides for the construction and equipment of a gymnasium building at the Fort Totten Indian School, North Dakota.

- **No. 71**: Provides for an assembly hall and employees' cottages at the Wahpeton School, North Dakota, in accordance with the department estimates.

- **No. 72**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 73**: Provides that Osage County, Okla., shall be deemed Indian country within the meaning of acts of Congress making it unlawful to introduce intoxicating liquors into Indian country.

- **No. 77**: Provides for a reappraisal of Osage County, Okla., and appropriates $5,000 from tribal funds for such purpose.

- **No. 78**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 79**: Provides that the city of Tishomingo, Okla., shall convey sites for the dormitories for the Murray State School of Agriculture by fee-simple title.

- **No. 81**: Provides for the payment of M. L. Mott, formerly national attorney for the Creek Nation of Indians, for expenses incurred during the period January 15 to February 8, 1914, when his successor was appointed.

- **No. 83**: Reinstates the act of Congress by fee-simple title.

- **No. 85**: Provides that the Department of Agriculture by fee-simple title.

- **No. 86**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 87**: Appropriates $7,500 for the repair and improvement of the road from Canton, S. Dak., to the insane asylum for Indians at that place.

- **No. 88**: Provides that the Department of Agriculture by fee-simple title.

- **No. 90**: Provides for the purchase of tracts of land on the Columbia River, Ore., as fishing grounds for the Oregon Indians, and appropriates $5,000 therefor.

- **No. 91**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 94**: Merely corrects the language.

- **No. 97**: Appropriates $5,000 for the repair and improvement of the road from Canton, S. Dak., to the insane asylum for Indians at that place.

- **No. 98**: Provides that the Department of Agriculture by fee-simple title.

- **No. 101**: Provides that certain patents issued to certain Indians as fee simple patents under the homestead act of May 20, 1862, be ratified and confirmed as of the dates of their issuance.

- **No. 102**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 104**: Appropriates $1,500 for the purchase of a storage battery at the Indian school, Tushar, Wis.

- **No. 105**: Corrects the totals to correspond with amendment No. 104.

- **No. 107**: Amends the House provision authorizing the Department of the Interior to withdraw $300,000 of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin to purchase timberlands of the Indian Bureau that the lands are more valuable for agricultural purposes than for the preservation of the timber growing on the land. Also the amendment provides for a per capita payment, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, of $50 to each member of the Menominee Tribe.

- **No. 108**: Corrects the section number.

- **No. 109**: Increases the appropriation for the irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyoming, and indicates that part completed ditches or canals on the reservation where the work shall be completed. The amendment also appropriates $5,000 additional for the purpose of making further surveys and examinations relative to the irrigation of the conditionally ceded lands on the reservation.

- **No. 109**: Amends the House provisions of the amendment with modifying or substitute amendments: 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 22, 24, 32, 35, 40, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 60, 63, 66, 84, 85, 87, 90, 92, 93, 110.

- **No. 110**: Increases the appropriation for the irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyoming, and indicates that part completed ditches or canals on the reservation where the work shall be completed. The amendment also appropriates $5,000 additional for the purpose of making further surveys and examinations relative to the irrigation of the conditionally ceded lands on the reservation.

- **No. 112**: Amends the House provisions of the amendment with modifying or substitute amendments: 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 22, 24, 32, 35, 40, 42, 46, 49, 50, 51, 60, 63, 66, 84, 85, 87, 90, 92, 93, 110.
On No. 9: Decreases the amount allowed by the Senate for the support of the Indian day and industrial schools from $1,550,000 to $1,600,000.

On No. 10: Decreases the amount allowed by the Senate for the construction, lease, and repair of school and agency buildings from $260,000 to $250,000, and restores two provisions as estimated for by the department.

On No. 11: Provides that when expenses for transportation and collection of pupils have been refunded that they shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid.

On No. 12: Decreases the appropriation for industrial work among the Indians from $500,000, as it passed the Senate, to $475,000, and provides that $75,000 of this amount shall be used in the employment of additional field matrons.

On No. 16: Decreases the appropriation for pay of judges of Indian courts from $10,000 to $8,000 and provides that no part of this money shall be expended for any judge for the Pueblo Indians in New Mexico.

On No. 19: Decreases the appropriation for industry and self-support among the Indians from $450,000, as it passed the Senate, to $400,000.

On No. 22: Decreases the appropriation for reimbursing Indians for loss of stock infected with dourine and other contagions from $100,000, as it passed the Senate, to $75,000, and provides that the same shall be immediately available and remain in available until expended.

On No. 24: Strikes out both the Senate and House provisions authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to empower any employee of the Indian Service to take judicious inferences in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties.

On No. 32: Provides that the appropriation for the construction of two bridges near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., shall be reimbursable from any funds now or hereafter placed to the credit of the Navajo Tribe of Indians in the Treasury of the United States.

On No. 35: Decreases the appropriation for the purchase of lands for homeless Indians in California from $25,000, as it passed the Senate, to $20,000.

On No. 40: Authorizes an amendment to the act of January 12, 1891, so as to enable the President to extend the trust period on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands of Indians in California.

On No. 42: Directs the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to make a per capita payment to the enrolled members of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of Indians in Iowa.

On No. 46: Authorizes certain expenditures for the support and education of 75 Indians at the Indian school, Pipestone, Minn., including a domestic-science cottage, an addition to the hospital, a central heating plant, and for road and drainage, and decreases the total appropriation for this school from $75,175, as it passed the Senate, to $74,675.

On No. 49: Authorizes the expenditure of $5,000 of the funds of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River, Cass Lake Reservation, Minn., upon condition that Congress shall hereafter appropriate $10,000 to be contributed to the Forestry Service, and that the State of Minnesota, or the local Minnesota authorities, shall also contribute $10,000 for the construction of such bridge.

On No. 50: Authorizes the payment from Chippewa Indian funds to persons whose names had been erroneously stricken from the rolls of the Chippewa Indians and had been reinstated prior to the passage of this act.

On No. 52: Appropriates $8,000 of the funds of the Chippewa Indians for the expenses of the general council of such tribe to be held at Bemidji, Minn., and also the necessary expenses of delegations of Chippewa Indians when attending to the business of the tribe in Washington, D. C.; also authorizes a special agent of the Interior Department to attend future meetings of the council.

On No. 60: Authorizes the erection of a steel water tank and employees' quarters at the Indian school at Genoa, Nebr., and decreases the appropriation for the school from $129,920, as it passed the Senate, to $88,320.

On No. 62: Decreases the appropriation for the school at Carson, Nebr., from $90,146, as it passed the Senate, to $87,430, this decrease being necessary by the action of the Senate in conferees in reeding from Senate amendment No. 62.

On No. 63: Decreases the appropriation of the Senate amendment appropriating $25,000, reimbursable, for the construction of a steel bridge across the San Juan River in San Juan County, N. Mex., which bridge was shown to be badly needed by the Indians.

On No. 84: Changes the wording of the amendment appropriating $5,000 from the funds of the Chickasaw Nation of Indians for the purpose of reimbursing Douglas H. Johnston, governor and principal chief of the Chickasaw Indians, for extra expenses incurred in the performance of his duties, as such governor and principal chief between the years 1907 and 1912.

On No. 85: Provides that hereafter no allotments shall be made to members of the Creek Nation without specific authority of Congress, and authorizes the Secretary to pay to the enrolled members of the Creek Nation who have not as yet received an allotment of lands $1,940 each in lieu of an allotment, said payments to be made from the funds of the Muskogee Creek Nation of Indians.

On No. 87: Reduces the appropriation for the construction of buildings at the Indian school, Salem, Oreg., from $40,000, as it passed the Senate, to $30,000, and corrects the total to correspond.

On No. 90: Authorizes an allotment of not exceeding 80 acres to each Umatilla Indian residing on the Umatilla Reservation, Oreg., who has not been allotted but who has allotment rights on the reservation, so long as the lands remain available for such purpose, and authorizes the issuance of trust patents for the selections so made. Also provides that the application of amendment shall not interfere with rights of the Umatilla Indians as guaranteed by treaty.

On No. 92: Corrects the section number and reinstates the House provision.

On No. 93: Strikes out the specific appropriation of $900 for two busses at the Indian school, Pierre, S. Dak., and provides that such busses may be purchased from the appropriation for the support and education of the Indians at this school. Also decreases the appropriation for this school from $54,650, as it passed the Senate, to $53,750.

On No. 110: Restores the House language providing for an investigation by the members elected of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, makes the appropriation immediately available and to remain available until expended; also gives the committee authority to examine all books, documents, and papers of the Indian Service, to subpoena and compel the attendance and administer oaths to witnesses, and to employ such clerks and other assistance, including stenographers, as may be necessary for the proper prosecution of its work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks upon the naval bill. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on national prohibition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the subject of the necessity for a forest reserve at the headwaters of the Red River, in Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Ransom upon the Senate amendment to the legislative bill to place postmasters under the civil service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Ransom upon the rising cost of living.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 10, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for con-
PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 20838) to donate certain condemned cannon and cannon balls to the city of Ironton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20830) to donate certain condemned cannon and cannon balls to the city of Gallup, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 20840) providing for the construction of a public building at Binghamton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 20841) for the reclamation of the Salt River on the Salt River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 20842) providing for the registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 20843) to authorize a report upon the necessity for the construction of a bridge across the Salt River on the Salt River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 20844) to establish a United States commission of mediation and conciliation for the purpose of investigating the relations between railroads and their employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SARATH: Resolution (H. Res. 490) providing for telephone service at Capitol after March 31, 1917; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. CALLAWAY (by request): Resolution (H. Res. 492) providing for a referendum vote on a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Resolution (H. Res. 493) requesting certain information of the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) to authorize the printing of 10,000 copies of the immigration law (Public, No. 301), Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting suffrage to women; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring amending the Constitution of the United States so that the President may veto single items in appropriation bills; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, urging the appropriation of $3,000,000 for a naval base upon the Columbia River in Oregon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the reclamation of arid and swamp lands in the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the improvement of Crescent City Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the loaning of a portion of the funds of the postal savings bank directly to public-school districts; to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the holding of a congress of States to consider the sources of revenue with the object of segregation of State and Federal revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the appropriation of money for the hydrographical work on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the lowering of water level of Lower Little Kimnath Lake; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction of a military highway along the north bank of the Columbia River, between Fort Canby and Fort Vanport; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging the appropriation of $2,612.60 by the United States to reimburse the State of Washington for expenditures in connection with the mobilization of the Washington National Guard; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction and maintenance of military highways along the Pacific coast from the Canadian border to the Mexican border; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, declaring the loyalty of the people of Connecticut to the Government of the United States in the present international crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby the President shall be authorized to disapprove of any items of a bill making an appropriation of money; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SINNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon favoring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the President to disapprove of any items of a bill making appropriations of money; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 20845) granting an increase of pension to William H. Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20846) granting an increase of pension to Adam Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 20847) granting a pension to Leon L. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 20848) for the relief of Mary White, widow of Benjamin White, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 20849) granting an increase of pension to James Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FEISS: A bill (H. R. 20850) to correct the military record of Frederick Colburn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 20851) granting an increase of pension to George Gannell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20852) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20853) for the relief of R. M. Blount; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTH: A bill (H. R. 20854) granting an increase of pension to John Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 20855) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20856) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Waldrep; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20857) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Jennings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBET: A bill (H. R. 20858) granting an increase of pension to John F. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 20859) to relinquish, release, and quitclaim all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 20860) granting an increase of pension to John E. Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.
PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's table and referred to the committees as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of citizens of Framingham, Mass., asking Congress to submit suffrage amendment to the State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Local Union No. 1347, of Pennsylvania, favoring embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Scranton (Pa.) Supply & Machinery Co., favoring amending section 5 of House bill S834; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of John Schuette, of Manistowoc, Wis., relative to inviting all warning and neutral nations to a conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred K. Myer, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 20090, migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, against tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry farmers in the State of Wisconsin, relative to advancement in price of hides twine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to discontinuance of the package-freight business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Berden's Condensed Milk Co., of Belvidere, III., against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, relative to raising funds for the relief of the bum babies and their families; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANK: Petition of members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Old Middlesex Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, indorsing compulsory military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Local Union 1772 of the United Mine Workers of America, of Palsades, Colo., urging placing an embargo on coal products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College relative to the United States taking its part in a league of nations to prevent future wars, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Miss Luella Meloy and 48 other members of the Pennsylvania College for Women, of Pittsburgh, Pa., with a motion to the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORDAN: Petition of 700 citizens of the State of New York, favoring the Fitzgerald bill for an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition of 28 citizens of Dillwyn and Christian Endeavor people of Coldwater, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring any fair and equitable taxation necessary to the protection of American lives and property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.


By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., affirming its devotion to the program of preparedness and opposing taxation of excess profits of corporations and cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Fred K. Myer, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring passage of House bill 20090, migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Local Union 1772 of the United Mine Workers of America, of Palsades, Colo., urging placing an embargo on coal products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Old Middlesex Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, indorsing compulsory military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Local Union 1772 of the United Mine Workers of America, of Palsades, Colo., urging placing an embargo on coal products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Papers relating to House bill 20670, for increase of pension for James Mackall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of ex-confederate soldiers of Simpson County, Ky., for a refund of the cotton tax imposed by the Government during the Civil War; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of Old Middlesex Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring compulsory military training in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of C. W. Ellington and other citizens of Velva, Bismarck, N. Dak., opposing any policies, etc., tending to war, etc., with foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 400 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people of Holyoke, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.


By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Local Union 1772 of the United Mine Workers of America, of Palsades, Colo., urging placing an embargo on coal products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College relative to the United States taking its part in a league of nations to prevent future wars; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of 400 Woman's Christian Temperance Union people of Holyoke, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of C. W. Ellington and other citizens of Velva, Bismarck, N. Dak., opposing any policies, etc., tending to war, etc., with foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.