By Mr. SHOOTE: 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. Wynn, Caroline W. Davis, Alice E. Streng, 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. Emerly, 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: Petition of citizens of North Dakota: Petition of citizens of Hubron, Wis., 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.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS.

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

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 elected and qualified as Senator from said State to represent said State 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 MATTSON,
Secretary of State.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. BRADY.

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:


Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Cough] 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 appropriation bill is before the Senate.

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 74, line 12.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health department," on page 74, line 22, after "$1,200," to insert "serologist, $2,500; scientific assistant, $1,200," and on page 72, line 2, after the words "in all," to strike out "$7,490.40" and insert "$7,740.40" so as to make the clause read:

"Health officer, $4,000; assistant health officer, $2,500; chief physician and deputy health officer, $3,000; chief of all medical staffs, $1,200; assistant chief $800; medical inspectors—1, $1,000 each, 2 at $1,000 each, 3 at $900 each, 4 at $800 each, 5 at $700 each; sanitary inspectors—chief, $1,800; assistant chief, $1,400, 8 at $1,200 each, 2 at $1,000 each, 3 at $900 each; food inspectors—chief, $1,600; assistant chief, $1,400, 5 at $1,200 each, 5 at $1,000 each, 5 at $900 each, 5 at $800 each; chemist, $2,000; scientific assistant, $1,200; assistant bacteriologist, $1,200; serologist, $2,500; scientific assistant, $1,200; skilled laborers—1, $720; 2, $600; 2 messengers at $800 each; driver, $500; mechanical, $1,400; 6 at $500 each, 2 at $400 each, in all, $7,740.40.

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 "$7,000" and insert "$8,500;" and in line 20, after the words "in all," to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$11,500," 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 so 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 1, square 26, 1911, now occupied as building for 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 therefore, for said District of Columbia, the 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, $4,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 "$7,550," 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; court-probation officer, $1,800; assistant probation officer, $1,000; contingent expenses, $550; in all, $7,550.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. On page 78, lines 24 and 25, I moved to strike out the words "Hancock for the Insane" and insert "St. Elizabeth's Hospital." That was the name of the hospital by law. It was a mistake to put in the other name.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Interest and sinking fund," on page 80, line 9, after "$975,405," 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 revenues of the government in the Treasury, otherwise appropriated, $975,405.

"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."

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

Mr. SHOOTE. Just one word, Mr. President. This amendment provides for and after any other appropriations 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 appropriation 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 hereinafter referred to has not been expended, but that it lies unexpended in the Treasury. All 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. SMITH of Maryland. In reply to that, I wish to suggest that the amendment was agreed to.

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. SMITH of Maryland. If there is any impolitic language in the amendment or if the amendment requires any further amendment, we shall take the matter up in the conference committee and arrange it there. I entirely agree with the Senator from Utah that if there is any balance it ought to go to the credit of the District, and we shall endeavor to so provide.

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

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes. That is the first year.

Mr. SMOOT. That was not the first year.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If there is any impolitic language in the amendment of the committee, or if the amendment requires any further amendment, we shall take the matter up in the conference committee and arrange it there. I entirely agree with the Senator from Utah that if there is any balance it ought to go to the credit of the District, and we shall endeavor to so provide.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. 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 $450 per annum, $3,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Charities and correction," on page 83, after line 2, 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 as follows:

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 word "Board of Charities," to strike out "$20,000," and insert "$20,000," so as to make the clause as follows:

For emergency care and treatment of, and free dispensary service to, indigent patients under a contract or agreement to be made with Columbia Dispensary and Emergency Hospital by the Board of Charities, $26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 1, to insert: Gallinger Municipal Hospital: Toward the construction of the Gallinger Municipal Hospital, including grading of the site, to be located on Rock Creek Road, N. W., in accordance with plans and specifications prepared under the authority contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1971, $150,000, and the limit of cost of the construction of said hospital and accommodations thereof is hereby fixed at $300,000. Said hospital shall be constructed with a view to making such future additions as the exigencies may require, and the work herein authorized shall be so constructed as to permit the same to be used by the District of Columbia, $150,000, and the limit of cost of the construction of said hospital and accommodations thereof is hereby fixed at $300,000. Said hospital shall be constructed with a view to making such future additions as the exigencies may require, and the work herein authorized shall be so constructed as to permit the same to be used by the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 25, after the word "officers," to strike out "1, $1,200," and insert "2 at $1,300 each," so as to make the clause read:

For agents, $1,800; clerks—1, $1,200, 1, $900, 1, $720; planning and inspecting officers—2 at $1,500 each; record clerk, $900; messenger, $300; in all, $16,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 1, after the word "$1,000," to strike out "7," and insert "8," 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 Military District of Columbia may put 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 now known as 230 First Street NW., now occupied as an armory for mounted and other troops, at an annual rental of $3,600, 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:

That the said commanding general may put 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 now known as 230 First Street NW., now occupied as an armory for mounted and other troops, at an annual rental of $3,600, 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:

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it will be remembered by some that this building, the Gallinger Municipal Hospital, including grading of the site, to be located on Rock Creek Road, N. W., in accordance with plans and specifications prepared under the authority contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1971, $150,000, and the limit of cost of the construction of said hospital and accommodations thereof is hereby fixed at $300,000. Said hospital shall be constructed with a view to making such future additions as the exigencies may require, and the work herein authorized shall be so constructed as to permit the same to be used by the District of Columbia.
over seven years to complete this improvement, in addition to the time which has already expired; and which makes an appeal, giving the Secretary of War to settle the event that it will be necessary during the current year, to have $400,000 inserted in place of $300,000.

I will ask the committee if it sees any reason why the United States should not go to the Secretary of War.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. As I understand, this 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. Mr. President, in this connection I ask permission to insert a statement prepared by my friend Mr. Finger, 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 estimates submitted by this office, which has charge of this improvement, for work during the fiscal year 1918 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dredging</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining walls, including foundations</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trench and embankments</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications of bridges</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases of materials, pipe, valves</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of property and upkeep of floating plant</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, including stump work, Engineering, clerical, office rent, and contingencies</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $400,000

This estimate was communicated by the War Department to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia unchanged, but was, I am informed, reduced by the commissioners to $300,000 when their estimates were presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

The increased figure of the annual estimate for this work may be briefly explained, as follows:

The total estimated cost of the project (exclusive of the purchase of land) is $2,706,000, the amount being derived from the necessary cost of placing the material behind these sea walls as a fill. It has been found necessary to allow for the necessary foundation to stand for about 12 months before placing the material superstructure thereon, and for another 6 months before putting material immediately back of the sea wall. The valley of the upper Anacostia at the beginning of the project was simply a broad stretch of marshland, with many meandering channels. This condition made it difficult to retain the mouth of the work simultaneously, and the work was therefore progressive in addition to being delayed to allow for the settlement referred to above. These difficulties have been largely overcome, and the scheme of the work is now such that even if construction, dredging and silting can proceed at a rapid pace, which will permit the expenditure of practically all funds now available by June 30, 1917, and of the amount estimated, $400,000 by June 30, 1918, it is necessary to project the date for the completion of the project for the year 1918; that is, for the seven years required for the dredging and sea-wall construction are of some $35,000 for modification of the present $2,000,000 for the construction of the sea-walls, etc., may be put and overcome before they can interfere with the progress of the work in general.

**C. A. E. Flagg.**

Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Anacostia River and Flats," on page 101, after line 11, insert:

In connection with the said reclamation and development of the river and the lumbering of the Anacostia River Flats, for highway and park purposes, in connection with the construction and development of the Anacostia River and Flats, and in the event that the Secretary of War is further authorized and directed on behalf of the United States, to acquire, for highway and park purposes, in connection with the said reclamation and development of the Anacostia River and Flats, certain lands along the Anacostia River, the railroad bridge at the Anacostia River and the south line of 1 Street, shall reciprocallly release, as shown on said plat, and the railroad company all appropriations heretofore made to acquire the railroad bridge to the point of Fifteenth Street east, to the portion of the District of Columbia with the railroad company, and all appropriations heretofore made to acquire the railroad bridge to the Anacostia River and the South line of 1 Street, the railroad company for its entrance on the Anacostia River, and all appropriations heretofore made to acquire the railroad bridge to the Anacostia River and the South line of 1 Street, and shall release and quitclaim to said railroad company any right, title or claim to any certain lands now owned by the railroad company, as shown on said plat, and to permit the extension of said company's right-of-way to include the tracts of land 3020 acres, lying at the junction of the railroad bridge and the original left shore of the said river, as shown on said plat, together with all appurtenances and riparian rights, for the settlement referred to above. These difficulties have been largely overcome, and the scheme of the work is now such that even if construction, dredging and silting can proceed at a rapid pace, which will permit the expenditure of practically all funds now available by June 30, 1917, and of the amount estimated, $400,000 by June 30, 1918, it is necessary to project the date for the completion of the project for the year 1918; that is, for the seven years required for the dredging and sea-wall construction are of some $35,000 for modification of the present $2,000,000 for the construction of the sea-walls, etc., may be put and overcome before they can interfere with the progress of the work in general.

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 for the Anacostia Flats, and also to appeal to the Senator from Maryland to give the reason why a department of the Government and the proceeds of the condemnation proceedings in the event that it is wrong, and also to appeal to the Senator from Maryland to give the reason why it is wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; and they have contested it. They say that they are entitled to the amount found in the first in-
Mr. SMITH. 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. SMITH. 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 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 $2,300.

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 Senator 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 18, 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. SMITH. Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. The next amendment was, to insert:

For the acquisition for a public park of the tract of land known as the Dean tract, assessed on the records of the assessor of the District of Columbia, $30,000; for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of water meters, $625,000; for the purchase of the Treasury buildings, of the State, War, and Navy Department Building, and for each and every purpose to which such buildings may be put, $1,800; for the purchase, maintenance, and installation of the library and reading room of the Library of Congress, $1,800; for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of the library and reading room of the Senate, and $1,800; for the purchase, maintenance, and installation of the library and reading room of the House, and $1,800; for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of the library and reading room of the Senate, and $1,800; for the purchase, installation, and maintenance of the library and reading room of the House, and $1,800.

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 munificent sum of $300 each. The House in its wisdom struck out one of its words and made 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 had a board; that they have performed their duties satisfactorily and everything has been done in a cumbrous and awkward manner, and they 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 $2,500 was defeated in the House. It may finally 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 putting him into the hands of steam engineers, who very likely he has not any qualifications for. That is the situation.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I say that there is no change in that paragraph.

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 should be one of the board of examiners of steam engineers, regardless of the words used in the amendment, without additional compensation, as provided in the bill as passed by the House, it virtually gives the master mechanic the salary of $2,300.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No, sir.
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further legal proceedings will work any hardship on parties who are engaged in this business.

Mr. NORRIS. I fully agree with the Senator from Maryland in his statement in favor of this practice. I have no doubt that there is a good deal of it going on.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will suggest that if the Senator from Nebraska desires to offer an amendment to the amendment I will accept it, and let the matter go to conference, when we will further investigate it.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not prepared any amendment designed to cover the subject.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want the law to be framed as perfectly as it can be. 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 something ought to be done.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I suggest that the matter be passed over for the present in order that the Secretary from Nebraska may prepare his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We will accept an amendment, and let the matter go to conference, and see what is best to be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, there is a matter to which I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee, I suggest to him that section 7, which provides for increased compensation to Government employees, be transferred to the end of the bill. The other legislative provisions would then precede.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The Secretary. It is proposed to change "section 7" to read "section 9," in order to transfer it to the end of the bill, and to renumber the other sections to correspond.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to. There are amendments which have been passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators absent who are interested in amendments which have been passed over, and I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The amendment will be passed over. The roll call is present. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Beckham
Borah
Bradley
Ceveralnes
Chilton
Clapp
Clark
Colburn
Fall
Fletcher
Gallings
Grorns
Harding
Hitchcock

Bennett
Hunting
Jones
Kenyon
La Follette
Pilhan
Pettman
Pohpeter
Roby
Ludow
Mclean
McVea
Maritime, N. J.
Norris

Overman
Owen
Pace
Penrose
Pethman
Pittman
Pohpeter
Pendexter
Randall
Red
Riddle
Riddle
Roby
Rode
Sheppard
Sheppard

Smith, Md.
Smith, Mich.
Smoot
Sterling
Stone
Tillman
Underwood
Yardman
Wadsworth
Warren
Webster
Williams
Sherman

Mr. JEA of Tennessee. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained on important committee work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will state the first amendment passed over.

The Secretary. The first amendment passed over, having been passed over at the instance of Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey, is on page 28, after line 15, to less than.

That part of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1917 providing to "Repave with asphalt the roadway of Fourteenth Street, from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street, 26 feet wide, $7,500," is hereby suspended until further action of Congress.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I make the point of order against that amendment on the ground that it is new legislation.

Let me state that I have no desire to be ungenerous, and God knows I have no desire to be unjust to anybody, but there is a very peculiar relation existing in that street right in the heart of the city which, to my mind, seems an abomination and a wrong, and I think it should be corrected.

My attention was directed to this matter last year by petition, letter, and signature on the part of very many citizens of the District of Columbia. Congress enacted legislation providing for the repaving and widening of that street between Pennsylvania Avenue and F Street, but through some process, I can make it appear to any man that that matter has been held up, and we now find an amendment in the pending bill providing that the action taken by Congress last year shall be suspended.

Briedly 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. This portion of the street is on a severe incline, and within the last two years trolley tracks have been laid to permit that the street car traffic and the ordinary vehicle traffic have made a condition that is absolutely dangerous; but, aside from that, it is unfair and unjust to the rest of Fourteenth Street that one block should not be widened.

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 Ebbit Hotel property, I found a condition of congestion thus: Opposite the doorway and opposite the Willard Hotel I found five taxicabs installed. Then coming up on that same sidewalk a little farther I found a great vault about 60 feet square, with an iron rack and framework, occupying that portion of the sidewalk. Up a little farther—this 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, which little was about, that about 60 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 another car, now giving automobiles. At that time I saw a buggy, 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?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. In regard to the delivery of coal, is it not necessary? It does not matter what the conditions may be, coal has to be delivered to hotels and the cars 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.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the argument is with reference to the advisability or nonadvisability of the Senate adopting the amendment.

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 hopped up like a cork at once.

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.

If you will sit down, from Maryland, I want to say that, of course, I am practical enough to know that we, in a frigid climate, have to have coal for domestic purposes, heating and otherwise, but this is a peculiar situation. Mayhap in front of the Hotel Willard a simple coal vault and a chute stand, but in this particular case there are two vaults, two openings 5 feet square, and an iron framework 5 or 7 feet high, existing on the sidewalk perpetually. Some-
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 Hotel.

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

Mr. KENYON. No, I mean any such 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 or pretended right was granted for any particular specified 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—

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

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask 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 Ebbitt 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. No; but the value of the property.

Mr. NORRIS. 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.

Mr. NORRIS. Between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue on Fourteenth Street?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. On Fourteenth Street. Now, it does seem to me that it is a manifest bit of injustice and undue advantage to property holders and traders against 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 you should make fish of one and fowl of the other. Now, they say it will cost $2,000 to move this machinery. 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. NORRIS. 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 you have referred to, the boilers, engines, ice plant, and dynamos, 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 machine shop. But, great heavens, 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 in the middle of Pennsylvania Avenue or the middle of Fourteenth Street? I say it is an abomination; it is a utilization of the public highway for private purposes, and it is a manifest wrong.

I do not want to do these people any harm. I talked to-day with Commissioner Newman, and he said that the public felt that it was wrong, and he said the commissioners felt that there should be a correction. As I said to Mr. Haight, the gentleman who represented the hotel company, who came to me to-day very solicitous about it, "I do not want to unreasonably disturb you, but you pay nothing for this." They have never paid a sou marque.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that they have to pay a license fee.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. There has never been a license fee. No license ordinance ever had been enacted until the last year.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is true.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. And I do not think they have paid for anything.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not know about that, either.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I told Mr. Haight that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But I will say to the Senator that they are subject to a license.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say, further, that while in the past they may not have paid a license fee, property is made up by the improvements, and the value of property is made up by the improvements, and by—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. By what they steal from the public?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; but the value of the property is made up by the accommodations on that property. There is no question but that the fact that this vault is under there, affording them conveniences and means of using their machinery, adds to the value of that hotel.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. But it is not their property.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. And undoubtedly that hotel is assessed for more money than it would be assessed for if that vault were there. Now, Mr. President, is that a fair deal?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That has only come about within a year.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. True; but it is a law, nevertheless, and ought to be enforced.

Mr. MARTINE. I do think.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will say, in answer to that, that they have never paid a sou marque of vaultage rental to the city; and that law has only been passed within a year. I mentioned that fact to Mr. Haight, and he did not know, but he rather tacitly admitted that they had not paid anything. Well, of course they would. Of course they could not get out of it if we have passed it. All I say is that they have no right, pay or otherwise, to have this supreme advantage over their neighbors. I said to Mr. Haight that five or six thousand dollars was all it would cost—and I think it would be within that limit—but that I would let them stay if I could do so without inconveniencing the public, taxing them vaultage rent.

The thought has occurred to me—I suggested this to Mr. Newman and Mr. Newman acquiesced in the matter—that they might keep their machinery there, but let them with a system that would maintain a roadway, cutting back the sidewalk so that the traveling public and the vehicles should have the privilege of using the whole portion of the street. It could be vaulted back; I should be the last to object to that. And would they not let them make this 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 cannot 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. NORRIS. Has the Senator been in the vaults? Has he visited them and inspected them?
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. Yes, Sir.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then it would be necessary to suspend this provision or to enact an amendment authorizing the arrangement which the Senator has suggested.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. To carry that out, it would; but I say this; Defeat this proposition, put it back as it stands today on the statute books, that this sidewalk shall be widened, and then provide that the Commissioners shall arrange as they may beneath.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator sees the difficulty about that. If the improvement which has been authorized proceeds, then the opportunity to give 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 in Washington, D.C., is a very steep one. It is paved, as every one now knows, with rough stone, called Belgium block; and the principal traffic on that street is heavy wagons. There is no great amount of other traffic there, for the reason that the street is very steep. The requirement upon the occupant of the property was that if these streets were paved with asphalt it would be impossible, in my judgment, 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 the street with asphalt.

As to the proposition of compelling the hotel company to remove 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 advisable 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—upon the value of the property, 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 establish 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 committee has written into the bill, or some similar provision, must be enacted. Otherwise, the improvement that has been authorized will proceed and it would be impossible to effectuate the relief.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas 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, as well as the interest of the property, that have been vested in the hotel company by the public consent.

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 concerning the subject, Mr. President. It seems to me that the proposition of the Senator from New Jersey is simply the 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 asphalt. I want to say, upon the recommendation and somewhat persistence of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That might be.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true. It was in the estimate. Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think it very unfortunate.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me one other suggestion. I am not going to argue the desirability of continuing the existing system beyond this point. It has been stated here that this corporation is not paying anything for that accommodation. I chance to know it is the rule in this District that the owners of valuable privileges shall pay the fair valuation of the property. Last evening I was talking with the editor of the Evening Star and large owner of the Evening Star Building, and this very matter came up. I said to him, You have accommodations under the sidewalk, have you not? He said, "Yes," "Do you pay anything for them?" He said, "It is assessed and added to the value of the property." I do not think that this is an exceptional case in that respect. I have very much whether adequate recompense is received for that valuable privilege. But I say it would be really dangerous, it would be unfortunate, it would be ungenerous and unfair to me and every other property owner in the District of Columbia to acquiesce in the suggestions made by the committee. If you strike this out, it is admitted, as it seems to me, the most manifest wrong, impartiality, and unfairness of maintaining in force a situation of this kind. Pass a resolution, if you choose, advising the commissioners to confer with the owners of this affected property in a way that shall grant the public their rights and at the same time operate unjustly on them.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is true. It was in the estimate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I trust there may be some way of ascertaining these privileges proposed, not very much whether adequate recompense is received for that valuable privilege. But I say it would be really dangerous, it would be unfortunate, it would be ungenerous and unfair to me and every other property owner in the District of Columbia to acquiesce in the suggestions made by the committee. If you strike this out, it is admitted, as it seems to me, the most manifest wrong, impartiality, and unfairness of maintaining in force a situation of this kind.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I trust there may be some way of ascertaining these privileges proposed, not very much whether adequate recompense is received for that valuable privilege. But I say it would be really dangerous, it would be unfortunate, it would be ungenerous and unfair to me and every other property owner in the District of Columbia to acquiesce in the suggestions made by the committee. If you strike this out, it is admitted, as it seems to me, the most manifest wrong, impartiality, and unfairness of maintaining in force a situation of this kind. Pass a resolution, if you choose, advising the commissioners to confer with the owners of this affected property in a way that shall grant the public their rights and at the same time operate unjustly on them.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me to? The Senator says that a year has elapsed and nothing has been done to carry out the law enacted a year ago. Of course, the proprietor of that hotel can not be charged with neglect.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator says that a year has elapsed and nothing has been done to carry out the law enacted a year ago. Of course, the proprietor of that hotel can not be charged with neglect.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Oh.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will allow me, if there has been any neglect, it is the neglect of the District Commissioners; but, of course, they can not do everything in a year. I don't think anybody ought to be held for that.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I am not charging anything on the Willard Hotel owners. They are human. They are like the rest of us. I know they want to retain this privilege; but
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 sure that there is no impartial legislature to grant this privilege. You grant it away temporarily, you say; but it may be that it should remain in the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, notwithstanding the special pleading of the Senator from New Jersey, I do not think 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 to commence during the 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 loss amounting to very many thousands of dollars; in fact, to submit to a less in amount that would build 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. I wish to give the information.

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 it is 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 under discussion. Both sides of the street have had wide parking space ever since the street was laid out, as I remember it.

Mr. NORRIS. If under the sidewalk they have not excavated beyond the usual width of a sidewalk, then the cutting off of the sidewalk and having 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 they have not excavated more than 12 feet under the sidewalk gutter.

Mr. OVERMAN. And on the opposite side of the street, where the Ebbitt is. It is done on both sides not by the New Willard but the Ebbitt.

Mr. NORRIS. And the New Willard, I understand.

Mr. OVERMAN. It makes a very narrow street.

Mr. NORRIS. The Ebbitt is on one side and the New Willard is on the other. I know the sidewalk is very wide.

Mr. WARREN. On both sides, for machinery that is fitted in there, and the uses made for it are such that if it is restricted it simply means that they will have to pose to cut that sidewalk down and make the street through that block just as wide as it is farther up?

Mr. WARREN. I assume that is the presumption.

Mr. OVERMAN. I was speaking to the question of restriction. The Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia said. He came before our committee last year and recommended that this street be widened. They wanted to extend the Fourth Street that so employees could go with convenience to the Department of Agriculture. Two tracks there would make the street too narrow. So they said, which I thought was safe. The engineers of the city themselves recommended that this should be done.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me now before proceeding further, I might ask the Senator if he knows, is quite steep from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street. You see there very few automobiles or carriages—in fact, I might say almost none at all going up and down that street. It is only a very short detour to go out around the Treasury Building. So the travel, except the trucking or something that is to be delivered on either side of the street and the taxis that wait at the doors of the hotels, uses that street very little; but as to the street cars and people going back and forth, up and down, and the same is true as to the street cars. The cars that have already been put 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. It is not a long block because as I understand it 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 of the hotel. 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 a decrease rather than an increase in motor-propelled transportation is concerned over that street. If it is restricted it simply means that they will have to put in there and the street cars have been running for a long time.

Mr. NORRIS. I asked the Senator a question? I live in what is known as the Cochran Hotel. All their machinery and plants 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 not be lessened and not disturb the machinery? As far as I am informed, they do not extend on 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, 30 stories below. The Ebbitt is in fact 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 sidewalk. There is no use for machinery that is fitted in there, and the uses made for it are such that if it is restricted it simply means that they will have to...
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator from Wyoming will allow me, I will say whether right or wrong they were granted this permit 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 excessive amount of machinery that is there.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

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 on the space there.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The whole machinery of that hotel is under there. The engines are under there, their boilers are under there, their dynamos are under there, there is the ice plant 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. W. P. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WARREN. Just a moment. What the Senator from Maryland says is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the fairness of the Senate that if Senators will take the pain to look in there I doubt if there is anyone who, after looking over the situation, will say that it is the right thing for this District, first, to give permission; second, to allow the construction to go on and to see how it is done; and third, to demand that the street be widened regardless of these great losses. We are only asking a matter now that anything has been expended until the Senate does know more about it. I would be glad to see the street widened, if it could be done reasonably. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NOBIS. Mr. President, if I understand the question, I want to ask the Senator if the building was put there by consent 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 it ought not to be some limit on the space there.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. No; I do not believe so.

Mr. NOBIS. Then ought there not to be a limit at least in the amendment, say one year or two years.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. That might be, I will say to the Senator, but the Committee on Appropriations should have the opportunity to look into all these matters. I dare say members of the Committee on Appropriations have inspected this underground space and its contents, and few, if any, of the Senators on that committee have ever inspected the underground premises at all. The most valuable machinery of that entire structure is located under the sidewalk. As I have said, in the world over spaces under sidewalks and streets even are used, and we do not see this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. NOBIS. If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me there is something to be said for the lawfulness, we ought to take it out, if we think it ought to be taken out lawfully, and if they suffer any damages we ought to pay for it, but, as I understand the situation, the sidewalk goes beyond the limits of the building, and if this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me there is something to be said for the lawfulness, we ought to take it out, if we think it ought to be taken out lawfully, and if they suffer any damages we ought to pay for it, but, as I understand the situation, the sidewalk goes beyond the limits of the building, and if this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. Mr. President—
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Mr. WARREN. Just a moment. What the Senator from Maryland says is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the fairness of the Senate that if Senators will take the pain to look in there I doubt if there is anyone who, after looking over the situation, will say that it is the right thing for this District, first, to give permission; second, to allow the construction to go on and to see how it is done; and third, to demand that the street be widened regardless of these great losses. We are only asking a matter now that anything has been expended until the Senate does know more about it. I would be glad to see the street widened, if it could be done reasonably. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NOBIS. Mr. President, if I understand the question, I want to ask the Senator if the building was put there by consent 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 it ought not to be some limit on the space there.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. No; I do not believe so.

Mr. NOBIS. Then ought there not to be a limit at least in the amendment, say one year or two years.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. That might be, I will say to the Senator, but the Committee on Appropriations should have the opportunity to look into all these matters. I dare say members of the Committee on Appropriations have inspected this underground space and its contents, and few, if any, of the Senators on that committee have ever inspected the underground premises at all. The most valuable machinery of that entire structure is located under the sidewalk. As I have said, in the world over spaces under sidewalks and streets even are used, and we do not see this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. NOBIS. If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me there is something to be said for the lawfulness, we ought to take it out, if we think it ought to be taken out lawfully, and if they suffer any damages we ought to pay for it, but, as I understand the situation, the sidewalk goes beyond the limits of the building, and if this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. Mr. President—
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Mr. WARREN. Just a moment. What the Senator from Maryland says is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the fairness of the Senate that if Senators will take the pain to look in there I doubt if there is anyone who, after looking over the situation, will say that it is the right thing for this District, first, to give permission; second, to allow the construction to go on and to see how it is done; and third, to demand that the street be widened regardless of these great losses. We are only asking a matter now that anything has been expended until the Senate does know more about it. I would be glad to see the street widened, if it could be done reasonably. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NOBIS. Mr. President, if I understand the question, I want to ask the Senator if the building was put there by consent 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 it ought not to be some limit on the space there.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. No; I do not believe so.

Mr. NOBIS. Then ought there not to be a limit at least in the amendment, say one year or two years.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. That might be, I will say to the Senator, but the Committee on Appropriations should have the opportunity to look into all these matters. I dare say members of the Committee on Appropriations have inspected this underground space and its contents, and few, if any, of the Senators on that committee have ever inspected the underground premises at all. The most valuable machinery of that entire structure is located under the sidewalk. As I have said, in the world over spaces under sidewalks and streets even are used, and we do not see this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. NOBIS. If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me there is something to be said for the lawfulness, we ought to take it out, if we think it ought to be taken out lawfully, and if they suffer any damages we ought to pay for it, but, as I understand the situation, the sidewalk goes beyond the limits of the building, and if this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WARREN. Just a moment. What the Senator from Maryland says is absolutely true. I have such confidence in the fairness of the Senate that if Senators will take the pain to look in there I doubt if there is anyone who, after looking over the situation, will say that it is the right thing for this District, first, to give permission; second, to allow the construction to go on and to see how it is done; and third, to demand that the street be widened regardless of these great losses. We are only asking a matter now that anything has been expended until the Senate does know more about it. I would be glad to see the street widened, if it could be done reasonably. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NOBIS. Mr. President, if I understand the question, I want to ask the Senator if the building was put there by consent 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 it ought not to be some limit on the space there.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. No; I do not believe so.

Mr. NOBIS. Then ought there not to be a limit at least in the amendment, say one year or two years.

Mr. W. P. ROBINSON. That might be, I will say to the Senator, but the Committee on Appropriations should have the opportunity to look into all these matters. I dare say members of the Committee on Appropriations have inspected this underground space and its contents, and few, if any, of the Senators on that committee have ever inspected the underground premises at all. The most valuable machinery of that entire structure is located under the sidewalk. As I have said, in the world over spaces under sidewalks and streets even are used, and we do not see this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it thoroughly.

Mr. NOBIS. If the Senator will permit me, it seems to me there is something to be said for the lawfulness, we ought to take it out, if we think it ought to be taken out lawfully, and if they suffer any damages we ought to pay for it, but, as I understand the situation, the sidewalk goes beyond the limits of the building, and if this particular building at this particular time and then force this through without having proper time granted to investigate it 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 our next amendment 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 12 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 seeing ample 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 amendment to the amendment. I was on that side of the divide two years ago. 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 any other person tells the Senator he investigated the matter. I am governed by the city engineers, by the Commissioners of the District, by the Secretary of the Treasury; and when those men whose duty it is to investigate and inform my committee and tell us that it ought to be done, I know what the city engineers think about it, I know what the Commissioners of the District think about it, and I know what the Secretary of the Treasury thinks about it. If the Senator will accept the amendment, I shall not go on any further, although I can, if it be deemed necessary, read what the officials to whom I have referred have said regarding this matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have investigated this subject very thoroughly, and I, too, have felt that some relief ought to be given to those people; but very likely the proposed amendment goes so far that I will offer it as a substitute for the amendment of the committee what I now send to the desk.

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

The amendment, from line 16 to line 21, inclusive, on page 28, is proposed to insert the following:

"Such part of the District of Columbia appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913, as provides for the regulation of F Street, W., from Pennsylvania Avenue to F Street, 70 feet wide, $7,500. It is hereby suspended until March 1, 1919."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That is extending it for a year.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the chairman of the committee will accept that, I shall have nothing more to say.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that seems to me, is an unreasonable extension. The same arguments were used last year, that these people were located there and that we must not disturb them.

Mr. GALLINGER. This matter cannot be adjusted in a day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I realize that. I do not want to be unreasonable.

Mr. GALLINGER. This proposed relief is only for a year, and during that time conferences can be held and very likely an adjustment can be agreed upon.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I will make no objection to that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I think the amendment to the amendment ought to be accepted.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to. The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, is the bill now open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is one more committee amendment which was passed over.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that there is one more committee amendment which was passed over that has not yet been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment passed over will now be stated.

The Secretary. The last committee amendment passed over was, on page 118, after line 2, to insert as a new section the following:

"Sec. 8. Hereafter when any piping or other household fixtures or secondhand goods of any description whatever have been stolen and sold by private individuals, secondhand dealers, or secondhand dealers in the field of the District of Columbia, under such circumstances that the commissioners, after hearing granted, are satisfied that said dealer should have had reasonable ground, to believe, or could have ascertained by reasonable inquiry or investigation, that the goods were stolen, and that the dealer did not make reasonable inquiry or investigation as to the title of the seller before making the purchase, the commissioners are authorized and directed to revoke the license of such dealer; and his action shall not be a bar to criminal prosecution for receiving stolen goods."

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, however; 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 now in force will 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. The Secretary. After the word "each," at the end of line 7, page 56, it is proposed to insert: "One hundred additional members of class 1, at $900 each, to be employed on or after March 1, 1917, $120,000; $50,000 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 more in the nature of an emergency act. The police force now has 715 men; 10 years ago it had 718 men; and in 1912 its total strength was 755 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 and the various offices of the Government now amount to 150 that require to be more closely watched, and this increase of a hundred privates to be made available upon the approval of the act is an imperative need.

These policemen, as I presume every one here understands, work in three shifts; so that, if the amendment is agreed to, it means approximately an increase in the number of policemen of 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 privates of class 1 at the police station.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Utah that Commissioner Brownlow had a talk with me about the matter. The policemen work in three shifts, as the Senator from Utah understands, and the amendment really only means an increase of 33 policemen on each shift. It is stated that a great many of these men have to be detailed on account of emergencies here to do certain work, which has placed the additional number of privates on the force a very awkward situation. Brownlow came to see me about the matter this morning. I suggested that they be put on the force temporarily, but his reply to that suggestion was that it would cost us pretty well at $900 a year to perform such service temporarily; that we had better arrange it in this way, and whenever the emergency ceased to exist they could discharge these men as they have heretofore done in such cases.
Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOUT]. 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 is proposed for the Metropolitan 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 we now have.

Mr. SMOUT. Or 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. SMOUT. 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. It is necessary 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.

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 which I think the House Committee on jurisdiction to increase the number of the Capitol police force.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But if the Senator will excuse me, I merely wished 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. President, this morning he came to me and to a 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 for purposes 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.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. 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. SMOUT. Mr. President, I notice the Senator's amendment provides for an appropriation of $200,000 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. SMOUT. Of course, I know that if the money is not made immediately available, they do not expect it to be used until July 1 of this year. I simply wanted to know what was the 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 funds immediately available is to enable them to employ and pay these additional policemen before the beginning of the new fiscal year.

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, when a matter goes to conference the
conferences on the part of the Senate are naturally expected
expected to stand by it; but I assume the Senator from Pennsylvania
does not demand that of the conferences of the Senate in this case.

Mr. PENROSE. I appreciate the courtesy of the chairman
chairman of the committee. It is obvious there are not many
Senators present to discuss the matter, and I will be content to let it go to conference for such consideration as
such conference may have by Mr. SMITH.

In that connection, for the information of the conferences, I ask
have inserted in the Record a brief statement entitled "Reasons
reasons for asking for proposed amendment to House bill H1010 relating to Metropolitan Police Department. In the statement
statement, which will appear in the Record,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter
matter referred to is as follows:

REASONS FOR ASKING FOR PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO H. R. 1910.

With the price of foodstuffs and other necessities of life constantly increasing, the bare necessities become almost beyond the reach of the
the average layman, with most of the large corporations in the United
in the United States recognizing the need of giving their employees a living wage, the situation of the Metropolitan police force is somewhat
situation of the Metropolitan police force is somewhat different. While the members of the fire department
department are forbidden by law to charge excessive rents, the
the rents are excessively high, all

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to is as follows:

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATISTICAL TABLE I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Number of patrolmen</th>
<th>Salary (per annum)</th>
<th>Time to attain maximum grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, Cal.</td>
<td>452,235</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>15 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>399,108</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>20 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, N. Y.</td>
<td>253,401</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>25 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonkers, N. Y.</td>
<td>170,231</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tenn.</td>
<td>141,231</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, N. Y.</td>
<td>22,477</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Vernon, N. Y.</td>
<td>35,374</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$97</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn, N. Y.</td>
<td>83,569</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haywood, N. J.</td>
<td>66,941</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, Cal.</td>
<td>166,953</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oreg.</td>
<td>296,382</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoboken, N. J.</td>
<td>39,397</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis, Ind.</td>
<td>622,877</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D. C.</td>
<td>306,928</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N. Y.</td>
<td>5,362,530</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>2,397,600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Mass.</td>
<td>5,344,727</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>30 days leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Not graded.

2 Given 15 days leave, in addition 1 day off in 8; a total of 46 days leave in each year.

In Washington the policemen have to purchase their own uniforms, this, when the inspector for clothing of the department thinks they need it, the price being
are allowed every 46 days, one for every six months. The policemen working 345 days in each year, with the exception of about 20 days annual leave and

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, and then I am done. I offer the amendment which I submit 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 diem or annual roll, shall be increased according to the following schedule:

Every employee now receiving $1,200 per annum or less shall receive an increase in wages, salary, or compensation of 10 per cent.
Every employee now receiving over $1,200 and not more than $2,000 per annum shall receive an increase in wages, salary, or compensation of 10 per cent.

In all existing grades of employees the raises will be no more than 10 per cent, which I send to the desk.

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

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

Mr. SMITH. Of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that it was, and that the consensus of opinion of the committee was that increases should be given to the employees of the Metropolitan police department.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will permit me, there is this to be said about the matter, that we have already inserted in the bill an amendment taking care of all employees of classifications by a certain schedule of increases. A similar amendment shall have two provisions in the bill in conflict with each other. I really think the Senator from Pennsylvania ought to be content with what the committee has put in the bill and what the Senator from Pennsylvania will have inserted.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I recognize the difficulties and the complications surrounding legislation of this character, but I do not want to withdraw the amendment, but I will ask to have it left on the table, and I will ask the committee, if they can, to adopt a somewhat more liberal schedule than is now contained in the bill as reported.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I submit to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.
The amendment, in all probability, will not be adopted. Amendment, but in all probability if the first amendment is agreed to the second amendment might not be adopted. The Senate amended, but in all probability if the first amendment is agreed to the second amendment might not be adopted. It is desirable that some action be taken at the place indicated, if the property is not to be acquired, then the fill-in should be permitted. I therefore present my amendment to be agreed to in order that the whole subject may be considered in conference.

In conclusion, I desire to insert in the Record the letter of the District Commissioners, signed by the president of the Board of Commissioners, Mr. Newman. Some of the objections made in the letter have been met in the amendment which I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter referred to will be printed in the Record.

The letter referred to is as follows:


DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have had under consideration the following amendment proposed by District Commissioners, in order that the property owners may make an earth viaduct on the line of Connecticut Avenue where it crosses and may be necessary: Provided, That no part of this money shall be available until the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have secured satisfactory guarantee of sufficient fill and base to bring said area up to the proper level of Connecticut Avenue.

The first amendment is in compliance with the estimates submitted by the District Commissioners. The amendment which I have just read was submitted to the District Commissioners by the Committee on the District of Columbia, but before their report was received the bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce and reported adversely on the second amendment, but strongly recommend the first amendment. The first amendment is in substantial compliance with a report made by Col. Hays on July 14, 1916, that report, however, is not in agreement that certain other areas be also acquired. This amendment relates to the area embraced in Col. Hays' report, which he said in the report he thought it most desired to secure at that time. The amendment is in agreement with the resolutions of the Senate and for which reason I move that the amendment be adopted, so that the entire subject matter may go to conference and the conferences may have the privilege of selecting either of the amendments. The District Commissioners have very earnestly for some time advocated the adoption of the first amendment. They say that there is no a suitable approach to Rock Creek Park at that point and that the acquisition of this area could be accomplished now, or otherwise it may pass from the power of Congress to obtain it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not get the location of this proposed addition to the park as provided in the first amendment, which, as I understand, is the only amendment the Senator has formally offered. Does the amendment now pending relate to the area contiguous to the bridge just north of the Connecticut Avenue entrance to the Zoological Park?

Mr. ROBINSON. That is the location of the land.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, I have the location in mind, then. Mr. Smith of Maryland. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee I accept the amendment and will let it go to conference.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator accept both amendments? Mr. Smith of Maryland. I will accept both amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRIS. As amended by the amendment of Mr. Smith of Maryland.

Mr. ROBINSON. The amendment read at the desk. I shall offer the other amendment after that is disposed of, for the reasons I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, as stated by the Secretary.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no objection to that amendment, but I want to be present for the second amendment.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I now offer the second amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The Secretary. The following amendment just agreed to, is to be inserted in the bill, and followed by the amendments offered by the Senator from Nebraska, as follows:

For the construction of a culvert to carry Kingle Valley Creek under Connecticut Avenue, in order to enable adjoining property owners to make an earth viaduct on the line of Connecticut Avenue where it crosses and may be necessary: Provided, That no part of this money shall be available until the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have secured satisfactory guarantee of sufficient fill and base to bring said area up to the proper level of Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I explained a moment ago—probably the Senator from Nebraska did not hear me—that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia had been urging the first amendment, in which it was desired to acquire more than $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-

DEAR SIR: The Commissioner of the District of Columbia have given you the following amendment to the pending District Appropriation bill, as follows:

For the construction of a culvert to carry Kingle Valley Creek under Connecticut Avenue, in order that adjoining property owners may make an earth viaduct on the line of Connecticut Avenue where it crosses and may be necessary: Provided, That no part of this money shall be available until the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have secured satisfactory guarantee of sufficient fill and base to bring said area up to the proper level of Connecticut Avenue.
Mr. NORRIS. Kingley Valley Creek. The bridge over that ravine, and also the site of the bridge, is owned by the 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 where the bridge is not far from Macomb Street, which is the only street there. There are lots and buildings facing on Macomb Street. Part of this land 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 wooded, its sides being covered with very heavy timber. The land on the north side of that ravine is just north of Macomb Street, which is the only street there. The bridge over that ravine. That ravine is covered with heavy timber. For that reason, Mr. President, we never ought to adopt the second amendment as proposed. As I look at these amendments, they are absolutely inconsistent with each other.

The proposition of the second amendment is that the Government may pay $15,000, as I remember the amount from hearing it read, to make an archway for this small creek to flow under this 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 the Government would pay $15,000, and that slope that will give it 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 that ought to be done. There is only one object in 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 familiar he is with the subject, but I should like to go with him and show him the great difference between the first amendment as adopted, and the second amendment as proposed. I will explain to him what this amendment means. 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 adopted, will give the conference 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 is passed a law two years ago this 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 side 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. We have already passed a law to purchase as an addition to the Zoological Park.

I am satisfied that Senators would not 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. Scoot] lives not so very 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 himself or any other Senator.

Suppose this middle aisle here were Connecticut Avenue, and up there, about to the door, going in that way, were the entrance to the present Zoological Park. We are all familiar with that. People on until you come to a bridge going over a ravine that is 50, 75, or 100 feet deep. That is the place where this fill is to take place. At the end of that ravine, which is covered with heavy timber, runs right under it, running east and west, mainly. It goes a little bit west of the bridge, and then angles up and comes out on Woodley Road, and comes down here and passes under this bridge. Now, if we fill this ravine, say 100 feet deep, we destroy...
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. We have come to the bridge, we come then to the line of the property 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 this driveway. We have come to the bridge, and then it gets that beautiful driveway anywhere in any of the parks of the city of Washington. The Government owns the road there. They cannot destroy that. The only benefit will come to the owners of the property posing to the Government of the only part of their property that filled up unless the Government takes action and permits the Government to remain there. Nobody except the Government owns the road; at least, that is nothing else, unless it is filled up.

If the amendment that has already been agreed to in the bill, this is what happens: It takes both sides here as an addition to the park, then the property owners are disposed 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 not see anything in it excepting, it is true, that it would enable the owner of the property on each 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 speculation and sale. It is not possible that the Government owns the road; at least, that is nothing else, unless it is filled up. 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 says so, and permit it to be done, because it would destroy public property to do it.

Mr. BRADY. Private property.

Mr. NORRIS. If it is filled up, it will destroy the road, of course. It can not be filled up 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 $800 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 $800 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 $800 acres of land is located, and see the character 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 accords it the high honor of considering this $800 acres of land this year, yet do not feel that they can pay $10,000 an acre for it, I should like very well to have the amendment agreed to at a reasonable rate and allow the $800 acres of land 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 Senate 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 in here, and I knew why the Senator offered it.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has well stated that the amendment has repeatedly put in the bill this first amendment, which has almost dropped out of the bill, 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 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 to the Senator by the Gettysburg that if they would pass this first amendment, providing for the purchase of the $800 acres of land, I sincerely hope that the Senate conference will not agree to the fill as provided for in that amendment.
The purpose of the property owners was to grade their hills and attract the public. The development that the property owners was to grade their hills and attract the public. It was entirely within our power to shelve off those hills and to fill up that valley and end it, but I did not think that it would be a becoming thing to do. I thought it would hardly be a public-spirited thing to do until Congress should have an opportunity of acting upon the subject. Now, Congress has had those opportunities for 10 years, and for 10 years the Government Commissioners— with the approval of the Art Commission, I think— have been seeing the condemnation of this valley; but as yet, while I believe it has had the approval of the Senate, it has not had the approval of the House. I am told that there are those in the House who think that as a matter of economy a viaduct of earth ought to be built across there, and save the Government the expenditure of $250,000, and that when filled, after five or six years, it will be as attractive as it is now in its natural condition. I am assured by landscape architects that it can be made nearly as attractive when filled in as now, and that the approach to the national parkway will be made as effective as it could be if this natural beauty were availed of.

Now, meanwhile that land, which was acquired at a large cost by the Cherry Chase company 27 years ago, has been uncultivated, and we have seen that they ought not to act arbitrarily in the matter, and, waiting for the Government to act, content that the Government abandon the acquisition of the parkway, deserves that they should do so. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish the Government to acquire an inch of the land in which I have any interest. It is a matter of delicacy with me, as a member of this body, and I would much prefer that I should have no dealings whatever with the Government with reference to any land in which I am interested.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PHELAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I want to fortify what the Senator has just said. When I was chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the committee took the matter up in the first place, the Senator opposed the project, saying that he preferred the Government to retain the lands for right of way to have them sold to the Government at any price. I recall that very distinctly as having occurred on two different occasions.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, does it interfere very materially with the plans of the owners of that property, and if the owners of the property had been allowed to go on there would not have been done during those 10 years this unsightly approach to the Serailed Park and the unfinished appearance that now presents itself.

Now, as to the value, I will state that that land cost 27 years ago $5,000 an acre, if my recollection is right. The addition of interest and taxes for this period would bring its cost to the present proprietors to twelve or fifteen thousand dollars an acre. I call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to this—

Mr. BURR. I was engaged and did not hear the Senator. Mr. NEWLANDS. The land, as I stated, cost 27 years ago, if I recollect right, $5,000 an acre, valley and upland. The cost would amount now, I imagine, to $12,000 or $15,000 an acre with interest and taxes added. The land 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 recommended by the District Commissioners as the estimate of value 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 $200,000 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 recollected also that the use 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 Kilgingle Valley between the park and the land owned by the Cherry Chase Real Estate Co.?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The easterly 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 Senator can describe to us what part of the park and the land owned by the Cherry Chase Real Estate Co. How far down the valley eastward is the line from the bridge on Connecticut Avenue?

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

Mr. SMOOT. Does it stop at the bridge?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No, it stops just about at the bridge. Mr. 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 Cherry 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 that fill would run up to 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 resid­dence of the homes. Farnsworth's with its neighborhood. 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 will come to us. If 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 would it not?

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 one end of the 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. Is it 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 cannot 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 give us the plans, and I think they have been very unjustly tied up. I do not wish to-morrow, to give us sufficient time to show the importance of the matter that was up before, and it did not get into conference simply because we delayed the bill several days 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 into conference.

Mr. BRADY. I think it entirely of too much importance to be permitted to go to conference without full discussion in the Senate; and from this point of view I am so inclined. And I think it would be better for the District to pay $250,000 for the construction of that bridge, if it did cost that much, and $87,000 for this land, if that is the price to be paid, rather than to remain longer before the Senate, but let us take it into conference. I have no objection to its going into conference.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator, I do not think there is any disagreement out there in the Art Commission and the District Commissioners for 10 years 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 disagreement out there in the Art Commission and the District Commissioners for 10 years been endeavoring to get a proper entrance to 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 available a distance of about 1,000 feet of the valley unaffected. I mean that it could be so done. Let us see if we can do it in some satisfactory way. Connecticut Avenue was given to it by the very company that wants to fill it under. The very bridge you have there was a gift I may say of this company. The very right of ways if it is unoccupied, was the gift of the proprietors of the soil. There was no interest in anybody except these 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. It seems to me that what we should 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 that we are not going to recede from the position that the bill should be amended, and that these taxes that should be imposed upon the 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.

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 a supporter of the four-mile fill that runs out about 500 feet of the valley. I think there is any disposition to suppress any argument in regard to this proposition. We have been discussing it for about two hours, and if the Senator wants to discuss it, keep on at it, I have no objection, but do not take it over until to-morrow, let us dispose 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 a supporter of the four-mile fill that runs out about 500 feet of the valley. I think there is any disposition to suppress any argument in regard to this proposition. We have been discussing it for about two hours, and if the Senator wants to discuss it, keep on at it, I have no objection, but do not take it over until to-morrow, let us dispose of the bill to-day, even if you want to discuss it further.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator, I do not think there is any disagreement out there in the Art Commission and the District Commissioners for 10 years 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 disagreement out there in the Art Commission and the District Commissioners for 10 years been endeavoring to get a proper entrance to the valley.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is it.
Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield?

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. I have, and I am asking attention to such a situation. It looks to me as though there was a settled policy on some one's part to hold that bridge up in the air and to tax those owners until they have got to take some small price for it, and then build a bridge, or build property. Of course that may not be so. It may just be the drift of what is everybody's business and nobody's business. This bill has $20,000 in it to grade New York Avenue. The amount will not begin to fix that heavy avenue situation, or to provide for the time the Senate ought to have enough money appropriated to do business and nobody's business. This bill has $20,000 to tax these owners until they have got to take some small price for it, and then build another bridge and nobody's business.

Mr. BRADY. 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. BRADY. 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 intended that it will not pass in continued, separate, and in the continued suspension through another term of years.

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. It settles it in one way or the other. I believe if our committee would insist upon holding in the bill the amendment we have adopted it would be retained there, and this matter would be settled, which ought to be done.

There is no question that the Senator from Nevada has made citizens of this District every proposition a man could make that was fair and equitable relative to that property, but they have not accepted it. I want to be understood now as realizing that he has never attempted to do anything in this matter that he did not believe was for the best interest of the community, as well as his associates.

On the other hand, I do believe that the scenic beauty of that valley should be retained. I do believe that we are making a fatal mistake if we permit a fill to go in there at this time. If these two amendments go to conference, the conferes will throw out the first, likely, and agree to the second.

Now, $15,000 will not build a structure there that will leave enough ground for a road. It is just a start. It would take from $50,000 to $75,000 to fill it properly the way it ought to be done.

The way that valley should be improved is for the Government to buy these 8 acres, or whatever the amount is, and then agree with the adjoining property to fill that valley halfway across, if necessary. They could then leave the balance of the valley, so that you could drive through there very nicely; but if we put in this small appropriation now, it simply delays the matter for years to come, when they can never put a structure in there that can be approved by the Art Commission of the District, with the appropriation that we have, and they will have to come back here to get an additional appropriation.

Now, let us do business along business lines and follow business principles. Let us purchase this land, pay these owners what they ought to have, and what it is worth, and then at another time consider the matter of the improvement of Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator is consistent. He proposes for taking the property and settle the question that way. If he proposes to insist upon the amendment of the Senate to that effect, of course, his position would be unsalvageable. But I am simply talking about a vacillating policy with reference to these large pieces of property, most of them very much larger and more valuable than in the particular instance under discussion, where there does seem to be the most uncertain attitude on the part of Congress and the District Commission, and that is going to be determined.

It seems to me that this New York Avenue and bridge situation ought to have enough money appropriated to grade it to that bridge, and that the Government could fill it up in $50,000. It has a bridge structure which has been standing there idle in the air ever since 1905, and which, by the way, was improperly charged under the terminal construction against the stock of the State of Maryland in the fund of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. It happened to take part in the investigation made in the Legislature of Maryland into the affairs of the Washington Branch of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. I learned in that way that at the time the bridge was built what it cost, and I have been more or less interested to watch it amass the earnings through the years that have still not been paid on account of the loss. A very large sum has accrued interest and deterioration, and that this bridge represents, and I must say, Mr. President, that I could not help thinking of it as an illustration in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, and of the need of putting some settlement and decisive policy with reference to the treatment of the various properties in the District of Columbia that have been indicated by their position or by artistic recommendation for condemnation for various reasons.

And there is that bridge.

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, that they are not the only owners, and that there is another bridge. 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 developed the property on the Chevy Chase and away beyond. It has become a very beautiful and attractive residence section, and they have disposed of lots and lots and lots.

Mr. Bride of Maryland says that for this land they paid $5,000 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, saw that it was fair, and that there was not much better than the same. Assuming that it is fair, does it follow that we 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 little trip that runs through the bottom of the ravine. God made that ravine and the ravine itself, and we are going to fill it up that ravine. 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. It runs down into this ravine at its north line. When it reaches the hill there is a slope of at least 45° on the average; sometimes more and sometimes less. That sidehill is wooded. That is the part that it is proposed in the amendment which was accepted to buy from the other side. 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 fit to build on in value and in appearance. There does not 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 Chevy Chase Land Co. happens to own a piece of property on a sidehill that is not valuable unless they can fill it up 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 Chevy Chase Land Co. but to the people of Chevy Chase 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 who always has advocated that the State of Nevada has been, 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. 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 very long, but that I 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.

I referred 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 than that place that that place, 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? Mr. NORRIS. I do not care to have the Senate do so now, but I should like later to have the Senate 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, at other 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. I do come up that roadway many times, and I enjoy the scenery and the beauty of it, more particularly in the hot weather of summer time. 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 already disposed of there to make a market of opening, cutting the trees or trimming 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 perfectly attractive. The park is used by countless hundreds of people, for the reason that it is not an artificial park. I should look upon it as the same.

Still, I can see and realize the other 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. I come up that roadway many times, and I enjoy the scenery and the beauty of it, more particularly in the hot weather of summer time. 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 already disposed of there to make a market of opening, cutting the trees or trimming 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 perfectly attractive. The park is used by countless hundreds of people, for the reason that it is not an artificial park. I should look upon it as the same.

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.

Mr. NORRIS. That is my understanding.

Mr. LANE. With a "jump-off" of perhaps 100 to 150 feet in depth, in which 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 deficit covered, and they 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 it, 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—as to let the Government buy both sides of this gulch for park purposes.

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. We cannot pay what the property is worth in any case. Any method that 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. LANE. Then it is with the 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 be allowed an equal opportunity for the expense to which they would be put in order to bring their property into suitable condition.

Mr. NORRIS. That has not anything 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 the side of Connecticut Avenue opposite the entrance 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. Mr. LANE. She may get married on her way home.

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 allowed to have that done, and I think it unnecessary to advert to that. However that may be, it does not have anything to do, as I look at it, with this proposition.

We have put into the bill a provision to buy this land. Certainly the appropriation provided is ample. The property ought to be bought for what it is worth, and we ought to be willing to pay what it is worth. Now, to put in another provision that is entirely inconsistent with it, with the understanding that the whole matter is, to me, a right to be done, then I am afraid, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Brady] has said, that when it comes back out of the Senate it may be that the good amendment will be lost and the other amendment left in, upon 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 no one 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 to dig out by condemnation. I think we ought to take 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; even though the property is something which 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—Mr. Smoot from Nevada [Mr. Newlands]—that possibly this fill 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. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. NORRIS. If that is done, then we will certainly have 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 except by climbing up a steep hill to the bridge or go out the other side by another steep. In other words, if all the sides of 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 Nevada.
Mr. LANE. It is more than 1,500 feet from the Woodley Road entrance to that gulch to 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 make 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.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent to-day on account of illness, and I am paired with him for to-day. Therefore I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "aye."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENNINGTON] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], I vote "aye."

The roll was concluded.

Mr. GALLINGER (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O’GORMAN], but I am privileged to vote on questions of this kind, and I vote "aye."

Mr. CHILTON (after having voted in the affirmative). I desire to inquire whether the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a pair with the Senator, which I transfer to the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "aye."

Mr. WILLIAMSS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], I vote "aye."

The roll was concluded.

Mr. POMERENEN. I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be designated as section 10, to come in at the end of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, to be known as section 10, as follows:

Section 10. In order to get into it.

So Mr. ROBINSON’s amendment was rejected.

Mr. POMERENEN. President—

That the President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. POMERENEN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Since the assessment of the District of Columbia has been changed so as to make it biennial, does the Senator think the amendment is now necessary?

Mr. POMERENEN. I was just about to explain the amendment. It was originally introduced as a bill by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and was referred to a sub-committee of the District of Columbia Committee, which favored its adoption. It is to meet this situation: We have been informed by the other parts of property that any owner of any portion of land to go before the tax assessor and ask for redistribution of the tax upon that land so that, if, for instance, I were negligent in the payment of my taxes on that portion which I still held, the Senator from Utah could not pay the taxes, and the taxes would not be received at the Treasury Department, so he would be compelled to pay the taxes on the full tract or his land would become delinquent. But it would be clear that, if the amendment is included he would authorize any owner of any portion of land to go before the assessor and ask for redistribution of the tax upon that land so that if, for instance, I were negligent in the payment of my taxes the Senator from Utah could not pay the tax on his portion, and thus avoid the penalty for delinquency.

Mr. SMOOT. That is as I understood the amendment. I think that such a provision ought to have been in the law of the District of Columbia for several years past, particularly when we had an assessment once every third year. I believe it is a matter of good judgment to adopt the amendment now, even with biennial assessments, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I take it that the adoption of the amendment would interfere in any way with the payment of the taxes on any portion of the land.

Mr. POMERENEN. Not in the least.
Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Then, I will offer no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Ohio if he will kindly let that be numbered section 9?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; all you have to have is the Utah license.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I received a letter last June by some road supervisor of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that I not only have a letter, but I have a thorough statement in the letter. I would not state upon the floor of the Senate anything that I did not view was correct, and I want to say to the Senator that I would not do anything that would lead the Senate to get a wrong impression from anything I may say here.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am not imputing to the Senator any such thought or idea. I have a letter here signed by Mr. E. Austin Baughman, commissioner of motor vehicles, 11 East Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md., dated February 5, 1917. The letter reads as follows:

"Replying to your letter of the 2d instant, I beg to advise that an amendment was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, which provides that the commission of motor vehicles at Baltimore, Md., is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations and requirements as may be necessary to determine what the Maryland law was, and the question really was not passed upon.

The pending bill provides a tax on all motor vehicles in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, and the District of Columbia, while used or operated within the District.

This amendment provides, for instance, that if the State of Maryland charges a tax for a license upon a motor vehicle if Maryland cars come into the District they shall also pay a tax to the District as long as there is not reciprocity between the District and the State of Maryland.

The question was discussed in the Committee on Appropriations, but wasn't acted upon, and I reserved the right to offer this amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOTH. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I received a letter last June by some road supervisor of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator knows this, does he not? For instance, I may have a Utah license tag upon my automobile, and under this bill I have got to have a District license tag. If I go into the State of Maryland with a District license tag on my machine, I have got to have a Maryland license.

Mr. SMOTH. Even though I have a license from the State of Utah?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; all you have to have is the Utah license.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I received a letter last June by some road supervisor of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that I not only have a letter, but I have a thorough statement in the letter. I would not state upon the floor of the Senate anything that I did not view was correct, and I want to say to the Senator that I would not do anything that would lead the Senate to get a wrong impression from anything I may say here.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am not imputing to the Senator any such thought or idea. I have a letter here signed by Mr. E. Austin Baughman, commissioner of motor vehicles, 11 East Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md., dated February 5, 1917. The letter reads as follows:

"Replying to your letter of the 2d instant, I beg to advise that an amendment was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, which provides that the commission of motor vehicles at Baltimore, Md., is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations and requirements as may be necessary to determine what the Maryland law was, and the question really was not passed upon.

The pending bill provides a tax on all motor vehicles in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, and the District of Columbia, while used or operated within the District.

This amendment provides, for instance, that if the State of Maryland charges a tax for a license upon a motor vehicle if Maryland cars come into the District they shall also pay a tax to the District as long as there is not reciprocity between the District and the State of Maryland.

The question was discussed in the Committee on Appropriations, but wasn't acted upon, and I reserved the right to offer this amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOTH. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I received a letter last June by some road supervisor of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator knows this, does he not? For instance, I may have a Utah license tag upon my automobile, and under this bill I have got to have a District license tag. If I go into the State of Maryland with a District license tag on my machine, I have got to have a Maryland license.

Mr. SMOTH. Even though I have a license from the State of Utah?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. No; all you have to have is the Utah license.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I received a letter last June by some road supervisor of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I want to say to the Senator that I not only have a letter, but I have a thorough statement in the letter. I would not state upon the floor of the Senate anything that I did not view was correct, and I want to say to the Senator that I would not do anything that would lead the Senate to get a wrong impression from anything I may say here.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am not imputing to the Senator any such thought or idea. I have a letter here signed by Mr. E. Austin Baughman, commissioner of motor vehicles, 11 East Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md., dated February 5, 1917. The letter reads as follows:

"Replying to your letter of the 2d instant, I beg to advise that an amendment was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, which provides that the commission of motor vehicles at Baltimore, Md., is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations and requirements as may be necessary to determine what the Maryland law was, and the question really was not passed upon.
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The question was discussed in the Committee on Appropriations, but wasn't acted upon, and I reserved the right to offer this amendment on the floor of the Senate.
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Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I am not imputing to the Senator any such thought or idea. I have a letter here signed by Mr. E. Austin Baughman, commissioner of motor vehicles, 11 East Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md., dated February 5, 1917. The letter reads as follows:

"Replying to your letter of the 2d instant, I beg to advise that an amendment was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland, which provides that the commission of motor vehicles at Baltimore, Md., is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations and requirements as may be necessary to determine what the Maryland law was, and the question really was not passed upon.
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Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMOTH. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I received a letter last June by some road supervisor of Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Senator knows this, does he not? For instance, I may have a Utah license tag upon my automobile, and under this bill I have got to have a District license tag. If I go into the State of Maryland with a District license tag on my machine, I have got to have a Maryland license.

Mr. SMOTH. Even though I have a license from the State of Utah?
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 has never 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 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 puts 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 man in Montgomery County, for police purposes, is given 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. Not under the law as it stands. If the Senator from Utah has a tag from his own State on his auto, and then he has a District tag upon it, he has to pay from $20 to $30 for a license in the State of Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not understand why the Senator chooses to confuse with the District of Columbia a plain provision of the Maryland law that is aimed at everybody who runs an automobile, namely, that you must not have a whole lot of numbers plastered over your machine. The necessity of having single numbers to deal with, for police purposes, is absolutely evident, and to have a confusion of numbers flashed before the eye of the officer is objectionable. There is no discrimination there against the District. You simply have to take off your extra tag, and that is a provision in the administration of the law.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, under the provisions of this bill every person operating an automobile in the District from now on, and in the past, too, has been compelled to get a District license, 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 pay a license; and as long as he is compelled to have the District license, of course he cannot go into Maryland without paying for a license there. If I drove from Utah and temporarily came into the District of Columbia I would have to pay a District license; and as long as he is compelled to have the District license on it, and under the 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. The District license satisfied the District law—either 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 given up?

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

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

Mr. REED. Well, that is exactly what the law says.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Smith is in the chair.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. 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. Now, of course there is nothing in that. The constable can always stop a machine, and he can always ascertain whether or not 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 or may not be, that the construction that has been given to this law by the constables and justices of the peace who immediately surround the city of Washington—the constable lying in wait always far enough back of the line so that you have violated the law if you go into the State, never at the line to warn you back—the construction they have put upon the law has been that if you have no Maryland license, although you have a State license, you have frequently been haled up and fined; but that where you have a State license and a District license 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 if he can say by any chance whether 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 or owner of any motor vehicle operated in this State who shall have complied with the laws of the State in which such vehicle is operated, including the registration of motor vehicles or the licensing of drivers thereof and the display of the appropriate registration or identification number, shall have the privilege of operating such vehicle in this State, in accordance with the laws thereof, and such other laws as may be required.

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 had an experience 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 stated, in effect, that the law of Maryland is, and I agree with the commissioner.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not know whether the Senator has a right to make that statement or not.

Mr. SMOOT. This is what the commissioner says:

If the car in question, however, displays a District of Columbia license, it is also necessary to have a Maryland license.

There is not any question about the law. It specifically states so.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Wait a moment. If a citizen of the District of Columbia has a license for the District of Columbia, he is not entitled to go into Maryland. The District of Columbia is not treated like all of the States are treated.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. And the Maryland law specifically eliminates the District of Columbia.

The District of Maryland. Mr. President, we do not profess to have reciprocity with the District of Columbia, because there is no reciprocity between the District of Columbia and Maryland. Maryland 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 people to this extent, for the people of the District of Columbia, who can not give us reciprocity, to expect us to keep up these roads for them to use and to destroy.

As I said just now, Judge Peter, of Montgomery County, told me that 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.

In regard to the District they charge 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 period 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—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question of tide seems to have been questioned, having both a Delaware and a District of Columbia tag on that machine. In the last four years I have been warned several times by the—
Mr. SMOOT. That is exactly what I have done for four 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 answer.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Here is another Senator who has not had that same experience. A Maryland constable has $5 of mine now. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President.

Mr. SMOOT. That is a Senator who does not know that 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, as he says, they can not go into Maryland without a Maryland license unless they are arrested.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. 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. SMITH of Utah. 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 that the officers of the law in Maryland have a right 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 officers have a right in our State have always done what they should have done; I suspect they have violated the law; but I do say that the officers of the State of Maryland do not feel that they ought to be taxed to build roads and keep them in repair. The tax from $800,000 to $3,000,000 a year and that the District of Columbia, which cannot 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.

I will also 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 they have very tolls: A gentleman told me that he was in Virginia three or four days and the tolls amounted to from $13 to $14.

In our State we have bought up the roads that had tolls in order that we might get rid of tolls, and much tax as that upon the people who travel in our State. I say it would be absolutely wrong. The Senator from Utah says he wants it done right. We all want to do right, but I do not think it is right that we should take ourselves to build roads and they should be used by the people of the District of Columbia, who can not give us reciprocity.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator recognizes the fact, does he not, that the people of the District of Columbia are taxed to build roads and the Maryland people use the roads?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Not in Maryland.

Mr. SMOOT. Not in Maryland, but in the District.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. But the use of roads in the District of Columbia by the people of Maryland amounts to little when compared with the use of roads in Maryland by people from the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the proposition seems to be that the people of the District of Columbia ought to pay for the Maryland roads. I can not understand why that should be the case at all.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, that is not my idea about it.

Mr. LODGE. I summed it up briefly.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We ourselves pay something for the use of the Maryland roads.

Mr. LODGE. We pay an unusually high license to have the use of Maryland roads.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. It is only what we pay ourselves.

Mr. LODGE. New England has unusually good roads; the States there have spent enormous sums of money. It costs us a good deal more than $800,000 to keep our mileage in Massachusetts in repair. In the summer New England is filled with people from other States who use the roads. Quantities of automobiles are there. Massachusetts draws no line on the District of Columbia. We interfere with no State and we do not interfere with the District of Columbia. We do not expect to have other people pay for our roads. I do not think any State does expect Maryland, as far as I know.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. If the Senator will pardon me, the State of Massachusetts is not situated as the State of Maryland is in regard to the District of Columbia.

Mr. LODGE. That is perfectly true.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Probably would not be a hundred people in the District of Columbia who would use the roads in Massachusetts, but they use our roads every day and use a part of them a great deal more than the people of Maryland.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think it ought to be reciprocal. If Maryland is going to charge a high license to everybody in the District of Columbia who crosses the line—personally I have never interfered with, but I know of such cases where there were posted men around the Chevy Chase Club and they grabbed them one after another as they came out and fined them, and it is only a little over the border—if Maryland is going to do that I think the District ought to have an equal tax on every Maryland automobile that comes into the District.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President.

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

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator understand that it is reciprocal in that the District automobile owner gets a license when he goes to Maryland and the Maryland automobile owner when he comes to the District gets a license?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I think it is reciprocal. I would put on the same tax they levy on us.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. That would not be reciprocal.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely, it is reciprocal; but to charge $40 in Maryland and $10 in the District 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.

And in 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 $2 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, but Maryland has undertaken, in my judgment, to build up a road system and to maintain it. This license business goes to the maintenance of the road system.
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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 law?

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 long in 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 three weeks, or whatever the reciprocity period is, 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 the gentleman to come into our State under the laws of the State of Maryland.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let us know where you come from. That is all we ask; but do not come into the State saying you come from here or you come from there if you come from somewhere else. There is a great deal of necessity under modern police conditions for regulating and observing automobile traffic.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland another question for information.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to conclude the question I desire to ask?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am a little bit troubled about this. I go into Maryland very little.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. We will be glad to have the Senator come as often as he likes.

Mr. GALLINGER. But I have a couple of grandchildren at school in Maryland, whom I should like to visit. Now I have a New Hampshire tag on my car, but I cannot get to the Maryland line without having a District of Columbia tag on my car also. Must I stop at the line and take the District tag off? Have but one tag on my car in Maryland? I am asking the question for information.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am very glad the Senator has asked me the question, because it would take him a very little while when he gets to the District line to take one tag off. Then there would be no complexity about it. The New Hampshire tag would be good in Maryland. There is no occasion for using two tags there to confuse the numbers and it is a very small thing to ask the Senator to take off his New Hampshire tag. He is nowhere near New Hampshire, so what is the occasion for using the New Hampshire tag?

Mr. GALLINGER. There is occasion for using it, because certain States recognize it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. If you are going into another State, then put it on.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it not true that if the New Hampshire license tag was taken off and the District license tag was put on, he could not go into Maryland then unless he paid the Maryland license tax?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I am asking my question entirely for information. I have a good deal of sympathy, I want to say from what I have heard of the argument, for the position the two Maryland Senators have taken. It seems to me that the District of Columbia, occupying the position it does, with such a large population and such a small area, and Maryland having the beautiful roads that she has, it is not unfair that she should be allowed to tax some way for the very large use that is made of the roads of Maryland. The District would not dare to do it, so far as I know. It is practically unlimited, because it is impossible to spot a man when he goes out and when he comes in. That is why such an arrangement between Maryland and the District can not be worked. If we gave the District a three weeks' reciprocity period, we would never find the time when that period was ended, so far as a District car was concerned.

Mr. NORRIS. The idea that impressed me, however, was this: If Maryland is giving other States the proper reciprocity, as I understand the Senator to claim she is, in case of some one, like a Member of Congress or a Cabinet officer, from some State, go into Maryland, or a State of Maryland during the session of Congress, if the laws of the District make it necessary for him to get a District tag, then in order to comply with the law of the District, he would in reality offend against the laws of Maryland if he went across the line. Let us know about it.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. If he carries two tags over the District line.

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 seems to rely more than any other thing else is, it seems to me, contrary to the actual requirement of the Maryland law. He says the purpose is to keep a 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 due to the legal residents of the District of Columbia if the State from which he comes in or in which he has his legal residence does not recognize the District of Columbia license tax.

Mr. NORRIS. Then it would not apply to residents of the District at all, and would have no application to them?

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Not in the slightest.

Mr. JONES. Except that it is hoped that it would work out reciprocity between Maryland and the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, then—and I want to get a right understanding of it—it would only apply to people in the District who are legal residents outside of the District. Is that right? In other words, it only applies to nonresidents of the District who are in the District.

Mr. JONES. I suggest that the amendment be again read. That will be the best way to understand it.

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. SMITH of Maryland. I claim that the bill is 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 contention of the Senators or any points of order that they may make is without effect.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is not familiar with the proposal to which this is an amendment, and would
to have the amendment returned to the Secretary's desk, so that it may be read. The Secretary will first state the proposed amendment.

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 of motor vehicles or licensing of operators thereof and the display of identification or registration numbers on such vehicles, and which identification or registration number shall be displayed on each such motor vehicle as provided by the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia, or used or operated within the District, the owner of such motor vehicle has his legal residence extends the same privilege to the motor vehicles owned or operated in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President—
The House is prepared to rule. 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 Senator does not hold that the Senate has not the right to amend the House text?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. The Chair is prepared to rule. 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. SMOOT. The Chair will hear the Senator from 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 have really 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. 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 in any manner 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 accountable under the laws by residing in 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. SMOOT. 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 the legal residents have 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. LEE of Maryland. 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—
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. SMOOT. They are the only body that can 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 say that he has the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. As this seems to be a matter which affects the entire country, does not the Senator think that the Committee on Interstate Commerce ought to deal with it?

Mr. JONES. I am serious about that.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

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.

Mr. SMOOT. What we want to do is this: 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 state right here that they will not do 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 Union, 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?
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. 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 can not 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 section of the country. To answer your question, I have to say that there may be some tollgates there. 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. SMITH of Maryland. I have to say to the Senator that I do not believe there are any toll roads in our State except in this very small piece. I want to say that there may be some tollgates there, 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 by on Chery Chase Circle, with a 40-horsepower machine, I have to pay $50 for that privilege, though I go across the State once a year. Now, it is pretty hard 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 for a citizen 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 such a thing. 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, to cross your State that the resident of the State of North Dakota would have? 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 $800,000 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—particularly in Washington who live here permanently, it seems to me, ought not to object to paying something toward the upkeep of roads in Maryland. The justice is not all on one side, as I look at it. I should like to have some law of reciprocity. I dislike to go as far as this amendment would go. It does not seem to me to be quite fair. It is hardly applicable to any other case that I know of where a large city is just at the edge of a State whose population use the roads of the State more than the people that build the roads. The Maryland people have to pay the taxes, and enormous taxes, to keep up the good roads they have. They have been doing wonderfully well, it seems to me, on the good-roads proposition. Maryland. It would hardly be right to allow the 350,000 people who live right at the edge of Maryland continually to use the roads day after day, not for temporary purposes but permanently, without requiring them to pay something toward the upkeep of the roads.

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. I do not think the amendment I offered was very good. The amendment of the Senator from Utah is still pending. Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought. Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, what became of the amendment I offered?

Mr. NORRIS. I want to make a few remarks on the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

The President pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Utah is still pending. Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought.
amendment in the affirmative without excusing ourselves as license taxpayers. We are going to pay the license in the District of Columbia. Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that we always straighten out everything and that the Senator from Wyoming is not in order to make an accusation of that kind. It is not in order to make an accusation of that kind. The Senators from Maryland—because it excuses them from some financial obligation. It is, in my judgment, stepping across and over the rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the point of order made by the Senator from Wyoming is correct, but the Chair did not understand the language of the Senator from Maryland to mean that.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. No; there was no invidious reflection in my remarks. I was speaking to the Senator from Utah just now, and I said he was unconscious of that, which was perfectly proper.

Mr. SMOOT. I speak of it as a reflection upon the entire Senate, except the Senator and his colleague, and I think I am justified in making the complaint. The record of the report of the remarks of the Senator will show. But I do not care to pursue the subject.

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 Senator from Maryland will proceed.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I should like to go on and make a statement of what I propose to say.

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 what the amendment provides. I do not put the same construction on the amendment that the Senator from Maryland does. 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, a machine. You may.

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 have the same treatment, but that is all there is in it. 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 they could put a tax on the automobile, but that under the law 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 required. This bill has a provision that an amendment will provide for an annual tax. The Senator from Utah expects to pay any tax imposed as the Senator from Maryland does. He must be mistaken as to what the object is.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I do not reflect upon the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Wyoming in the slightest degree or upon any Senator who votes for this amendment. It is simply an awkward piece of legislation. The alleged object is to produce complete State reciprocity between the District of Columbia and the Maryland people. It is a holepiercing amendment, and that is all, so far as we are concerned; but the effect it has is that it excuses every Member of the Senate or anybody else in the District of Columbia from paying an annual license tax 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 simply provides for a State reciprocity situation between Maryland and the Senator from Wyoming is doing exactly the same as any other citizen of the State. The reason or the cause I do not know. There must be a reason, God knows.

Mr. SMOOT. 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. Last there must be some reason. I have racked my brain for half an hour to find out why it was that what these distinguished gentlemen say in this body all tends one way, to Maryland. Finally the thought came across my mind that Maryland is wet and the arid portions of our immediate neighborhood are in Virginia and West Virginia. As much as I love Virginians and West Virginians, I think the gentlemen here are justified in bearing for Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator that we have such good roads they can get to their destination very quickly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Good roads in Maryland, good whiskeys, and beautiful women.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. Not knowing how he would vote on this amendment, I will withhold my vote now.

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Underwood]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and I withhold my vote.

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Swanson], who is absent on account of illness. Therefore I withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (when Mr. Saulsbury's name was called). Making the same transfer as announced on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN (when his name was called). I desire to ask if the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Brany] has voted? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Pсосes] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Kern], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Presbyterian] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Husting] and vote "yea."

Mr. VARDAMAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Brany] to the Senator from California [Mr. Price] and vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (after having voted in the negative). I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts.
sets [Mr. Weeks] to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Bankinghead] and allow my vote to stand.

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

Mr. CHILTON. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Fall] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. Currier] and vote "nay."

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

Mr. JONES. I transfer my vote with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Swett] 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. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont has been agreed to.

Mr. BRYAD. I offer the amendment which I sent to the desk, to be inserted at the proper place in the bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I make no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota is accepted by the chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment may be considered as agreed to.

Mr. BRYAD. I offer the amendment which I sent to the desk, to be inserted at the proper place in the bill following: 1,000 dollars for plans for a bridge to be built across Kline Valley on Connecticut Avenue.

Mr. BRADY. If the amendment which we adopted to-day relative to the purchase of a park site is retained in the bill, it is very essential that this amendment should be adopted. If that amendment is not retained, the conference committee can, of course, reject this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I make no objection to that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

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 question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHILTON. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment 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, and $2,000. Provided, That existing provision of law requiring the appointment of two privates of the Metropolitan police force for the enforcement of said act is 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 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 as far as I am concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will not be adopted. It does not strike me that this is a very apt time to purchasing half-million-dollar parks in the District. We are needing about all the money we have. The Federal Government in its half of the police matter can easily go to some more convenient season, as was stated by Senator St. John. Paul upon an occasion when the remark was not quite so apropos as it now is.

Mr. CHILTON. 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. As long as we have the half-and-half 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 legislation what has been fairly dealt with. The question is whether a person knows that there has been a contest in this city whether we should buy what is known as the Patterson tract in the north-east or whether we should buy the Dean tract in the northwest. That has been decided to buy the Dean tract for $625,000, instead of buying the 93½ 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, and we will not be blessed with. 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 which has been historically considered most suitable for our park system at once, and not take the childish system of gauging our work in this city by the narrow ideas of a few people. We have a city that is reached as to what the city has to do and what we ought to do. That would be the broad way. Of course, the Senate is not now going to do that; but it is going to keep on in the old-fashioned way with as many things as it can, and the half-and-half system is one of them. It is going to keep on in the little, narrow, impractical way of doing a few things this year and a few things next year. Of course, the property is going to get more valuable from year to year; more and more people are going to suffer because they do not know what to do with their property; and this great northeast section will be more and more neglected, as it has been in the past.

But I thought there might come a sense of justice across the Senate and individuation of the Senate to the Senator from Virginia? I do not know anything about what the Senator from Maryland said or did, nor am I taking exception to the manner in which he asked his question. Dr. Hall, of the Columbia Institution, out there, called my attention to it. I agreed to offer this amendment. I know nothing about who owns the property or anything about the matter except what I have stated. I only know that we are again up against the proposition of the old half-and-half system that is holding down the development of the city of Washington simply because a few people are in the habit of going on and trying to govern the United States have decided long ago that this Government should not have any other system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the old-fashioned plan of cutting your cloak according to your cloth is not a bad thing, but a very sensible one. It is pretty good common sense for anybody, an individual, the Nation, the State, the District, or any other entity, not to spend any money that they have not got, and it is a very good idea for the property owner or anybody about anything that I have hinted. I only know that we are again up against the proposition of the old half-and-half system that is holding down the development of the city of Washington simply because a few people are in the habit of going on and trying to govern the United States have decided long ago that this Government should not have any other system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the old-fashioned plan of cutting your cloak according to your cloth is not a bad thing, but a very sensible one. It is pretty good common sense for anybody, an individual, the Nation, the State, the District, or any other entity, not to spend any money that they have not got, and it is a very good idea for the property owner or anybody about anything that I have hinted. I only know that we are again up against the proposition of the old half-and-half system that is holding down the development of the city of Washington simply because a few people are in the habit of going on and trying to govern the United States have decided long ago that this Government should not have any other system.
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 $3,050,000 for the purchase of a bridge site. Now for park purposes for 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 receive our approval to the extent that we expect the members of the conference committee to stand for the proposed amendments.

I have every desire to comply, where I can, with the wishes and desires of the Senator from West Virginia; but I certainly hope that some evidences of economy, somehow, will be manifested in this session of Congress before we adjourn.

The Finance Committee is busily engaged in an effort to formulate tracks that shall fit into the interests which is sought to be taxed in protesting against being compelled to contribute to our expenditures. That is perfectly natural; that is only human, in fact; but those of us who have the task of providing revenues for the purposes of the Government have some little appreciation of what the task means.

If it be true that $325,000 has been appropriated by this bill for the purchase of park land elsewhere, then I am very sorry. I do not think the people of much foresight and judgment will pay any such purposes anywhere. They can wait. We are upon the brink, possibly, of a situation that will require tremendous expenditures, and that ought to bring to us, to some extent at least, a sober realization of our burdens and their repercussions on any such purposes anywhere. They can wait. We are upon the brink, possibly, of a situation that will require tremendous expenditures, and that ought to bring to us, to some extent at least, a sober realization of our burdens and their repercussions on any such purposes anywhere. They can wait.

My judgment is that it is not to the interest of the owners of this property to accept this price, I do not know what they would do, but if I were within the orbit of public life, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Colorado both to what I had to say this morning about this very property.

The tract in question is directly on a car line, easily accessible from the District of Columbia, and it points right into this Patterson tract. That bridge was built as part of the arrangement of this terminal system, and it is known as the District of Columbia bill, now pending before this House, $440,000.

The tract in question is directly on a car line, easily accessible from all parts of the northeast, as well as many parts of the northwest. It was built as part of the arrangement of this terminal system, and it points right into this Patterson tract. That bridge was built in 1908, and ever since that time that $440,000 of expenditure has been in the air, because the District of Columbia would never appropriate the money to put in the fills and use the bridge. These people have had New York Avenue condemned through their property, and they are being assessed and taxed to-day on the theory that they practically have this great thoroughfare, New York Avenue, coming at their property and going through it; and yet for all this period that $440,000 structure has been in the air, and no provision whatever has been made to make it available for the benefit of the public at large, or the development of this tract and other real estate to which this bridge would give immediate access across the river of railroad tracks into the street.

Here is a very good illustration of what we were talking about this morning. Either "take it or leave it," so to speak. Let these streets go out, and let these people develop their land according to the natural conditions, or take it, if you are going to take it—whatever you are really going to do. But to hold these people up for eight years and tax them at a high rate, with a bridge suspended in the air that cost $440,000, and not be willing to bring the little money that is to be made available through this bridge and continue that highway, seems to me to be practically a sort of municipal highway robbery.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, if the Senate see fit to vote down the purchase, I am going to ask the Senate to vote its approval of the purchase, and I am going to ask the Senate to vote the amount of money that is in this bill to put that street out. There is $20,000 carried in this bill to extend New York Avenue and fill in up to the bridges to that roadway, and I think it is a little less than half of the work—hardly any of it. If the Senate see fit to vote down the proposal to take this land, then, for goodness sake, let these people alone and let them have the street. Do not stay here any more in this dog-in-the-manger attitude of having a bridge there, right next to them, that cost this great sum of money without permitting them to use it as access to their land. Over half a million dollars of money has gone into that bridge—half a million dollars of expenditure to build it, with accrued interest at a low rate.

The positions are absolutely inconsistent. Congress ought not to be guilty of that sort of treatment of any of our citizens. So if the Senate, with its eyes on $440,000, or some other item, will vote down this bridge, then I think we ought to be consistent and at least give $40,000 to let that street go out over that bridge that has already cost $500,000, and is now and has been for eight years (Mr. JONES. Anybody).

Mr. CHILTON. 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.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 8, 1917.

Hon. WILLIAM E. CHILTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir: I beg leave to call your attention to the enclosed amendment. I feel it should be made a part of the bill 19119, usually known as the District of Columbia bill, now pending before the Senate. I hope you will be willing to propose when this bill is considered.

The citizens of the northeast have approved of the purchase of this tract for the benefit of all parts of the city. They are especially interested at the present time in having provided for the northeast end of the city the same sort of protection that is now enjoyed by the northwest section, because there the citizens desire, which is known as the "Patterson tract," the following points to be taken care of:

1. Great need. The section in which it lies is being built up rapidly. It has no public park, with the exception of one-half of Lincoln Square and Stanton Square, representing a few acres of formal parking.

2. The tract is already being used extensively as a park, showing the need of securing it as public property.

3. The tract is included in the improvement of the President's plans.

4. The purchase of this tract has been recommended year after year by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as the most desirable park project in contemplation.

5. It is not an expensive tract, comparatively speaking. The $1,200 acres of which it is comprised can probably be bought for $500,000. Comparing this with the 91 acres of the Dean tract for $325,000, makes the desirability of the price more evident.

This tract, once acquired, will not require much further expense, partly because it is already level, another part consists of open hillside, and the remainder a high wooded hill containing a splendid oak woods.

The tract is directly on an electric car line, easily accessible from all parts of the northeast, as well as many parts of the northwest. It is within 20 minutes' ride from the present Eastern, Technical, Business, and Central High Schools.

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

Yours very respectfully,

Evan H. Tucker.

Percival Hall.

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 which they had hoped to consolidate into this tract. Some time after year one of this was in the bill, 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. Having thought on it after the adjournment, 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. JONES. Is this a question of a tax? I should like to 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 if it were used in some manner, and I want to know how it is to be used in this association, because it is conceivable that they might invest in property which was to be used for purposes of profit. How is the property to be used? Mr. CLAPP. This is used for their building and their equipment. 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 amendment.

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

That the property situated in squares 178 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, inclusive, occupied by the Daughters of the American Revolution, be, and the same is hereby, exempt from taxation, and, subject to the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1877, providing for exemptions of church and school properties and acts amendatory thereof. And there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $99.19. The proportion of taxes upon said lots since February 23, 1916, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay said sum of $99.19 to the treasurer of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

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.

The 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, that may be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

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

DEAR SENATOR CLAPP: I am inclosing the statement in regard to 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 yours,

EMMA HAYES DAVIS.

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

Taxes due May, 1916.......

$282.99

Pro rate taxes, at $252.99 from July 1, 1915, to Feb. 23, 1916 (payment made before land purchased).....

183.80

Amount paid by society.......

99.19

$282.99 will be due May, 1917.

[From page 13822 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Aug. 1, 1917.]

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 back again to the United States. Mr. J. n the interest of explaining why they did not pay their taxes, it was suggested that they pay their taxes, and if the bill became law it would be a very easy matter to have a bill passed to reimburse them for the taxes. The tax certificate here, if there is any question raised as to that. It is a small matter. I realize that probably it would be subject to a point of order, but it is on the agenda, and I hope some body in particular has to look after it, to save them the bother of trying to get the bill passed through both Houses of Congress, in charge of the bill, I offer the following amendment:

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Order. On page 132, after line 16, insert:

"That the sum of $271.76 is hereby appropriated to repay 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 yours,

EMMA HAYES DAVIS.

LLOTS 4, 5, 6, 7, and 11, SQUARE 178.

Taxes due May, 1916.......

$282.99

Pro rate taxes, at $252.99 from July 1, 1915, to Feb. 23, 1916 (payment made before land purchased).....

183.80

Amount paid by society.......

99.19

$282.99 will be due May, 1917.

On page 132, after line 16, insert:

"That the sum of $271.76 is hereby appropriated to repay the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution the tax certificate held by said society upon lots 23, 24, 25, 27, and 28, square 178, in the District of Columbia, as follows: $143.75 as per receipt for taxes paid March 14, 1916; $127.98 as per receipt for taxes paid March 24, 1916; and $8.27, said sum to be paid upon the presentation of said receipts by the treasurer general of said society.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I make no objection to this amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senate having just rejected the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] to purchase the Patterson property, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CHILTON. Certainly.

Mr. CHILTON. I simply wish to serve notice, Mr. President, in view of the action of the Senate regarding the Patterson tract, that I want to reserve for a separate vote in the Senate whether we can purchase tracts of the size of those matrons at $720 and on page 68 there are three matrons at $800 each, one having as far as I can see the same power of arrest as to act as policemen. There may be some reason for that, also. I appeal to the Members of the House who called it to my attention that the hard work was to be done by those who are getting only a salary of $600.

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 in the increase to the matrons, but let the committee be the ones to set the rates at $720 and on page 68 there are three matrons at $800 each, one having as far as I can see the same power of arrest as to act as policemen. There may be some reason for that, also. I appeal to the Members of the House who called it to my attention that the hard work was to be done by those who are getting only a salary of $600.

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-
Mr. NORRIS. I noticed that.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. We have depended upon the increase made by the Smoot 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. NORRIS. 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 resolved.

Mr. 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 Smoot 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 reason for the amendment.

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

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

Mr. 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 a thing which will, perhaps, appeal to not many. We have a large collection of animals there, and it is most unusual 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 hillsides, 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 48 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. Then there is no place 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 could 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 the Senator will go on with 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 its basis in certain quarters outside of the park as well as inside the park, and it belongs on this bill.
Mr. WADSWORTH presented a petition of sundry citizens of
Gainesville, N. Y., praying for national prohibition, which was
ordered to lie on the table.
Mr. STONE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Westchester
County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to found
the Government of the United States on Christianity, which
was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.
Mr. PFELAN presented the petition of the conservation department
of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles,
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. CLAPP presented a petition of the Boosters Club of
Atascadero, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to
found the Government of the United States on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.
Mr. COLT presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial
from Oscar Arneson, chief clerk of the house of representatives
of the Legislature of Minnesota, transmitting a resolution of
that body, praying for the enactment of legislation to found
the Government of the United States on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.
Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a petition of the Portland
(Me.) Typothetae, requesting against a change in sec-
ond-class rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.
Mr. PAGE (for Mr. DILLINGHAM) presented telegrams in the nature of a memorial from the City of Chicago, Ill., praying
for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.
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 I shall submit
a report (No. 1021) to accompany the bill at a later day.
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
Gardner, Susan R. Salter, Susan Mann, Celia Thayne, William
Cox, Theodore Farley, Adele Laxon, Clara L. Tenney, George
M. Adams, Charlotte Jensen, and Sophia Huff, reported it with
amendments and submitted a report (No. 1022) thereon.
Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclama-
tion of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 8044)
for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain
lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act, reported it
without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1029) thereon.

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:
A bill (S. 8192) for the relief of Charles S. Fries (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.

By Mr. JAMES:
A bill (S. 8194) for the relief of W. F. Tomlinson, adminis-
trator of Samuel Tomlinson, deceased (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 Pen-
sions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:
A bill (S. 8196) granting a pension to Jennie L. Sidelingler
(with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 8197) granting an increase of pension to Horace A.
Wright (with accompanying papers);
A bill (S. 8198) granting a pension to William Gilmour (with
accompanying papers);
and
A bill (S. 8199) granting a pension to Martha Holt (with
accompanying papers); to the Committee on
Pensions.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.
Mr. NELSON presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial
from the National Dairy Council, of Chicago, Ill., remon-
strating against the proposed change in the tax on oleomargar-
ine, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.
The President, pro tempore. The message will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Commerce.
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. 15455) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Department 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, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 19, 20, 21, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 55, 58, 62, 63, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 89, 100, 103, 106, and 112.

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 27, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, 106, and 117.

That the House recede from its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided, That the sum proposed of $5,000 shall be used for an investigation and on the merits of the claim of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation and for the purpose of bringing the case of such Indians to a contest with the United States; and that the Secretary, or his duly authorized agent or representative, shall have the power to institute and conduct such a contest, and to investigate into the adverse claim of the United States, and to prosecute such claim to a successful conclusion; and that the Senate agree thereto.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided, That the sum proposed of $75,000 shall be used for the employment of additional field matrons; that the Senate agree to the same.

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: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided further, That the Senate agree to the same.

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 amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided further, That the Senate agree to the same.

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 amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided further, That the Senate agree to the same.

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 138 of the bill:

That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior, or his duly authorized agent or representative, shall have the power to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties."
That 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.

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 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.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, 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.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed strike out 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.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, 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.

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 lieu of the amendment proposed strike out the following:

"That the sum of $50,430, be...
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 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 48, 50, 95, and 111.

HENRY F. ASHURST, Chairman.
L. H. MYERS, Republican.
Moses E. CLAPP, Democrat.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN H. STEPHENS, Chairman.
C. D. CARTER, Republican.
P. D. NORTON, Democrat.

Managers on the part of the House.

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 connect the county of Montgomery, in the county of Montgomery and Elmore, in the County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across Red River of county commissioners of

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. 1474. 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. 18321. 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. 18534. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Farkin, Ark.;

H. R. 18553. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Hamilton, in the State of Alabama, at a point somewhere between Judlin Ferry and Hughes Ferry;

H. R. 18562. 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 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 suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 18564. 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. 19239. An act granting the consent of the Senate from Nevada to the Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate adjourn.

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. Mr. President—

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

Mr. OVERMAN. All right; I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment? Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. OVERMAN. That the Senate proceed until further notice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana yielded 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.

Mr. OVERMAN. It 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 our way, 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. The gentleman from Kentucky asks 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.

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.

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 this body, and the bill to which the President referred 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 48, 50, 95, and 111.

HENRY F. ASHURST, Chairman.
L. H. MYERS, Republican.
Moses E. CLAPP, Democrat.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN H. STEPHENS, Chairman.
C. D. CARTER, Republican.
P. D. NORTON, Democrat.

Managers on the part of the House.

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 connect the county of Montgomery, in the county of Montgomery and Elmore, in the County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across Red River of county commissioners of

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. 1474. 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. 18321. 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. 18534. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near Farkin, Ark.;

H. R. 18553. An act granting the consent of Congress to the county of Hamilton, in the State of Alabama, at a point somewhere between Judlin Ferry and Hughes Ferry;

H. R. 18562. 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 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 suitable to the interests of navigation, in the county of Lake, State of Illinois;

H. R. 18564. 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. 19239. An act granting the consent of the Senate from Nevada to the Senator from North Carolina moves that the Senate adjourn.

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. Mr. President—

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

Mr. OVERMAN. All right; I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment? Several Senators addressed the Chair.

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.

Mr. OVERMAN. It 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.
Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is pension day, and I understand that two pension bills were put on the Private Calendar, one a Senate bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions and one a House bill from the Committee on Pensions, to be considered in order and taken up following the completion of the roll call on H.R. 6500.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that a Senate private pension bill from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and also a House bill from the Committee on Pensions, be taken up immediately following the conclusion of the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Is there objection?

Mr. KITCHIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Missouri that it was understood the other day, or rather the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. RAUCH] gave notice, that immediately after the conclusion of the naval appropriation bill he would ask for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill. It will take not more than an hour and a half or two hours, if that. I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri make his request to follow that bill. I understand the gentleman from Missouri thinks it will take only half an hour of his time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It will take about 22 minutes to pass the two bills.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, we can stay here an hour later if necessary.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Well, I will change the request and ask that these private pension bills be taken up following the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to object. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Missouri, as well as to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KIRK], that there is no objection to the consideration of these bills, but there is some difficulty in making an agreement in advance. It is just as easy to take up these bills after the pension appropriation bill is passed as it is now. I will take this advance agreement. Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Because this is pension day, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. They are in order at any time.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think there will be no objection. We can stay here an hour or two later if necessary.

Mr. GARNER. Does the gentleman believe that in spite of the fact that any man would take more than half an hour? Mr. KITCHIN. No; and it will not take half a night.

Mr. MANN. They could be considered now while waiting for Members to come in.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Why not read them now?

Mr. KITCHIN. That would be perfectly satisfactory to me. If the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] in charge of the pension appropriation bill would prefer that course all right, but if he prefers to go on with the naval bill, very well.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I prefer that the matter be disposed of now rather than to break into it at 5 o'clock this afternoon, because I can not forecast as to the time it will take not more than 20 minutes I shall not object.

Mr. MANN. It will be in order at any time to move to defer it. I suggest that the gentleman from Missouri consider those bills in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] asked unanimous consent to proceed for not exceeding five minutes' objection?

There was no objection.

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

The CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, acting wholly upon my own initiative and in obedience to a sense of justice, I am making this statement in advance of time.

Yesterday while the House was debating some of the Senate amendments to the legislative bill I had an understanding with the representatives of the Illinois [Mr. Bryan], who had charge of the time, that I was to have five minutes in opposition to the amendment proposing to classify postmasters. I hurriedly proceeded to arrange in my mind the points I would endeavor to cover in the few minutes' notice. At the last moment from Tennessee informed me that owing to encroachments upon his time by those who had preceded me he could only yield me a minute and a half and I then had less time than that remaining in which to think of something to say in that minute and a half. [Laughter.]

It occurred to me that I could cite my experience as appointment clerk of the Census Office in helping to organize that office and finally the independent of the civil service as an illustration of how easily a high standard of efficiency can be obtained and how necessary examination. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETTE] had both just spoken in support of the Senate amendment. I recalled that they had both submitted, along with other members of Congress, their recommendations to fill the quota allotted to them in that office; and, speaking in a spirit of bidenage, of course, hastily, I used language which was calculated to place those two gentlemen in the position of others' notes, 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 quota allotted in each instance was filled, but if I am in error as to that record of the facts, then I will say that publicly.

During my 10 years of service in this body I have never tried to misrepresent or otherwise do 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 said to him privately yesterday, but not publicly, that he did not hurt my feelings any? [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGLEY. 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.

The 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. LANGLEY. 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. 8057. An act for the relief of the legal representatives of Napoleon B. Giddings.
H. R. 8257. An act to place Bernard A. Schaaf on the retired list of the Army;
H. R. 217. An act to authorize the sale of school property in the city of Denver, Colorado;
H. R. 3238. An act for the relief of Sarah B. Elliott;
H. R. 8452. An act for the relief of Charles L. Moore;
H. R. 9547. An act authorizing the United States Government from the Kanesaw Memorial Association of Illinois of a proposed gift of land on the Kanesaw battle field in the State of Georgia;
H. R. 12742. An act for the relief of John Brode;
H. R. 12742. An act for the relief of Gottlob Schlect and Maurice D. Higgins and for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Valentine Brash;
H. R. 13106. An act for the relief of the trustee and parties who are or may become interested in the estate of James A. Chamberlain under the terms of his will; and
H. R. 13820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Buttnor; and
H. R. 14572. An act for the relief of Gertie Foss; and
H. R. 14964. An act for the relief of the legal representative of P. H. Aylett; and
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

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:
S. 7833. 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. 7493. An act for the relief of Willfred 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. 8251. An act for the relief of John F. Kelly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.
S. 5488. An act to authorize the appointment of William S. Kinney as judge in the middle and eastern judicial districts in the State of Tennessee; 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. 5890. 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. 8507. 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, announcing that the Senate had agreed to amend said Senate bill to give said amendment the same effect as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

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. 16359. 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 battle field of Guilford Courthouse with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read 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 battle field 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 announced as the conference on the part of the House Mr. Dent, Mr. Nicholls of South Carolina, and Mr. Kahn.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up pension bills on the Senate Calendar of Bills, and have 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 have 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, as follows:
A bill (S. 7486) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependents relatives of such soldiers and sailors.

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, upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, to order pensions to:
the name of Celia A. Hibbard, widow of Benjamin F. Hibbard, late of Company C, First Regiment Vermont Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month, the same to be paid
the name of Julia Ann Higginbotham, widow of John W. Higginbotham, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $26 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.
the name of John W. Hendricksen, 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. Rodenbeck, late of Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
the name of John J. Schillemann, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-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 $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
the name of Blanche F. Nash, widow of Guy T. Nash, late of Company F, Seventh 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 $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
the name of John J. Jarrett, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
the name of William R. 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 Gleeson, widow of William J. Gleeson, late of Company C, Forty-seventh 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 A, 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 deduction or rebate on account of former alleged erroneous payments or overpayments of pension.
the name of Ellen Rusch, widow of Ebenezer 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 A. Bleese, late of Company A, Eighty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
the name of George D. Smith, late of Company K, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
the name of William J. Crink, late of Company A, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry; and Seventh 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 Shapin, late of Eleventh 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 La Fayette Mutt, late of Company C, One hundred and Twelfth 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. Gain, late of Seventh Company, unused 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 C. Patterson, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lawrence D. Two hundred and tenth 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 Emily E. Hubbard, widow of George M. Hubbard, late first Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William H. Cleland, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-eighth 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 James K. Wesley, late of Company I, Forty-ninth Regiment Kentucky 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 Henry M. Bryant, late of Company F, Twelfth 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 Samuel D. Seymour, late of Company K, Ninety-sixth Regiment Indiana 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 Jacob W. Perkins, alias William West, late of Company C, First Battalion Ohio 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 John E. Madison, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment, and Company K, Second Regiment, Company H, 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 James R. Thornton, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Michigan 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 Frederick A. Churchill, late topographical engineer, captain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Piggott, late of Company F, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Cook, late of Company F, Eighty-fifth Regiment Michigan 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 Henry H. Niles, late of U. S. S. Moose, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

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

The name of Dr. John W. Terrance, late of Companies F and D, One hundred and twenty-sixth 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 Charles Gilmour, late of Company A, Seventy-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

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

The name of Grace Elizabeth Brown, helpless and dependent daughter of George R. Brown, late of Company A, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robertson, late of Company C, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois 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 George Banghart, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
The name of Ogden Peterson, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Simon Dow, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Mower, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

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

The name of Sarah Wright, widow of William H. Wright, late captain Company A, Twenty-second Regiment, New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin W. Brown, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

The name of Frances E. Wallace, widow of William A. Wallace, late of Company E, Thirteenth Regiment, New York State Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Edward Neupert, 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 C, Sixteenth Regiment New Jersey 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 Charles E. Collins, late of Company D, Thirty-first Regiment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert F. Hedrick, late of Company D, Thirty-first Regiment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

The name of Sarah W. Pownall, widow of William H. Pownall, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment of New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Smith, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $60 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

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

The name of Charles F. Prentice, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment New Jersey 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 Horace A. Vanover, late of Company H, Sixty-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 Lewis Menzies, late of Company G, One hundred and seventeenth Regiment Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Holiday, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth 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 Horace N. Holbrook, late of Company A, 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 James W. Treat, late of Company E, Nineteenth 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 James W. Treat, late of Company E, Nineteenth 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 Mary A. Atherton, late of Company B, Ninety-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of $35 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Sharpnack, late of Company D, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $25 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry S. Torrey, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Maine 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 Charles E. Collins, late of Company D, Twenty-first 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 John C. Rickey, late of Company I, Sixteenth 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 John B. Scott, late of Company F, Sixteenth 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 Reynold D. W. Campbell, late of Company F, Sixth 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 Henry G. Mitchell, late of Company A, Twenty-first 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 Margaret Steele, late of Company P, Seventh Regiment Iowa 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 Luther B. Johnson, late of Company C, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Countryman, late of Company A, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William F. Wilson, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
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 Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
The name of John W. Stahl, late of Company G, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $80 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
The name of John Stevens, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
The name of Levi G. Foss, late of Company G, Thirty-first 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 Levi G. Foss, late of Company G, Thirty-first 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 Levi C. King, late of Company K, Seventh 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 Levi C. King, late of Company K, Seventh 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 Levi C. King, late of Company K, Seventh 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 Levi C. King, late of Company K, Seventh 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 Levi C. King, late of Company K, Seventh 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 Levi C. King, late of Company K, Seventh 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 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 regular Army, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Numbers</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8617</td>
<td>Bailey Mitchell</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8637</td>
<td>Sylvester Clark</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8667</td>
<td>George W. Ward</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8687</td>
<td>Francis J. Connors</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8697</td>
<td>Charles Gilmore</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8707</td>
<td>William J. Love</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8717</td>
<td>Benjamin F. Treadwell</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8727</td>
<td>Grace Elizabeth Brown</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8737</td>
<td>Horace H. Bush</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8747</td>
<td>Henry C. Tully</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8757</td>
<td>John C. Allen</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8767</td>
<td>Frederick W. Exline</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8777</td>
<td>John M. Cornellson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8787</td>
<td>John J. Hodge</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8797</td>
<td>Anna H. Bowen</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8807</td>
<td>John W. Slusher</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8817</td>
<td>William S. Rowe</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8827</td>
<td>Thomas L. Irwin</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8837</td>
<td>Maurice M. Kight</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8847</td>
<td>Stephen P. Culby</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8857</td>
<td>Job Wiburn</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8867</td>
<td>Munroe J. Hodge</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8877</td>
<td>Mark C. Poole</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8887</td>
<td>Walter H. Dupree</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8897</td>
<td>Marita L. A. Hickford</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8907</td>
<td>William F. Wilson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8917</td>
<td>Elmer H. Keeler</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8927</td>
<td>John W. Upton</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8937</td>
<td>Charles P. Betts</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8947</td>
<td>Charles A. Ashford</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8957</td>
<td>John Cook</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8967</td>
<td>John A. Morgan</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8977</td>
<td>Watkin C. Morgan</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8987</td>
<td>Anna E. C. Tenney</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8997</td>
<td>Charles Washington</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9007</td>
<td>John W. Nally</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9017</td>
<td>Henry Thompson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9027</td>
<td>John R. Stillwagon</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9037</td>
<td>William S. Rowe</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9047</td>
<td>Thomas L. Irwin</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9057</td>
<td>Samuel M. C. Cissna</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9067</td>
<td>Isaac E. Allen</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9077</td>
<td>Thomas Brown</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9087</td>
<td>John R. Simonson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9097</td>
<td>Thomas D. Low</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9107</td>
<td>Kate M. White</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9117</td>
<td>Joseph C. Predmore</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9127</td>
<td>John W. Hendrickson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9137</td>
<td>George Maybury</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9147</td>
<td>John T. Schlissmann</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9157</td>
<td>John H. Jarrett</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9167</td>
<td>Joseph C. Patterson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9177</td>
<td>John W. Torrance</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9187</td>
<td>Napoleon J. Allen</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9197</td>
<td>John M. Cornellson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9207</td>
<td>James C. Coffyn</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9217</td>
<td>John W. Hendrickson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9227</td>
<td>Luther B. Johnson</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9237</td>
<td>John W. Hanlon</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9247</td>
<td>Charles F. Penley</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9257</td>
<td>Harriet B. Durgin</td>
<td>2-9-40</td>
<td>Consider</td>
<td>House bill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pension at the rate of $17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida Bill, widow of William Bill, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William F. 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 Lawrence F. 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 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 Lewis L. Cummings, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Ohio 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 G, Seventeenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Ira W. France, late of Company A, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph P. Riley, helpless and dependent child of Joseph P. Riley, late of Troop A, First United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John V. Milford, late of Troop A, Fifth United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph Tanco, Jr., late of Company I, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John B. Allison, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louisa Wilson, dependent mother of Michael Wilson, late of Troop L, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Howard M. Greenwald, late of Company L, Eighth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Walter C. C. Erlandson, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of David J. Keating, late of Company A, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John T. Wilson, late of Company D, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Louis F. Greenblatt, late of Company A, First Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Robert T. Rowland, late of Companies B and D, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Orin Marshall, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of James F. Crumlin, 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 Joseph Canton, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles B. Reid, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William H. Bill, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 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 Charles A. Vanzetti, late of Company M, Colorado Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John M. G. Smith, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary J. Knapp, dependent mother of Forrest W. Durante, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Alfred H. Pegram, late of Company M, Second Regiment Virginia 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 Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of William McCarty, late of Company D, Third Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John B. Burrow, Jr., late of United States Navy, 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 Allen P. Gabuardi, late of Sixty-sixth Company United States Coast Artillery Corps, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Daniel J. French, late of Fifty-first Company United States Field Artillery, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Jacob 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 John J. Johnson, 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 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 Daniel J. French, late of Forty-fifth Company 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 T, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Augustus D. Durkee, late of Company I, Nineteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company C, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Charles C. Wilson, dependent mother of Michael D. Wilson, late of Troop L, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Benjamin F. McPherson, 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 Robert L. Crook, jr., late major, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, was referred to the House of Representatives, was referred to the Committee on Pension, pursuant to a resolution of the House, adopted at 2:45 p.m., three days after the House adjourned the first session of the Twentieth Congress, pursuant to the resolution of the House, adopted at 2:45 p.m., three days after the House adjourned the first session of the Twentieth Congress.

The name of David I. Gordon, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment United States Infantry, War of the Rebellion, was referred to the Committee on Pension, pursuant to a resolution of the House, adopted at 2:45 p.m., three days after the House adjourned the first session of the Twentieth Congress.

The name of Capt. W. H. Kendrick, late of Capt. Tally's company, First Georgia Drafted Militia, War of the Rebellion, was referred to the Committee on Pension, pursuant to a resolution of the House, adopted at 2:45 p.m., three days after the House adjourned the first session of the Twentieth Congress.

The name of Francis B. Williams, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Capt. Yoakum's Tennessee Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Richard Thraish, late of Troop A, Third Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Margaret A. Wells, widow of Capt. McLin's company, Tennessee Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Gideon B. Marshall, late of Captain T. Johnson's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martha A. Knapp, widow of Captain T. Johnson's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William E. Williams, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Benjamin Harrison, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank E. Conkling, late of Company F, United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mr. Preston, late of Company G, (Burnetts) New York Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Thraish, late of Troop A, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank S. Caswell, late of Company C, First Georgia Drafted Militia, Indian War, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Oram, late of Company G, (Burnetts) New York Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Oram, late of Company G, (Burnetts) New York Volunteers, War with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Williams, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frederick J. Guite, late of Captain T. Johnson's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martha A. Harris, late of Company K, Thirty-first Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay her a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Mary E. Bowers, late of Company M, Thirty-fifth Regiment United States Infantry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Martin L. Thomas, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles V. Grogan, late of the United States Navy, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Capt. W. H. Kendrick's company, Florida Mounted Volunteers, Indian War, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Frank E. Conkling, late of Company F, United States Cavalry, Regular Establishment, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of Joseph A. B. Plank, late of Troop B, Fourth Regiment United States Volunteer Cavalry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John G. Fehrle, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of John V. Fohren, late of Company G, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of H. H. P. Oakey, late of Company B, Thirty-seventh Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of $20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.
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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 what is the nature of these documents and what is the extent of them.

Mr. FESS. Yesterday I placed in the Record the 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 them in a way 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. 1447).

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 read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 31.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 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 of Representatives, 2,500 for distribution to the members, and the superintendents of the said folding rooms are hereby authorized to deliver not more than one copy to each Member of the Senate and each Member of the House on request of the Member desiring same.

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 455 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 lawyers in such cases 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. I wish 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 is 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 law 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 number bound in buckram for the individual Members, and the rest could be bound in paper.

Mr. BARNHART. The difference in cost between buckram and paper is less than $300. If we should have a part of them bound in buckram and the rest in paper, the difference in cost would be slight that it was not put on account of the committee that we had better bind them all in buckram, the volume being an important one.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the Fox River Bridge bill, which was favored 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 up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 31.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 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 of Representatives, 2,500 for distribution to the members, and the superintendents of the said folding rooms are hereby authorized to deliver not more than one copy to each Member of the Senate and each Member of the House on request of the Member desiring same.
to each Member, and the folding room thereby will hold the balance until they are taken up.

I fold a 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 Moore's 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.

JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 65.

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-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1917, price $1,700 in cloth, 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 that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 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:

Mr. H. R. 20682 is the bill in which he stated that 938 officers short; that is, by August 29, so far as the officers are concerned. We

H. R. 20772 I can explain it. All of paragraph (d) is eliminated. That is the paragraph that authorizes the commissary to give the witnesses of labor. Then, on page 4, line 2, the language "at an amount sufficient to indemnify the United States shall be required to file a bond with the Secretary of the Navy, instead of the words 'Secretary of the Navy'" so that it would be determined by the President. The changes are simply verbal and do not change the meaning in substance.

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.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.
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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.

JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 65.

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-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1917, price $1,700 in cloth, 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 that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 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.
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H. R. 20772 I can explain it. All of paragraph (d) is eliminated. That is the paragraph that authorizes the commissary to give the witnesses of labor. Then, on page 4, line 2, the language "at an amount sufficient to indemnify the United States shall be required to file a bond with the Secretary of the Navy, instead of the words 'Secretary of the Navy'" so that it would be determined by the President. The changes are simply verbal and do not change the meaning in substance.

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.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

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.

JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 65.

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-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, for the year 1917, price $1,700 in cloth, 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 that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 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.
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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.

The resolution was agreed to.
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The resolution was agreed to.
tting 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 vacancy, so that the whole 9,000 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 63,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PADGETT. The authorized strength of the Navy, I think, is 78,000 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 8,049 Regulars and 23,330 reserves, after using 6,000 militia and 403 fleet 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, on page 601, there is a preliminary estimate of the personnel required for mobilization plan for July, 1918, which calls for the services, Regulars, to the number of 40,869, and reserves, 45,870. How near do we approach at the present time, or under the provisions of this bill, to these requirements stated by Admiral Palmer?

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 some of these 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 ago, who were on the service prior to that time could not, but 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 was the total number that make out 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 train men in advance. They ought to have at least a full year's training before they are placed 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 1919, 1,200 and 1,900 men much short of 50 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.

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. TOWNER. 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 the administration of the Taft administration and the Wilson administration as it occurred 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 53,500, and that the enlisted personnel under the present administration is 77,856—

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 28,000 better supplied with ordinary seamen than under the Taft administration, refering 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. Not to the actual enlistments.

Mr. BRITTEN. I am just elucidating, not asking 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, while under the Wilson administration the enlisted personnel of the Navy to-day, after three years of world unrest, is recruited only 68 per cent of its authorization.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BRITTEN. I can not yield inasmuch as I have only a few minutes.

Notwithstanding the fact, as I said before I was interrupted by my good friend from Texas, that the world has been at unrest for more than three years, and the need for men in the service has been evident everywhere but in the Navy Department, on February 1 we are recruited only 68 per cent of the authorization of 77,956, exclusive of 2,313 men with the Militia on probation. And I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Navy is worse than fill it up, so that the whole 928 could be made up from the Militia.
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 under the Taft administration and the five years of the Bryan administration, shorter than it was four years ago. And I want to say further that this accentuates, if it is possible for anything to accentuate it, the lack of business administration in the Navy Department under the present 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, there was no expectation of Dillon getting the necessary complement for vessels already in commission until, as he expressed it, some necessity arose. Is that true?

Mr. PAGGETT. I did not say that.

Mr. TOWNER. I hope I misunderstood the chairman.

Mr. PAGGETT. You did if that was your understanding. I said that the three-year program would require for the construction of the big ships, the battle cruisers and the battleships, at least 30 months for construction, even if expedited. The time that the contractors offered was, first, 48 months and 61 months, and the lowest they have up to the present time indicated was 40 months. But assuming that they should speed up to 30 months, then for those ships provision could be made as they came into commission.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me ask the gentleman this question: As I understand it, the department says they are doing all that they can to meet the deficiencies in the personnel of the Navy under existing law?

Mr. PAGGETT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Ah, let notwithstanding that fact there is existing a real deficiency now. Will the gentleman tell us what efforts are being made, and especially what provisions are made in this bill or any other, to fill the personnel of the Navy, at least to the extent of manning the ships that are now in commission?

Mr. PAGGETT. Yes, sir. The Navy Department is using every effort and energy. They are advertising, they are establishing recruiting stations throughout the country, that the men have been publishing and circulating, so as to get in touch with the public, the provisions of the law of August 29, 1916, reorganizing the personnel of the Navy, the enlisted personnel, whereby we gave very substantial advantages and benefits to the enlisted men. And as that is getting out and they are becoming acquainted with it, the enlistments are proceeding with much more satisfaction than heretofore. For instance, I had the statistics here, which I read on a former day, but I will call attention to it merely, that in January, 1914, the net gain in enlistments was $7,292 for the month. They do not go back of that time. They have no record kept before that time that I could find. It was $7,361 in 1915, the net gain was 375; in January, 1916, the gain was 57,612; in January, 1917, just past, under the operation of this new legislation that I stated, which information has just been scattered abroad and made known to the people, the net gain was $1,344.

Mr. TOWNER. Well, but does the gentleman believe that within a reasonable time we can fill the complement of the ships in commission?

Mr. PAGGETT. The chief of the bureau, Admiral Palmer, informed me that he expected, and he based his expectations upon an investigation into the working of the plan, and believed that during the fiscal year for which this legislation is passed he would have the enlistments up to 70,000.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the country will not be satisfied with that. I believe that at present, and unless recruiting stations throughout the country are established, and ships that we have in commission be fully manned, they will demand that our Navy be ready for any emergency. They will demand that anything that is necessary to be done be secured, a full complement for the ships now in commission should be done. And it occurs to me that it is the duty of this committee, and it is the duty of the administration, to take immediate steps to see that this is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Towner] has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three lines of the demonstration of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Towner], that the men now in active service will be under the supervision of recruiting stations throughout the country.

Mr. PAGGETT. 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 Taft administration as the most inefficient of all administrations ever to have been in office. The admiral of the fleet, the distinguished statesman 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 decide war or peace, and the Constitution has given the House of Representatives the power to decide what efforts are made to defend the country. The gentlemen are here, many of whom are representatives of a free people from acting as free men.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman to withdraw that last sentence.

Mr. 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 in lieu of the issue of food on board the ships for the period of three years from the date of the passage of this bill, and for the commutation of the rations paid to our soldiers in the army, and for the commutation of the rations paid to our sailors in the navy.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. 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 body, I want to say that I see no possibility of doing anything in the shape of a national Mock trial to determine the role of Congress. I am free to admit that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for the forces during period of active service; and for the service of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service, and the expiration of the sentence, the sentence of death, or the expiration of such sentence as may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, which shall in no case exceed 30 cents for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Treasury warrants once at 30 cents, at all, $10,144,943.40, 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.

Mr. 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 body, I see no possibility of doing anything in the shape of a national Mock trial to determine the role of Congress. I am free to admit that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for the forces during period of active service; and for the service of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service, and the expiration of the sentence, the sentence of death, or the expiration of such sentence as may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, which shall in no case exceed 30 cents for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Treasury warrants once at 30 cents, at all, $10,144,943.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in no spirit of criticism of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or of any of the Members of this body, I see no possibility of doing anything in the shape of a national Mock trial to determine the role of Congress. I am free to admit that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for the forces during period of active service; and for the service of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service, and the expiration of the sentence, the sentence of death, or the expiration of such sentence as may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, which shall in no case exceed 30 cents for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Treasury warrants once at 30 cents, at all, $10,144,943.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, in no spirit of criticism of the Committee on Naval Affairs, or of any of the Members of this body, I see no possibility of doing anything in the shape of a national Mock trial to determine the role of Congress. I am free to admit that the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to commute rations for the forces during period of active service; and for the service of female nurses and Navy and Marine Corps general courts-martial prisoners undergoing imprisonment with sentences of dishonorable discharge from the service, and the expiration of the sentence, the sentence of death, or the expiration of such sentence as may vary in accordance with the location of the naval prison, which shall in no case exceed 30 cents for each ration so commuted; and for the purchase of United States Treasury warrants once at 30 cents, at all, $10,144,943.40, to be available until the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.
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. Sears. 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 said they were mentally prostituted and 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 cease to be appropriated by Congress to support people on the retired list who are anxious 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. Tague. 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. Tague. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the opinion of the gentleman [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, and they are paid by the same method as other men, 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. Tague. Mr. Butler. 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. Tague. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; the Secretary of the Navy or 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. Padgett. 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. I am called to active duty, I get my full pay and allowances of my 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. Padgett. It is in keeping with the principle that I said 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.

Now, with reference to the pay. Up to the bill of August 29, 1916, they received three-fourths of the active pay which they were receiving when they went on the retired list. Now that has been changed, and for a service of 30 years they get 21 per cent for each year, which would be three-quarters pay, but for every three years the service less than that amount is reduced 21 per cent, so that a man has to serve 30 years in order to get three-quarters pay. That was the law of August 29, 1916, and it is no longer based upon the full three-fourths retired pay.

Mr. Tague. Mr. Chairman, may I ask an extension of my time for five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts, having now one minute remaining, asks unanimous consent that he be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. Sears. On page 49 there is appropriated, in addition to the amount I gave, $198,307.50 for the increased pay of retired officers regularly assigned to active duty. I do not know whether that is in addition to their retired pay, or extra pay, or what it is, but it adds $198,000 to the amount.

Mr. Padgett. Let me correct the statement of the gentleman. $198,000 is for the entire pay of all the retired officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. Tague. While the chairman of the committee is of course better informed on this subject than most of us, still my contention is this: If a retired officer is active enough to perform service for the Government, and his own request, then he is entitled to the remuneration that he received while in active service. Now, for instance, we have in the navy yard at Boston a commandant who, until last October, was paid as a captain. He went before the plucking board for advancement to rear admiral.

Mr. Padgett. Not the plucking board.

Mr. Tague. Whatever you want to call it.

Mr. Padgett. It is the examining board.

Mr. Tague. The examining board. He was examined and found to be physically and mentally sound, but for some slight and trivial matter he was not allowed his promotion, but was retained with a lieutenant commander's pay. Now, that man is to-day doing the same service for the Government that he has done in that yard for three years. He is commandant of the yard, and he is receiving in return the pay of a lieutenant commander. I do not know just how much, but much less than he was receiving as a captain. He is performing good service for the Government. He is physically and mentally able to perform that service. He has a record in the Navy as good as that of any man who ever served in it, and receiving a medal for bravery from Congress. Yet for a trifling matter this man is compelled to be retired against his own wish and against the wish of those who know him. He is working to-day and performing the full duty of a commandant and is receiving a lieutenant commander's pay. There is no provision in the law, and there is no provision in this bill, that permits the Secretary of the Navy or the President of the United States to pay a man single cent more than the pay of a lieutenant commander. I think this is unfair. I do not believe the law was ever intended to do this. I believe it was intended that when a man is performing Government service with a certain rank he shall receive the pay of that rank. Why this should be as it is I do not know. I have tried to find some way out of it, but I know of no way except to amend the law, and I offer an amendment to do that. I point out order will lie against it under the rule. So, Mr. Chairman, I think it is one of the many unfair things imposed upon officers in the Navy, many times creating hardships and leaving them no opportunity of redress. They have spent the best years of their lives in the service of their country, and when they have grown old, too late to begin life over again, although in perfect health, the cruel reduction of the office from which they have retired is inflicted upon them.

It has been decided by the board that the brave officer must go, no matter how it affects him, but it is decreed, and go, he must to the scrap heap of humanity. [Applause.]

It is an easy matter to smear the name and reputation of such a man as that, and to injure his character, and without any approval upon his performance of duty; and when a man with such a brilliant record for faithful performance of duty and for bravery is treated in this manner it is time to modify the law. Mr. Chairman, it is in keeping with the principle that I said 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, as I understand, 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 am sure that the duty of the Navy is to protect the American citizen when he enters that service, and there are many such cases. There is an American citizen who has served for many years as a seaman and was supposed to be re-  

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The commandant of the navy yard is a line officer and of his color, but throughout the whole service there are many honorable men who have served their country faithfully. The Lord knows that we all have our weaknesses. There is no man perfect, and men should be judged on the good things that they do and not always by their weaknesses.  

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. And cooperated with him in the preparation of this important  

Mr. BRITTEN. Did this man have any number?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not know. He was an  

Mr. BRITTEN. And because of his age has served through probably 12  

Mr. PADDGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the  

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.  

Mr. PADDGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.  

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is it the contention of the gentleman that because a ship is loaded with contraband, Germany has the right to destroy the lives of passengers and crew?  

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I made the statement that after all these headlines the State Department declared that there was no occasion for any warlike declaration in consequence of her sinking.  

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. PADDGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is no objection about that.  

Mr. BRITTEN. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact and ask the gentleman whether Tennessee has not put the officer into bed.  

Mr. PADDGETT. Mr. Chair- man, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

Mr. PADDGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is no objection about that.
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 statements appear in the newspapers, but 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 Germans, the German ambassador was being shown the officers and men in charge of these German vessels. It was evident that some tall lying was done in this instance for the purpose of irritating Germany under very strong and circumstantial reasons. We two the answer were given, the officers and men in charge of these

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes, Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be if the Germans Government had been forcibly restrains by our ambassador in that country? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines. Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read and force us to go to war. After the insertion had been heard that the German ambassador, who was on an excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has been in captivity and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; the gentleman does not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is absurd upon its face. Though we have had it for three days, this morning's newspaper conferences upon the congress with the American ambassador, that conferences have been going on in Berlin, and that the ambassador will be safeguarded out of Germany just as we are going to safeguard the German ambassador out of the United States. Oh, there is no war going on upon the so of somebody who is interested in having war.

Mr. DYER. His passports have been issued to him. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The ambassador is going to get out safely. Somebody wanted to inflame the American people by declaring that the American ambassador had been held in captivity. Absurd! We have given safe conduct to the German ambassador out of Germany, and the Germans have been decent with the American ambassador. But at least 2 college professors and about 150 editors, more or less, were very much informed that the barracks down here are waiting for men like them to come forward and enlist—but they declared in effect that they were willing to involve their country in war because the American ambassador had been held in captivity, and the German ambassadors were held in captivity, which explains their activity in general newspapers.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be if the Germans Government had been forcibly restrains by our ambassador in that country? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines. Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read and force us to go to war. After the insertion had been heard that the German ambassador, who was on an excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has been in captivity and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; the gentleman does not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is absurd upon its face. Though we have had it for three days, this morning's newspaper conferences upon the congress with the American ambassador, that conferences have been going on in Berlin, and that the ambassador will be safeguarded out of Germany just as we are going to safeguard the German ambassador out of the United States. Oh, there is no war going on upon the so of somebody who is interested in having war.

Mr. DYER. His passports have been issued to him. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The ambassador is going to get out safely. Somebody wanted to inflame the American people by declaring that the American ambassador had been held in captivity. Absurd! We have given safe conduct to the German ambassador out of Germany, and the Germans have been decent with the American ambassador. But at least 2 college professors and about 150 editors, more or less, were very much informed that the barracks down here are waiting for men like them to come forward and enlist—but they declared in effect that they were willing to involve their country in war because the American ambassador had been held in captivity, and the German ambassadors were held in captivity, which explains their activity in general newspapers.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be if the Germans Government had been forcibly restrains by our ambassador in that country? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines. Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read and force us to go to war. After the insertion had been heard that the German ambassador, who was on an excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has been in captivity and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; the gentleman does not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is absurd upon its face. Though we have had it for three days, this morning's newspaper conferences upon the congress with the American ambassador, that conferences have been going on in Berlin, and that the ambassador will be safeguarded out of Germany just as we are going to safeguard the German ambassador out of the United States. Oh, there is no war going on upon the so of somebody who is interested in having war.

Mr. DYER. His passports have been issued to him. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The ambassador is going to get out safely. Somebody wanted to inflame the American people by declaring that the American ambassador had been held in captivity. Absurd! We have given safe conduct to the German ambassador out of Germany, and the Germans have been decent with the American ambassador. But at least 2 college professors and about 150 editors, more or less, were very much informed that the barracks down here are waiting for men like them to come forward and enlist—but they declared in effect that they were willing to involve their country in war because the American ambassador had been held in captivity, and the German ambassadors were held in captivity, which explains their activity in general newspapers.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be if the Germans Government had been forcibly restrains by our ambassador in that country? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines. Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read and force us to go to war. After the insertion had been heard that the German ambassador, who was on an excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has been in captivity and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.

Mr. RAGSDALE. No; the gentleman does not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is absurd upon its face. Though we have had it for three days, this morning's newspaper conferences upon the congress with the American ambassador, that conferences have been going on in Berlin, and that the ambassador will be safeguarded out of Germany just as we are going to safeguard the German ambassador out of the United States. Oh, there is no war going on upon the so of somebody who is interested in having war.

Mr. DYER. His passports have been issued to him. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The ambassador is going to get out safely. Somebody wanted to inflame the American people by declaring that the American ambassador had been held in captivity. Absurd! We have given safe conduct to the German ambassador out of Germany, and the Germans have been decent with the American ambassador. But at least 2 college professors and about 150 editors, more or less, were very much informed that the barracks down here are waiting for men like them to come forward and enlist—but they declared in effect that they were willing to involve their country in war because the American ambassador had been held in captivity, and the German ambassadors were held in captivity, which explains their activity in general newspapers.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell me what he thinks of the duty of this Government ought to be if the Germans Government had been forcibly restrains by our ambassador in that country? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is carried away with the headlines. Mr. RAGSDALE. No; he is not. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will listen, I will demonstrate what fools some men are—not like the gentleman from South Carolina, of course—who believe everything they read and force us to go to war. After the insertion had been heard that the German ambassador, who was on an excellent terms with everyone in high life in Germany, has been in captivity and held for exchange. The gentleman believes that statement.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last part of this paragraph. 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 when 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 but to the attitude of the newspapers. The British steamship Philadelphia was reported sunk since the President was here, and yet the next day, after these reports had gone over the country like wildfire, nobody got off 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 true that the editors and the political college professors, I say to the gentleman that I quite agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that George 'Vashington, the so-called American, is a British subject; that is all. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman that there is too much noise and that the editors of this country may make too much noise. Fortunately the sound of their voices does not penetrate this Hall, while some of the noises which get in here might be suddenly ceased with a great deal of pleasure to some of us who have to stay here.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Illinois said he, the gentleman from Illinois, had sense enough to keep still.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I know what he said, but he did not disclose the fact that he had politeness enough, while keeping still, to abide by the rules of the House in undertaking to chide me. That is for the gentleman's information, the gentlemen from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANN. I am abiding by the rules of the House.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is undertaking to lecture me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, no. I have been lecturing the great editors and the political college professors. I did not have the gentleman in mind at all. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman's mind is rather limited in its memory.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Surely my mind is not limited when I refer to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. The gentleman says so little on the floor of this House that he ought to be given an opportunity in everybody's time to be recognized. May I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I merely wish to say that when I speak to the gentleman from South Carolina my mind is unlimited.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am quite sure that is true. There are a great many things the gentleman possesses that are unlimited, although his nerve is one of them. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, undertakes here to tell us about getting excited over the newspapers, and he undertakes to read from the newspapers, then proving that the conditions in Germany are not what they are reported to be in other newspapers. Now, why should we accept the statement from the newspapers selected by the gentleman any more than he would accept the statements made by the newspapers which he has not selected? I say to the gentleman that I quite agree with him that the people of our country ought not to be excited or hurried into war, but I say to the gentleman, sympathetic as I am to the people who are not peaceable, that Germany has placed a restraining hand upon our ambassador, who went there in good faith to represent this Government, as a Representative of my people I wish to exhaust every possible remedy to stop thesepreparedness arguments that are being filled with all sorts of exaggerated and mis-representations 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. All I can say then is that the papers report this afternoon that George Washington, the so-called American, is a British subject; that is all. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend I wish to say that so many rumors and reports of an exaggerated character have appeared during the last few days that even the President, who is known as the calmest of men, has given utterance over 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, who have been incited to spread these rumors of war for selfish purposes. When our President has made up his mind that American honor is at stake and that we must enter upon a war to uphold it, I have no doubt he will find cordial support in this Congress, but 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 warrant 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 is one of them. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Chairman, undertakes here to tell us about getting excited over the newspapers, and he undertakes to read from the newspapers, then proving that the conditions in Germany are not what they are reported to be in other newspapers. Now, why should we accept the statement from the newspapers selected by the gentleman any more than he would accept the statements made by the newspapers which he has not selected? I say to the gentleman that I quite agree with him that the people of our country ought not to be excited or hurried into war, but I say to the gentleman, sympathetic as I am to the people who are not peaceable, that Germany has placed a restraining hand upon our ambassador, who went there in good faith to represent this Government, as a Representative of my people I wish to exhaust every possible remedy to stop these
Mr. DYER. I will state to the gentleman that the Washington Times of to-day states that the ambassador has been given his passports and that he has never been detained at all.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will ask to my friend that he ought to take advice from the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and not be misled by newspapers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAGSDALE. To both at one time. Let us have a "talk fest." Go to it.

Mr. DYER. He has been furnished a special train to Switzerland by the German Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Please allow me to tell you that the gentleman knows that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a gentleman on this subject in Berlin yesterday, now, possibly the gentleman is the spokesman of the Department of State, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERRICK] is the spokesman of the White House. I would like him to say whether or not he knows that this conference took place in Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my information does not come solely from the newspapers. I did not say that I was the spokesman of anybody or anything except the people of the sixth district of South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I say that what I stated is true, and it cannot be disproven.

Mr. DYER. I will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my information does not come solely from the newspapers. I did not say that I was the spokesman of anybody or anything except the people of the sixth district of South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman that the Washington Post, a very reliable newspaper, states that there was a gentleman on this subject in Berlin yesterday, now, possibly the gentleman is the spokesman of the Department of State, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERRICK] is the spokesman of the White House. I would like him to say whether or not he knows that this conference took place in Berlin yesterday, in which the American ambassador bore an honorable part.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my information does not come solely from the newspapers. I did not say that I was the spokesman of anybody or anything except the people of the sixth district of South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I say that what I stated is true, and it cannot be disproven.

Mr. PADGETT. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Improvement of construction plants: For repairs and improvements of machinery and implements at Navy yards. For repairs and improvements of construction plants at navy yards at Portsmouth, N. H., $10,000; Boston, Mass., $25,000; New York, N. T., $25,000; Philadelphia, Pa., $25,000; Norfolk, Va., $25,000; Charleston, S. C., $10,000; Mare Island, Cal., $35,000; Puget Sound, Wash., $25,000; in all, $200,000.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Under the improvement of construction plants just read, $500,000, on page 41, there is an appropriation for Boston, Mass., of $25,000, and approximately the same appropriation is made for Boston, on page 44, under machinery plants. What is the condition?

Mr. PADGETT. They are in different bureaus or departments. One is in the Bureau of Construction and Repair, and deals with the hulls, and the other is in the Steam Engineering Department, that deals with the machinery and implements, and so forth, inside of the shops.

Mr. SEARS. The appropriations are so nearly similar that—

Mr. PADGETT. One relates to hulls. They are in different bureaus.

Mr. FOSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to Coast Guard cutters. Are they being built at all?

Mr. PADGETT. They are not being built at all. They could not get a bid within the limit of cost.

Mr. FOSS. Are they going to be built in navy yards or by private contract?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. The award is to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. I believe you called these navy-yard plants construction plants before.

Mr. PADGETT. I will say to the gentleman that the only difference is that we have grouped it all into one paragraph. Heretofore we referred to it as repairs and improvements of machinery and implements at navy yards.

Mr. MANN. You did not use the word "construction" heretofore.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; it is the same language, and then it was repeated in reference to every yard.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is in error, but I do not know that it makes any great difference.

The Clerk reads as follows:

The limit of cost of one steam Coast Guard cutter for service as an ambulance, per New York Times, May 23rd, 1917, authorized a vessel, authorized as "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year 1917, and for other purposes," approved August 29, 1916, to be, and hereby is, increased from $125,000 to $150,000.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order on the paragraph relating to Coast Guard cutters.

Mr. PADGETT. That increases the limit of cost.

Mr. MANN. It is clearly subject to a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. That is the limit of cost. We provided for that before.

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy Department has no business to interfere with these matters. Of course, you put it in the naval bill last year, and you had no business to do that now. You brought it in. The Committee on Navy Affairs does not have jurisdiction of it.

Mr. PADGETT. If the gentleman makes a point of order, I will say that it is subject to a point of order.

Does the point of order made by the gentleman from Illinois begin at line 11?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The work will read.

Mr. MANN. I also make a point of order on the rest of the page.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understood the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, while we are considering this section, in reference to the Bureau of Construction and Repair, I think it not inappropriate to call the attention of the committee to the naval disasters which have been suffered by this country in the past year. As near as I can ascertain, we have lost more ships, in number, by accident—that is, by accident pure and simple—in the last year than Great Britain, although she has been engaged in a war, in the course of the operations of which it was necessary to navigate long and unlighted coasts, among the great dangers resulting therefrom.

Probably all the Members of the House remember the recent accidents of the U-3, the cruiser Milwaukee, which went ashore on the Pacific coast, at the entrance of Humboldt Bay, Cal. That accident seems to have been caused either by poor seamanship or negligence. A still worse accident soon followed, when the cruiser Hector, in attempting to pull out the submarine, was trapped in some way by the tidal currents and drawn on one of the treacherous shoals of that coast, so that a fine vessel, a fine cruiser of nearly 10,000 tons, costing almost $4,000,000— in fact, one of the most useful cruisers that our Navy possesses is now, as I understand it, a total wreck.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Does not the gentleman think the department was at fault rather than the officers in ordering a ship like the Milwaukee to do that kind of work, when an ordinary salvage company would have undertaken that work for about $15,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation. The Navy

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. It commences with line 11.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Last fall the fleet ship Jupiter got into collision with an Italian bark, and I believe the commander was court-martialed and hung. In fact, there was no firing, the destructor 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 American Navy has been noted for their gallantry and seamanship, and it is peculiarly unfortunate, it seems to me, that at this particular time we shall have to chronicle the loss of vessels, with so many disasters. Some of them, unfortunately, can not be attributed to anything else but negligence or bad seamanship. We would prefer to turn from such a record to that of men past, and to recall those of American ships which distinguished themselves as the captain 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.

Talbott. Mr. Chairman, I suppose this increase shall be expended in the pay of allowances of any commissioned officer of the Navy detailed for duty at the United States Naval Academy performance which was performed by civilian instructors on January 1, 1891.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the 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 preparation. But a few moments ago I made the suggestion to the headmaster of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis that the law I hold in my hand it appears that last year 38 additional naval officers, who have been trained in an open-air life, should at least be active enough at 46 to 64 to keep them at the Naval Academy at Annapolis as instructors. In the present bill in all, under "Pay of professors and others, Naval Academy," there is an appropriation of $420,440 compared to $418,800 last year, or approximately a $1,600 increase. There are at the Naval Academy to-day about 1,200 students. The full quota is 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-curtain young man who believes only in wearing gold epaulets and having gold all around him; and I do not believe these young men should be brought up in that manner; nor do I believe the men desire he 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 appropriated for, and not see the young Americans could not be detailed, as I was detailed, to serve their turn and save this expense, small though it may be, to the Government. What I say may not save any of these young men, but it may help them finally to wake up to the fact that we are spending too much at these colleges, not so much to educate the young men to defend the country, but to educate them so they may go out and be able to make a fortune. Mr. Chairman, I could well afford to pass some law whereby these retired Army officers could be sent to Annapolis to instruct these young men, be-
cause they should be better able to teach them than any civilian.

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. SEARS] 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 $50,000, at least, for every man who was graduated from Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. We had 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. It is

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 an item also.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask a question. I would like to inquire of the chairman if the estimates he has given the committee relative to the expense of educating a student at Annapolis are based upon the number who are now in attendance, 1,200?

Mr. PADGETT. No; that was based upon the former number of 800.

Mr. DOWELL. Can the chairman give to the committee a statement of what additional expenditures 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. 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 great bulk of the expense in the larger estimate was the interest on the $14,000,000 investment, the maintenance, upkeep, repairs, heat, all those charges that are fixed charges. They do not increase with the increased number.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand the chairman, we could educate 1,700 for practically the same amount as 800?

Mr. PADGETT. Not practically; but I think about $200,000 more.

Mr. MANN. We will have to rebuild the academy. We have spent $14,000,000 on the Naval Academy since I have been a Member of the House, and if you make a further increase, you will have to expend that much more.

Mr. PADGETT. If the present condition 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 in 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. BUTLER. 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. Per capita, yes; 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 $4,873 for each of the 1,500 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 what any amount is provided for that here.

Mr. PADGETT. I am not the gentleman's pardon; what I had reference to is under public works.

Mr. NORTON. I quite agree with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] that it appears that the system they are now practicing at the Naval Academy is the same system carried out 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. They have been got out of that practice.

Mr. PADGETT. It is repulsive to most officers to do 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 teach 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 $600.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman is right—that makes a decided difference. My calculation made on the total appropriation for practically the same amount as $200,000.

Mr. SEARS. I understood the chairman to say that it required $16,000 or $18,000 to educate a cadet at Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; including the interest on the $14,000,000 invested, the salaries of the officers, and counting in the pay 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 I say it would be less. 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 [Mr. PAXTON] 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 the expenses of maintenance, upkeep, officers' salaries, interest on the $14,000,000 invested, and all that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Departments of electrical engineering and physics: Three electrical engineers, at $1,180 each; 2 mechanics, at $1,185 each; 1 laboratorian, $1,900; in all, $6,900.

Mr. McCracken. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last clause [Mr. Longworth]. I think there must be something very wrong at the Naval Academy.

Mr. MANN. I will yield for any information.

Mr. BUTLER. 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 $600.

Mr. SEARS. I understood the chairman to say that it required $16,000 or $18,000 to educate a cadet at Annapolis.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; including the interest on the $14,000,000 invested, the salaries of the officers, and counting in the pay 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 I say it would be less. 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 [Mr. PAXTON] 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 the expenses of maintenance, upkeep, officers' salaries, interest on the $14,000,000 invested, and all that.

The Clerk read as follows:

Departments of electrical engineering and physics: Three electrical engineers, at $1,180 each; 2 mechanics, at $1,185 each; 1 laboratorian, $1,900; in all, $6,900.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Can he not make up those conditions in those subjects?

Mr. MCCracken. No; not at all.

Mr. stafford. 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 require a man in 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, and to some of these boys, that was discharged. Everyone 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. Stafford. That would make no difference, because he was admitted to the Academy when he was 19. There is no time limit set for graduation; it is for admission. The boy was already admitted there, and I am sorry that the gentleman finds himself in this 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 after a competitive examination that I held, and he made very high marks upon the entrance test. I thought he had an assured place among the midshipmen at the Academy. He fell below the requirements. I am rather of the opinion that the rigidity at the Academy is not to be charged against the officers as any particular prejudice against the students. I do not believe that exists. I think that our boys simply do not get into the rigid methods of study that they require over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. MCCracken. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is made.

There was no objection.

Mr. Padgett. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto concerning the council of 17 officers, which was appointed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Humphreys], one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess], and two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Emerson].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Idaho for five minutes. The gentleman will proceed, and at the conclusion of that time the Chair will put the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Humphreys of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Idaho to make the statement that they were employing foreign teachers over there. Is it a fact that they employ foreign teachers to teach in the Naval Academy?

Mr. MCCracken. It may be that there are instructors teaching foreign languages in the Naval Academy who have been in this country only a very short time. I do not know as to their citizenship. But these boys who are sent here from the farm and from the country to this school come back and tell us they do not get any help there, and that is one reason also why they fail on their examinations, and if that be true, it is true that somebody was making an investigation of the Naval Academy; and of the gentlemen who constitute the faculty of that institution.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCracken. No.

Mr. FESS. I think there is some foundation for what the gentleman says in regard to the foreign teacher teaching the foreign language. The rigid methods of both France and Germany are put into our schools, and our boys are not used to getting down and boning as they do over there. I think it is more difficult to meet the requirements of a teacher from France, for example, teaching French, or a teacher from Germany teaching German, but the fault is not altogether with the teacher. It is because our boys do not meet the requirements, and I think our friend will admit that nobody ever knew a pupil to fall when it was not the teacher's fault.

Mr. MCCracken. I grant that is the case many times.

Mr. Padgett. I want to say to the gentleman from Idaho that in the past year, the increment of teachers at the Naval Academy is only 623 per cent out of 100, which is a very low passing mark, so I think there is some unjust criticism of these teachers when you take into consideration that 62.4 per cent of 100 is the passing mark, which is the standard.

Mr. MCCracken. I would like to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that there were 600 boys at the Naval Academy last year, and of that number more than 80 have resigned, which is tantamount to discharge.

Mr. Padgett. Sixty of the whole school; that takes in the whole school?

Mr. BROWNING. That is right, because my young man is in the third class.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman speaks of that as unusual. At the University of Virginia, while I was a student there, 80 men applied for a law degree and 30 got it. It was an unusually large class, and I think the average of the college will show that there are more severe examinations and a harder test than at either Annapolis or West Point.

Mr. Padgett. It is a hard standard, and a higher passing mark.

Mr. Stafford. Does not the gentleman realize it is absolutely necessary to have the midshipmen comply with the requirements of the professorial force rather than have the midshipmen determine their own standard of scholarship?

Mr. MCCracken. I will grant that; but I want to say that these boys do not get the help from the teachers at the Naval Academy, who are paid by the Government, which they ought to get.

Mr. Stafford. Boys are boys while attending either college or the Naval Academy, and they themselves know that if they do not apply themselves as assiduously as they should in their studies they will fall. Boys who want to make their lessons pass.

Mr. MCCracken. The gentleman has simply assumed that.

Mr. Stafford. I know that from my experience in college, and I do not think there is any different status as far as the boys at the Naval Academy are concerned.

Mr. MCCracken. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin be in favor of giving a boy a chance to make up his deficiency?

Mr. Stafford. Oh, I do not think a boy should be thrown out just because of one deficiency. I do not think he is thrown out if he merely fails in one study, but if he is deficient in more than one subject it is assumed and is not in the requirements to meet the requirements of the test when in active service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. Mann. Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to the time that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Emerson] mentioned the age of 19. [Applause.] Oh, I doubt very much whether when I was graduated at the age of 19 I could have passed the present requirements for admission to the Naval Academy. I know I could not unless I probably crammed for that purpose. Now, I have been a student all my life in school, and after graduating at college I took a course in a law school and was graduated at a law school. Now it would require three or four years at a law school, and if I had been going to a medical school as conducted now it would have required four years; and yet what do we require? We admit a boy at the Naval Academy at the age of 16. I believe, and it makes considerable difference in his education and in the age of 20. It makes a difference whether he retires as a rear admiral if he lives. We expect a boy at Annapolis to learn all that a man is expected to learn at an ordinary classical college and various other colleges and universities, and in addition to that to become the most perfectly drilled man on earth. No other men drill like the boys at Annapolis and West Point; at least I never have seen any; certainly there is a difference in the training of those graduates. Then we expect them to know something of seamanship, something of gunnery, something of navigation, something of international law, something of a great many other things. We asked on the floor here that that unfortunate occurrence come to any of my appointees, I believe, but I have had a good deal of difficulty getting boys into Annapolis and they have managed to stay when they got in; that is
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 medical school before he is 25, and then he will have to go out and be an intern in a hospital for two years, and after that he has got to go out and hang his shingle out and do a lot of work for nothing. He really has to get down to 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 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?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Did we not create a new cadet during this present Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not understand that. There has not been any appropriations since 1909, when your State was re-districted; but your appointment came from the Congressman at large, I presume.

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. HUMPHREY of Mississippi. Did we not create a new cadet during this present Congress?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. My impression is, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has not gotten it. There has not been any appropriations since 1909, when your State was re-districted; but your appointment came from the Congressman at large.

Mr. EMERSON. I have not appointed, nor have I had appointments from your State in that district, that would count from your district.

Mr. BUTLER. No; it would come from the State at large.

Mr. HUMPHREYS 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 the Secretary of the Navy has a certain number for 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 that that is so, but I know that 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. I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington that 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. PADGETT. No; that will not do anything. 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, I have found that the sons of a gentleman have the advantage over a gentleman that the son of a citizen has. I have named 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 that at the present time the head man 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 read as follows:

Department of seamen: Two cowxains, at $450 each; 3 seamen, at $217 each; in all, $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 my selecting young gentlemen to our 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 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 of the War Department for West Point. 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 had 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 such a commission might make, I have two 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 I could not determine 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.

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 of this year. Three hours 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 of the War Department for West Point. 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 had 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 such a commission might make, I have two 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 I could not determine 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.
The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and one-half be used by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in six minutes. Thither objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] is recognized.

Mr. FESS. 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. FESS. 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 been graduated near the head of their class.

Mr. FESS. 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. FESS. I am much obliged to my friend. My colleague here from Illinois [Mr. Mann] says he has not had a failure, and I dare 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 it to be the way to insure the best, choosing as the test year what would be called the “star” applicant whom I recommended 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. FESS. There is another question I would like to propose to one who can answer me. One of the candidates this year happened to have a course I happened to know his parents, and they are not wealthy, and this is a very promising young man—was also recommended by the Representative for Annapolis. He failed to enter; that is, he failed on his 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 board, and the Board of Education 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 declined 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. FESS. 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 well and to whom I have been able to write, and the Board of Education, I think, has shown that it can in cases failed. I apply to the academic board and was politely informed that the case was carefully considered, after which the board declined 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. FESS. 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 well and to whom I have been able to write, and the Board of Education, I think, has shown that it can in cases failed. I apply to the academic board and was politely informed that the case was carefully considered, after which the board declined 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. FESS. 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 well and to whom I have been able to write, and the Board of Education, I think, has shown that it can in cases failed. I apply to the academic board and was politely informed that the case was carefully considered, after which the board declined 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. PADGETT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for two minutes. The gentleman says that will be sufficient.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOSTON, Mass., February 3, 1887.

Congressman George F. O'Shaunessy, Washington, D.C.: In case of need the facilities of our factory at Cranston, R.I., will be at the Government's service.

J. B. LEBSON,
President Universal Winding Co.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. 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 preparatory program. [Applause.]

I believe it absolutely necessary that in all such complaints the committee should give those 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 selection of a bookworm or a civil-service examiner 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, radical, hardy manhood. [Applause.] First of all, a man who, when he is called upon, will have 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 that absolute, hearty handclasp from a fellow who looked me plumb in the eye, I have heard him say, "By the eternal God, there is a man that will make a good soldier or a good sailor." [Applause.] Back of all qualifications it should be number one. 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 young man's heart must be a wholesome love of country and a willingness to serve. I trust that this 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 failing after a rigorous examination to which they are subjected, and I fully believe that a thorough investigation at the time of their entrance by the Congressman who has the privilege of sending them there will remove any of these difficulties and aid to the service of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. 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.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has fixed the limit.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. The gentleman 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'SHAUNESSY. I voted for the President's recommendation, believing that these men should come from the ranks of the employees, and that the 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 differ 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 or midshipmen we should have personal interviews 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 cannot make a selection of a bookworm or a civil-service examiner 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, radical, hardy manhood. [Applause.] First of all, a man who, when he is called upon, will have 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 that absolute, hearty handclasp from a fellow who looked me plumb in the eye, I have heard him say, "By the eternal God, there is a man that will make a good soldier or a good sailor." [Applause.] Back of all qualifications it should be number one. 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 young man's heart must be a wholesome love of country and a willingness to serve. I trust that this 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 failing after a rigorous examination to which they are subjected, and I fully believe that a thorough investigation at the time of their entrance by the Congressman who has the privilege of sending them there will remove any of these difficulties and aid to the service of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. 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 preparatory program. [Applause.]}

Whatever this country is to be, I feel the gentleman's theory and my practice would lead to a vigorous, radical, hardy manhood. [Applause.] First of all, a man who, when he is called upon, will have 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 that absolute, hearty handclasp from a fellow who looked me plumb in the eye, I have heard him say, "By the eternal God, there is a man that will make a good soldier or a good sailor." [Applause.] Back of all qualifications it should be number one. 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 young man's heart must be a wholesome love of country and a willingness to serve. I trust that this 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 failing after a rigorous examination to which they are subjected, and I fully believe that a thorough investigation at the time of their entrance by the Congressman who has the privilege of sending them there will remove any of these difficulties and aid to the service of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:
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 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 ratio 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. Will any man on this floor say that the education at Annapolis is not worth at least four times what an enlisted man is?

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

Mr. SEARS. Does the gentleman think 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 cannot 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 state again briefly the method I have used 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 which I have tried to follow. 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 can get a dozen candidates for examination so that on 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 best of all. Some of my examinations have been conducted 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. I want to say that there was an examination held in my district several years ago of that kind, and the boy eventually graduated at the head of his class.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman realize that there is something more, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY], and that is, is not the supposed fitness of the boy for the mental berthings derived from his educational qualifications to render him eventually able to handle a battleship?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; and that is why we count the boy's physical examination and his record in athletics and his capacity for leadership.

Mr. STAFFORD. More physique does not determine whether a man has the metal to qualify him for leadership. I have seen a big bully who had plenty of physique who was a coward.

Mr. PLATT. The combination of mental capacity and physique ought to show the right qualification.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the gentleman whether, when a young man enters 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, such as good many boys break down under the physical training both at West Point and Annapolis. After the boy gets in he has the capacity to study, but the great trouble is that our grammar schools and high schools are not thorough. There is no ground the boy thoroughly in the things they are required to be grounded in. Boys fall largely in the grammar-school subjects. I have had a boy pass an examination with almost 90 in algebra and geometry and fail in history, which he ought to have been trained to master enough to pass the examination, but he could not do it. It was simply because he had not been trained to study and could not concentrate himself. He could not do what every boy who has had a high-school education ought to be able to do.

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 private 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 statistical record that 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 move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Padgett. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto close in two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that debate upon the pending 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 before the gentleman secured the floor, and the Chairman recognized me.

Mr. Padgett. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman whether two minutes would satisfy him.

Mr. Padgett. Mr. Chairman, I replied that I would not use more than two or three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee prefers a request for unanimous consent that all debate close.

Mr. Padgett. In three minutes; that the gentleman from Illinois have two minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Smith] have one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. That debate close in three 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 chairman if he could give the House information as to the percentage of boys who are now in the Naval Academy who are the sons or relatives of officers.

Mr. Padgett. Mr. Chairman, I can not; and I can not 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 sent to 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. Then it 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 square 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, 1917.**

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 unsettled by economic rather than military force. America is big enough to be patient and pioneer the way to better things.

J. H. KELLOGG.

The Clerk read as follows:

Outstanding: In one chief cook, at $1,200; 6 cooks, at $600 each, and 12 assistants, at $350 each; 1 steward, at $1,200, and 1 assistant, at $1,050; 1 head waiter, at $850; and 3 assistants, at $600 each; 4 pantry men, at $420 each; 1 chef baker, at $1,200; 3 bakers, at $750 each; 2 assistants, at $540 each, and 3 assistants, at $480; 1 head butcher, at $720 each, and 1 butcher's helper, at $480; 4 baker helpers, at $300 each; 65 waiters, at $250 per month each, and 62 waiters, at $30 per month each, and 1 waiter, 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 $300 each, 400 washing women, at $300 each; 2 seamstresses, at $420 each; 4 clerks, at $350 each; in all, $74,920.

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 26, strike out the figures "$381,173.20" and insert the figures "$381,173.20"; line 18, strike out the figures "$28,080"; page 46, line 22, strike out the figures "$63,420" and insert "$63,420"; and page 46, line 26, strike out the figures "$581,173.20" and insert "$579,978.20".

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 upon the other two amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment 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 in the question of asking a question, not in the judgment of the Chair, but for information. Is there any regulation or rule or law which pertains to men in the active service of the Navy who engage or associate themselves with others who are engaged in commercial enterprises for profit?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. There is a statute which was passed some years ago that prohibits retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, though not of the Army, from engaging in certain occupations. It is not an officer upon the active service.

Mr. PADGETT. A man upon the active service cannot engage at all.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, this situation has been brought to my attention. I do not want to mention the name of any officer because it is possible that there are others who are in the same position, and it is possible that neither he nor they are violating any statute. I am an officer in the active service of the Navy who has lent his name to an invention he has made to a commercial enterprise. This commercial enterprise advertises the fact that he is a captain in the United States Navy, and it is necessary that he engage in this kind of business, because the competitors do not have the same advantage in having a United States naval man at their head or as a consulting expert. It may be that it is best for the Government to allow this dual service so that the incentive for profit may stimulate the officers to perfect inventions from which the Government as well as the nation will benefit. Personally I question the expedience of such a practice.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the invention is and do not know about it, but the law prohibits a retired officer and also understand active officers from engaging in business in that way.

Mr. HICKS. I took this up with the Navy Department and I could not get any definite information, but I did get this much, that they do not find any law that prevents an officer in the active service of the Navy from lending his name to or associating himself with a private commercial enterprise.

Mr. BUTLER. It may be done, but it is against the will of the department, and it is certainly against the intention of Congress and I would be in favor of taking him off the active list if he does it.

Mr. PADGETT. He may have some patent and the concern uses his patent or invention.

Mr. HICKS. They do use his name in advertising it.

Mr. TALBOTT. Is it such an invention as the Government uses?

Mr. HICKS. No; it is used by small boat manufacturers.

Mr. TALBOTT. The gentleman knows the law is that any invention that an officer makes, either of the Army or the Navy, or anyone in the Government service, belongs to the Government?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. TALBOTT. But if it is an invention that is something that is not used by the Government, while it is not good trade, I do not think there is any law in reference to my remarks.

Mr. HICKS. The gentleman does not think there is any law to prevent it?

Mr. TALBOTT. No; but it may not be good taste.

Mr. HICKS. Should there not be such a law?

Mr. TALBOTT. I will take that up later on.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the gentleman presented the case to the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. HICKS. Yes; to the Judge Advocate General of the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. And the Secretary has made the reply that there was no law to prevent it?

Mr. HICKS. The Judge Advocate did not state it very clearly. He said that so far as he knew there was no law to prevent it.

Mr. BUTLER. Well, I will make it my business to look into this matter and see if we cannot get a law.

Mr. LINDENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent a district filled with peace-loving, loyal, patriotic people. Practically all of them are opposed to war, but if war comes, whether we be in it or not, we want all our men to serve the Government with all their power. Having in mind possibilities, the loyal and patriotic citizens of the village of Aitkin, far north in the district, comes to the front with a telegram promising the set of the flag at the home of the boy who was killed in the service of the country.

The people of Aitkin have not taken this step to encourage 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 economic law of 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 labor 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 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. If we adopt the economic law of commerce we shall conquer the world, not by dreary toil but by the grand glory that will be looked upon by succeeding generations as the last colossal act of American barbarism if it should come—no, but to bleed of the blood of the heart and will we conquer insanity, but we can do so in the common sense of a new nation-wide intelligence applied to an adjustment of business to meet the needs and demands of the people generally instead of us now to satisfy the politicians and make them lord of all our actions, even to the extent of forcing us into war.
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 is too low. My recollection is one cannot be admitted over 35 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 extend the limit 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 insisting that the best age that we could get 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 10 to 20, and you ask here the higher age, and the department is wanting it put at 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 as 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 is the boys do 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 much sooner. It is two years laterly 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 each year, and I am in favor of giving the graduate of the rural high schools an equal chance with the city boy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Department of Buildings and Grounds: 1 messenger to superintendent, $600; 45 building attendants, at $400 each, $18,000; in all, $18,000.

In all, civil establishment, $831,173.20.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 466, line 26, amend by striking out "$831,173.20" and insert "$379,978.20."

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

Mr. SEARS, Mr. Chairman, I fear my original statement may have been misunderstood. I believe that the best way to "Pay of professors and others at the Naval Academy." I now give the total of the expenditures at the academy for this year, which is $824,728.20, as compared with $708,946.92 for last year. I desire also to call the committee's attention to the fact 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 $1,127,740 for medical supplies, and so forth. I also find you have the heading "Pay of Professor and Surgeons at the Naval Academy," on pages 30 and 31, in which is included the Naval Academy together with other places, an appropriation of $291,680 for the pay of one messengers at the Post Office, for official use only, and so forth, and for naval medical supply officers, sick and sick quarters at the 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. Lyon, stated 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 expenses which might be done to 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 those are unique in 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 discussion. I trust we have not 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 can not 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, 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, 1,300 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 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 will not be less than 1,500, 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 it is the duty of the committee to see that the highest and best use is made of the money that is put into the institution. I do not believe 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. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close 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 close 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? [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, just before the gentlemen begin I would like to make a request. A great many gentlemen are asking that we expedites 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 military expenditure, 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 out from our 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 in our Navy, 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 seagoing, 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, I thought you would have the wisdom 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 that is the greatest defect existing in the Navy. It is the greatest 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 cannot 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, so that we have to do something to increase the personnel of the Navy? Gentlemen here that they are making earnest endeavor to recruit the Navy, but they also say that they can not, under existing conditions, recruit. Our Navy even to fill the ships now in commission, then we must do something in order to accomplish this result. We can expend hundreds of millions of dollars for more ships, but we are unable to spend a few thousand dollars to increase the pay of the men in the Navy in order to secure the necessary enlistment. I want to read from the hearings when the Secretary of the Navy was before the committee.

Mr. KELLEY asked: I wondered if you had worked out any plan whereby we might hope to get men faster than we have been getting them during the past six months.

The answer of the Secretary was: Yes; we have worked out plans. We have increased the number of recruiting stations to five. We have appropriated for the purchase of automobiles for the use of recruiting officials to be sent into the country districts.

Fifty thousand dollars for automobiles, but not one cent of increase in pay for the men who are to be enlisted in this service! [Applause.] And he goes on and says:

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I regret I can not.

Mr. BAILEY. Just for a question. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; but I suggest to the gentleman to make it very short.

Mr. BAILEY. Is it not true that the pay of the men in the Navy to-day is greater, all things considered, than that of the ordinary workman?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no; but I have not the time to discuss it. But, whatever it is, what futility is it for us to build ships and pay hundreds of millions of dollars for them and make no provision for manning them? We ought not to build the ships unless we are willing to pay what is necessary to get the men to man the ships, and it makes no difference what the amount required is our ships will be useless unless we have the men to man them. Comparative cost of the pay of the men in the Navy is but a small item in the large amounts that are provided for here.

Mr. KELLEY said further to the Secretary: We are rather an emergency time—I think everybody recognizes that—in the history of the world. Do you not think we ought to get the men now?

The Secretary said: Certainly; we ought to get the men.

And Mr. KELLEY asked: And take all the measures necessary?

And the Secretary said: We have already taken the steps necessary to increase recruiting, and we are already getting results.

It is fair to say that the Secretary agreed to the proposition that the pay of the men ought to be increased if we desire to get more recruits for the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he starts in?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] proposed an amendment to increase the pay of the sailors.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; and it should have been adopted. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I do not know what ought to be done, what inducements ought to be offered, whether it should be in the term of service or in some other form. But I do know, and I think every Member of this House knows, that we must do something in order to man the ships that are to compose our Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; certainly; I will be glad to yield to the chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. In the last session of Congress we authorized the increase of the enlisted personnel from 51,500 to a possible maximum of more than 88,000. We provided a reorganization of the personnel, and we have stated time and time again that we have given them greater advantages. We have provided for many benefits to them that they did not have before. We shortened the term of enlistment, and put it down either in that bill or in the one just before, allowing one year's enlistment. It was in that bill, I believe. You could get as low as one year's enlistment, and then allow them to extend if they wanted to.

Now, all of that was provided in August last, looking after the personnel, and as soon as that begins to spread out and get into communication with the public, and they are knowing it, we are getting increased enlistments; and I think the things that we have done, I think that we have done a reasonably good job of what we did on the 29th of August last, less than six months ago.

Mr. TOWNER. I will ask the chairman of the committee why he did not act on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy and increase the pay of these men?

Mr. PADGETT. Simply because we did not think it was necessary, in view of what we had done in the bill of August 28, 1916, less than six months before.

Mr. TOWNER. Now you have a deficiency of 20,000 men to man the ships now in commission, and you are not doing one single thing in this emergency to secure the men, and yet you are spending for millions of dollars to procure additional ships and ammunition.

Mr. PADGETT. Because we think we had done what was adequate only a few months before in the bill of August 28, 1916.

Mr. TOWNER. But we did not have the emergency then that we have now. You are offering amendment after amendment now to prepare for emergencies. Why not offer amendments to meet this emergency?
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 of the Navy were given $51.50 a month. When we passed the law the enlisted men of the Navy were given $51.50 a month. Mr. TOWNER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the statement that he has made is correct.

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. We had 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 constantly 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, if I may. We have 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 784 of the hearings that Lieut. Commander McCandless says that the base pay of the first class is $80 down, with $24 a month, of second class, $50 down, with $19; of seamen of the third class, $22 down, with $16 a month; that for messmen it is $60 down, with $18 a month. In other words, for the class of seamen that was specified, the pay is now $10 a month. It occurs to me, gentlemen, that it would be not only wise but a frugal policy, if we should add a dollar a month; so far as increases of salary are concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to some of them.

Mr. PADGETT. That is contemplated as to some of them.

Mr. GARDNER. If increases? he inform the House whether there have been any instances to tie our battleships to our current and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Academy, making as high as $60 a month. Mr. STAFFORD. Are those instances of the service of the academy and the private institutions?

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, $175,000, and this year it is being apportioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. As to some of them. Whether it has actually been done or not in the present session.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I do not recall any.

Mr. STAFFORD. For these specially enumerated officials who are carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. He has not consciousness of arrangements yet, and we have not got his report. The thing is undergoing reorganization now. He got his authority on the 25th of August and the school year began in September, and he has not had time to put into 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.

Mr. STAFFORD. 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 educational institutions?

Mr. PADGETT. The present classes 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 place 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 sending 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

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 recommendation 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 acquisitive, 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 consideration in the department where they acceded with the administration of the academy.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may be in error, but I do not recall any instance where the pay was increased that we have not increased in salaries as 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, $175,000, and this year it is being apportioned.

Mr. STAFFORD. For these specially enumerated officials who are carried in this bill?

Mr. PADGETT. Principal 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 consensuated his arrangements yet, and we have not got his report. The thing is undergoing reorganization now. He got his authority on the 25th of August and the school year began in September, and he has not had time to put into the reorganization. It is being worked out in the department.
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 Naval Academy because of dissatisfaction, or of desire to pay?

Mr. PADGETT. There may have been individual instances, but there has been no hegira.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly. Mr. SHERWOOD. Does not the gentleman think that in case of war or an emergency we could get all the volunteers for the Navy we 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 now 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 waiting list for enlistments in the Navy.

The 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 8 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 perfectly consistent. I want to be consistent 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 as the 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, $1,590,966.

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 do the officers in the Marine Corps appointed in the first instance?

Mr. PADGETT. By passing the examination, and under the law the men are transferred 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 Marines; that is to say, for a period of two years.

Mr. MANN. I find the following:

Louis W. Whaley, of South Carolina.
John M. Arthur, of South Carolina.
James F. Jeffords, of South Carolina.
Thomas P. Chentham, of South Carolina.
William C. James, of South Carolina.

Of course, they make only 5 out of the 10. It may be that the gentleman is 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 gentlemen 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 6 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 F. 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 6 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 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. MANN.] 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 with them. Am I to understand you to say, Mr. Chairman, that 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
proof from any of the gentlemen from South Carolina; and yet it hardly seems quite the proper method of selecting officers for the Marine Corps or any other branch of the Government service to fix it so that South Carolina and Virginia, between them, produce out of one State an officer for the Marine Corps.

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 if you will go to Santo Domingo, 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 that with respect to appointments, in so far as the Citadel is concerned, that men from the North recognize it as 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 in the nomination, on the large proportion of the commander 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 the State of Illinois in this hour of our country's need, who apply and who pass that examination, and then they have been appointed, are not sinners. They are not swivel-chair positions, not places where they can hang around Washington and wear parade uniforms, but these men have had to go and serve where the gentleman representing that State, I would not want to call attention to. The positions they have sought, and to which they have been appointed, are not sinecures. They are not swivel-chair positions, but 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. I have not encouraged.

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 that designation wiped out and give to those that merit. I do not want to comment on the large proportion of the graduates from those two States. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Naval 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 unfounded idle comment upon the large proportion of these 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 commission from a 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. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know the character of the schools? Can he tell us one of these schools?

Mr. CALLAWAY. The Chairman from Texas [Mr. Callaway].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to 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. My duty in this would not be performed adequately at the institutions.
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, 12 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., as the gentleman from Illinois said, out of 32. Three from the Northern States.

That standard was not reviewed by anybody in the employ of the United States. The Navy Department took the judgment of those teachers, 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 present 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 on the say-so of their own schoolmasters. It is a fact, I am sorry to say, that boys are admitted to West Point on the say-so of their own private 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 Uncle Sam's Commission gives on the say-so of their own 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 apportionment law in the civil service. The reason for the enactment of that apportionment 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 apportionment 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 apportionment 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 apportionment law is that candidates from the Southern States for the Federal civil service do not get as high passing marks as candidates from the Southern States. The argument which the Civil Service Commission makes in defense of that apportionment law is that candidates from the Southern States for the Federal civil service do not get as high passing marks as candidates from the Southern States.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment; which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 25 insert the following provision:

"Provisions of any enactment herein shall be used to pay any officer on the active list of the Navy or Marine Corps who shall engage in any private business, either actively or as a consulting expert, or in any other person, firm, corporation or association to make the officer in the conduct of its business."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order? Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will reserve it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering the amendment was in the account of the gentleman from Illinois; I made here a few moments ago in regard to men on the active list of the Navy and Marine Corps engaging in active business in the management of concerns or as consulting experts. And it seems to me that if the Government of the United States pays these men in the active service a full wage the Government should have the entire service of those men, and that those services should not be utilized by any commercial enterprise for the sake of profit.

Mr. PADGETT. I agree with the gentleman as to the general purpose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. HICKS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The language of the amendment, as I understand it, applies probably only to the appropriation for the pay of officers in the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it says "officers of the Navy and of the Marine Corps."

Mr. MANN. Yes; but it is offered as an amendment, apparently, to a provision which covers only the pay of officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. And hence would not have any effect, if it went into the law, if it applied only to that appropriation, on the pay of the officers of the Navy. But from the way it was read, apparently, it strikes me that it would cover officers on the retired list.

Mr. HICKS. No; officers on the active list.

Mr. MANN. Yes; well.

Mr. HICKS. I realize, Mr. Chairman, that it does not cover exactly what I intended, and that is why I asked permission of the Chairman to allow a return to the right part of the language. It could be offered properly, and the chairman thought it best not to agree that it should be done. Therefore I have offered it here.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that the gentleman is not in as bad a position as he thinks. At the end of the bill a limitation can be placed upon all the expenditures in this bill, which would certainly apply to those relatives. I am one of those relatives.

Mr. PADGETT. The limitation sought here is broader than the legislation to which it is sought to be affixed, and the objection to it is that it is legislation that ought to be considered and nurtured carefully by the gentleman. I do not know what the legislation ought to be or what the conflicts might be. I insist that this limitation is offered on legislation respecting the Marine Corps, while the limitation is intended to apply to the Navy as well as to the Marine Corps.

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.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the proposed modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike from the amendment the words "and of the Navy."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Reserving the right to object, there is no criticism of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Why will not the chairman allow us to offer an amendment at the right place?

Mr. PADGETT. We ought to understand it thoroughly. If we did not understand it and could understand whether it conflicts or not, it might not be objectionable; but offered in this way, without investigation, I do not think it is a good plan of legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill probably will not be finished tonight. Would the gentleman have any objection to considering it to-morrow?

Mr. PADGETT. If I can see it and ascertain what the substance of it is, and see that it is well grounded, I would not have any objection to well-considered and well-digested legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Tennessee has made an amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Tennessee on the point of order.

Mr. HICKS. I asked that so far as striking out the words "and of the Navy" is concerned—and that is the state it is in now, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the committee agreed that the words should be stricken out, which makes it applicable only to the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Well, it is useless to put that in. There is no complaint with reference to the Marine Corps. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee to withdraw it so that we can see whether or not something can be prepared that has some merit in it.
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?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

[Reads amendment]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. 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. We had in mind to have the privilege of distributing the mail on the battleships. I wish 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 it does not apply to the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps has the privilege of distributing the mail in the same manner as they do in the actual post offices, as the gentleman has described. They should be permitted to distribute mail to the mail clerks, and the mail clerks are authorized to charge for the privilege of distributing the mail.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know as to that.

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 postmasters.

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 extended the responsibility of the mail clerks, and registering mail, and I believe, issuing money orders, that they should be compensated for that service, in the main not to exceed $300 per month for the mail clerks.

Mr. STAFFORD. This simply extends 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 the additional service, 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 are members of 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 on it there, whereas by the present law members of the naval forces of the United States are permitted to drop letters in a mail box on board ship or here on land anywhere in the world, and a 2-cent stamp put on it, or is a 2-cent stamp put on it there?

Mr. PADGETT. The bill would be under the general postal laws, subject to the requisition of the officers, but this is designed 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. Does the gentleman from Tennessee say they would pay the same as any one else? What is that? The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BUTLER] and the gentleman from Tennessee said they would not pay the same as any one else. What is that? The gentleman from Tennessee said he would always pay 4 cents on his letters. I do not know what the rate is.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is because the gentleman's son is a very courteous man and writes him long letters which weigh more than an ounce.

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. DAY 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. He says that the rate 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 a very courteous man 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 "$4,800,532" and insert "$4,800,537."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, that amendment would not accomplish anything.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I should like recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee because 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 this paragraph. 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. The amendment which I now offer increases the amount of money available for Marine Corps pay just enough to enable the Navy to pay the enlisted men $5 per month more than they are now receiving. This amendment will not be adopted. Yesterday you voted down a similar amendment which I proposed for increasing the pay of enlisted men to $100 per month.

The amendment is proposed only for the purpose of emphasizing my view that the men of the Marine Corps, as well as men in the Navy, ought to have their pay raised $50 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 in 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 everything 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 something like half of them already, since the 1st of September.

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 favorite branch of the service. That is no reason why Uncle Sam should take advantage of men’s necessities and underpay them.
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. GARDNER. 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. GARDNER. 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 his 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 commanding officer 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 introduce as part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 has now called to the attention of 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 an­

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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. In reply to the remark of the gentle­man from Illinois, I think all who are familiar with Gen. Barnett will readily agree that thissplendid efficiency as an officer and his high character as a man, and I am sure that any statement which he may make in reference to this matter will have the respectful and thoughtful consideration of every Mem­ber of this Committee.

It will be noted in the statement supplied by Gen. Barnett, and which I will here set out, that the University of Illinois was written to and no reply received. Gen. Barnett informs me, however, that he hopes when this splendid institution is written to again a number of its graduates will be submitted for consideration. The statement from Gen. Barnett is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 5, 1917.

Mr. DEAR MR. OLIVER: In connection with your tele­

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. GARDNER. 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. GARDNER. 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 his 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 commanding officer 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 introduce as part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 has now called to the attention of 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 an­

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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. In reply to the remark of the gent­eman from Illinois, I think all who are familiar with Gen. Barnett will readily agree that thissplendid efficiency as an officer and his high character as a man, and I am sure that any statement which he may make in reference to this matter will have the respectful and thoughtful consideration of every Mem­ber of this Committee.

It will be noted in the statement supplied by Gen. Barnett, and which I will here set out, that the University of Illinois was written to and no reply received. Gen. Barnett informs me, however, that he hopes when this splendid institution is written to again a number of its graduates will be submitted for consideration. The statement from Gen. Barnett is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 5, 1917.

Mr. DEAR MR. OLIVER: In connection with your tele­

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. GARDNER. 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. GARDNER. 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 his 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 commanding officer 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 introduce as part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. 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 has now called to the attention of 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 an­

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

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. In reply to the remark of the gent­eman from Illinois, I think all who are familiar with Gen. Barnett will readily agree that thissplendid efficiency as an officer and his high character as a man, and I am sure that any statement which he may make in reference to this matter will have the respectful and thoughtful consideration of every Mem­ber of this Committee.

It will be noted in the statement supplied by Gen. Barnett, and which I will here set out, that the University of Illinois was written to and no reply received. Gen. Barnett informs me, however, that he hopes when this splendid institution is written to again a number of its graduates will be submitted for consideration. The statement from Gen. Barnett is as follows:

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
COMMANDANT'S OFFICE,
Washington, February 5, 1917.
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Mr. MILLER of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two or three words for the purpose of getting the floor. Mr. Chairman, without entering into the merits of the controversy raised on this point, I think in the South Carolina Military Institute, many of the officers might properly be informed with the House on this subject, concerning that institution.

Last year it was my privilege to be in Charleston and to see the students at the institute, and to inspect what is known as the South Carolina Military Institute. I should say while the House is on this subject, concerning that institution.

The same that they can not do it, but there are many men upon the retired list, and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation stated that they had a list, that they had sent to 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. MANN. I do not see how it could do any injury to make a statement as to the number of these officers who might be used in active service. I asked whether the gentleman had any such computation.

Mr. PADGETT. 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. PADGETT. 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. I take the gentleman will not come to you.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. If it were my understanding is that every retired officer has been asked to indicate to the Navy Department what work he considers himself fit and able to do. I am informed that they have according to the Navy Department. As to what work they have been designated for in the event of need, I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky think that the House, or at least the Committee on Naval Affairs, might properly be informed as to the number of men who could be put into real active service in case of emergency?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not questioning that. It so happened that a rear admiral of the Navy was in the other day touching another retired officer. He himself is much too old to be able to do any active work, and he spoke of a request of that kind having been made and of the work he thought this particular officer could do with very great benefit to the country. That is the way I came to know of the inquiry being made of them.

Mr. MANN. The wonder to me is that this information is not given to us.

Mr. PADGETT. 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. PADGETT. 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:

One chief clerk, at $2,000; 1 clerk, at $1,500; 1 messenger, at $975.

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. PADGETT. 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, it was about the graduation 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. PADGETT. It is published in the register, if the gentleman will look at it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want it in the register.

Mr. PADGETT. So I can not give the gentleman that. Somebody stated here this afternoon there were about 900. I have not looked it up myself.

Mr. CALLAWAY. 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. PADGETT. Counting the extra numbers, there are somewhere between 70 and 80 on the retired list.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Actually engaged in active service?

Mr. PADGETT. Counting the extra numbers.

Mr. CALLAWAY. How many on the retired list?

Mr. PADGETT. 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. The chairman put it into the record.

Mr. PADGETT. 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 the major general commandant—one chief clerk at $2,000, and so forth.

Mr. PADGETT. What point 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 not 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 carried 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 be will they 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. Panzer] 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 not 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 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 who are on the retired list and when the retired list is connected into a law, 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 proper intervals as may be advisable, and such officers as shall be found to have recovered from such disability or to be able to perform their service of value to the Government shall be retained on the active list. Such action shall be assigned to such duty as the Secretary of the Navy may approve.

Now, will the gentleman explain what earthly objection there would be, 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 age of 45, 25; lieutenants (junior grade), 27; lieutenants, 27; lieutenants (junior grade), 22; lieutenants, 27; passed assistant surgeons, 12; assistant surgeons, 6; paymasters, 8; assistant paymasters, 1; naval constructor, 1; assistant naval constructor, 1; or a total of 202.

Now, of those higher grade officers, their average age is 45. Then, in the Marine Corps there is 1 lieutenant colonel, whose age is 60, on the retired list. There are 4 majors, with an average age of 45, on the retired list; 17 captains; 10 first lieutenants; and 27 second lieutenants; or a total of 32. Noncommissioned officers, who are retired with rank of a commissioned officer, chief, 8; hospitalman, 10; chief gunner, 4; gunner, 12; or a total of 34.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for 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. TALBOTT. This is not the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia 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. 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. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. 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, but I am willing to address the 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 as nearly as I can understand him. I drafted the bill to the end of having these clerks included in the 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 in the Navy, the Agricultural Department were brought 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 Chief of Staff 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 design to force the legislation that affected the navy, 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 method of 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.

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say to my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] before the gentleman replies, that we did not attempt to have those clerks stricken out of this bill this year because we realized that the department would be against it. It is our desire that they be left there, and that the department have all these clerks under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and included in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, which is already in conference. We could not provide for them otherwise.

But I wish to direct an inquiry of the chairman now as to whether, in the formation of next year's bill, it would not be better for legislative purposes to have the clerks provided for in these four paragraphs included in the legislative, executive, and judicial 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 right 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 with the Bureau of Navigation and the Bureau of Yards and Docks?

Mr. MANN. In the office of the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. STAFFORD. Or the office of the Secretary of the Navy?

All the activities of the Navy other than this one, are included, so far as the departmental clerks are concerned, in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill.

Mr. PADGETT. They have always been appropriated for in this bill, time out of mind.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is that the only argument the gentleman can advance in favor of their retention in this bill? If he cannot advance any other one, I will be tempted to call attention to the subject when the next legislative bill is considered for the sake of consistency and harmony to have these clerks carried in that bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose in that event you would meet the same difficulty that you met on the Army bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, we might meet more. The Navy is much more potent with the big guns than the Army is with its little guns. But that, nevertheless, would be as good an argument as any other in destroying the naval appropriation bill as the members of the Committee on Military Affairs advanced in connection with the retention of those clerks connected with the office of the Chief of Staff.

Mr. PADGETT. I think we have all the arguments they had.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman may have something up his sleeve that he is withholding, but I am tempted to call the bluff, and ask to have them included in the next legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.
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 of $1,800."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 51, line 9, insert the figures "$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 $840.

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 at $840 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, $7,153,002.78.

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 private enlisted men; subsistence and lodging of enlisted men when traveling on duty, or cash in lieu thereof; commutation of rations to enlisted men, regularly detailed as clerks and messengers, and services of board and lodging of applicants for enlistment while held under observation, recruits, recruiting parties, and enlisted men where it is impracticable to furnish 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; ice for offices and preservation of food; rations, $1,676,000. Hereafter no law shall be construed to entitle enlisted men to any commutation of rations 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 rations en shore duty in the island possessions and on foreign stations with the Army ration, such marine may be allowed the Navy rations 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 Cuba.

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 in Haiti.

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 act?

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. Monin.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed 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. 20632, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. GALLIVAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave to be absent for four days, on account of attending the obsequies of a friend.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we passed House bill 1928, a bridge bill, where an identical Senate bill (S. 7337) 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:

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to request the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 1928) entitled 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 Allegany, 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-headact; and

S. 1444. An act for the relief of James L. Dickey, and

S. 1922. An act for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard;

S. 1923. An act for the relief of Mary Williams, and

S. 2063. An act for the relief of Peter Kenney; and

S. 2323. An act to reimburse John Simpson.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported the following bills that 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. 269. An act for the relief of Joseph A. Jennings;
H. R. 7763. An act for the relief of Stephen J. Simpson;
H. R. 7795. An act for the relief of C. H. S. Speer;
H. R. 11288. An act for the relief of S. S. Yoder; and

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

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 their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 55, 58, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 62, 88, 96, 101, 103, 106, and 112.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, 17, 18, 23, 25, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 61, 64, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 72, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 107, 108, and 109, and 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 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 cement reservoir near such spring or springs for the purpose of storing the water so acquired:

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of said amendment numbered 4 and the following language appearing in lines 10 to 14, inclusive, on page 18 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."

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 automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in connection with the construction of the reservoir to be built by the Secretary of the Interior in 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 June 25, 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 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "Provided, That $20,000 be appropriated for the purpose of constructing a reservoir near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, located near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, the purchase of such 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 springs near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, 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 the water so acquired:

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, 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 $300,000 shall be paid out of the seasonal 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 springs near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, 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 the water so acquired:

Provided further, That the amount herein appropriated may be used for the acquisition on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, of lands necessary for the site for the Mesquakie Day School, Sac and Fox, Iowa." 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 purposes, and such employee in the Indian Service, it shall be charged, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund charged 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 sum 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: "$85,000, of which sum to be used for the employment of additional field matrons;" 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:" $400,000 ;" 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: "$75,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert: "$75,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of said amendment strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert the following: "$50,000, of which sum to be used for the employment of additional field matrons;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, 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 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 amendment proposed insert: "$400,000 ;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, 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 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amendment proposed insert: "$75,000;" 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 line 4 of the amendment proposed, after the word "Interior," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "reimbursing the United States for the sums 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.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, 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.

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: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "$20,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, 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, 1891 (26 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 authorize the President, in his discretion and whenever he 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 Bands or villages of Indians in the State of California, 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 President of the Senate of the State of Iowa, the sum of $42,902.23 transferred to the credit of those Indians under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1896, of $10,334.96 be apportioned per capita among the enrolled members of said tribe.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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 "$71,175;" and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$74,675;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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 number 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 "trees," strike out the words "uniting the school" and in lieu thereof insert the following: "hereof erroneously stricken from the rolls and reinstated prior to the passage of this act;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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: "additional land, $50,430." and in lieu thereof insert the following: "$97,430;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the amendment strike out the following: "for the purchase of additional land, $41,600; in all, $129,020," and insert the following: "in all, $88,320;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 1 of the amendment strike out the figures "$82,100," and in lieu thereof insert the figures "$90,100," and in lieu thereof insert "$97,430;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, 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 State 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 number 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 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.

Amendment number 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 $8,490 in lieu of an allotment of land in said nation. Said sum of $1,040 to be paid to each and every person out of the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Muskogee Creek Nation; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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; in all, $162,200," and insert "$30,000; in all, $152,200;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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 number 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 305 Indian pupils at the Indian School at United States to the credit of the Treasury of the Superintendent, $62,955; for general repairs and improvements, $8,000; for new barn, $3,000; in all, $73,955.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 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: "in all, $35,750."

On page 40, line 1, of the amendment, strike out the words "in lieu thereof" and insert the following: "of which amount not exceeding $900 may be expended for the purchase of two new busses;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment number 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, 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, their organization and administration, 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, their 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 stenographers are not to 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 48, 50, 95, and 111.

JNO. H. STEPHENS, C. D. CARTER, P. D. NORTON, Managers on the part of the House.
HENRY F. ASHURST, H. L. MYERS, MOSES E. CLAY, Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The bill as passed the House carried appropriations as follows:

Gratuity ........................................ $7,152,895.67
Treaty .......................................... 5,697,706.90
Total ............................................ $12,849,602.57
The bill as it passed the Senate carried appropriations as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratuity</td>
<td>$8,305,146.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable</td>
<td>$3,157,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>$345,999.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$12,308,175.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bill as agreed upon in conference carries appropriations as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gratuity</td>
<td>$7,778,176.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable</td>
<td>$9,605,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty</td>
<td>$345,999.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$11,329,086.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figures do not include amendments Nos. 90, 95, 111, and 112, which are in disagreement.

The estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, were $12,290,356.67. 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 $860,071 less than the bill carried when it passed the Senate.

The Senate conferees have receded on the following amendments: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, 58, 62, 65, 73, 74, 76, 82, 88, 92, 96, 100, 103, 106, and 112.


The effect of the recession of the House conferees on the amendments on which they have unqualifiedly receded is as follows:

On No. 15: Provides for three warehouses in the Indian Service instead of two permanent warehouses in last year's law.

On No. 17: Provides $5,000 of the $135,000 appropriation for general expenses of the Indian Service immediately available.

On No. 18: Increases the appropriation for the purchase of tracts of land on the Columbia River, Ore., as fishing grounds for the Oregon Indians, and appropriates $5,000 therefor.

On No. 21: Provides for the purchase of additional lands to the insane asylum for Indians at that place.

On No. 23: Requires land purchased by the United States for day school or other administrative purposes to be sold to the highest bidder when any sale is made as contemplated by the law.

On 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 oil and gas pipelines.

On 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.

On No. 43: Corrects the section number.

On No. 44: Grants an increase of $2,000 for general repairs and improvements at the Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kansas.

On No. 45: Appropriates $8,000 for the purchase of additional land at the Indian school, Mount Pleasant, Mich.

On No. 47: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to accept the application of Richard David to enter 11/4 acres of land as a sign of Evaline Gallagher, and to issue patent to Ouley on his complying with the requirements of the law relative to making soldiers' additional homestead entries.

On No. 53: Corrects the section number.

On No. 54: Does not increase the appropriation, but provides that $1,000 may be used for the purchase of two automobiles at the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont.

On No. 56: Increases the appropriation to the amount estimated by the department for the irrigation systems on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont.

On No. 57: Increases the appropriation for the support and civilisation of the Rocky Boy Band of Chippewa Indians in Montana.

On No. 59: Corrects the section number.

On No. 61: Corrects the section number.

On No. 64: Corrects the section number.

On No. 67: Corrects the section number.

On No. 68: Corrects the section number.

On No. 69: Provides for the construction and equipment of a gymnasium building at the Fort Totten Indian School, North Dakota.

On No. 71: Provides for the purchase of additional land for a school at the Wahpeton School, North Dakota, in accordance with the department estimates.

On No. 72: Corrects the section number.

On 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.

On No. 77: Provides for a reappraisal of Osage County, Okla., and appropriates $5,000 from tribal funds for such purpose.

On No. 78: Corrects the section number.

On 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.

On 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.

On No. 83: Reinstates existing law providing for a national attorney for the Creek Indians, and authorizes the expenditure of Creek funds to pay for the same.

On No. 86: Corrects the section number.

On No. 87: Provides for the purchase of a storage battery at the Indian school, Tomah, Wis.

On No. 90: Corrects the section number.

On 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.

On No. 93: Corrects the section number.

On No. 104: Appropriates $1,500 for the purchase of a storage battery at the Indian school, Tomah, Wis.

On No. 105: Corrects the totals to correspond with amendment No. 104.

On No. 107: Amends the House provision authorizing the Commissioner of the Interior to draw $38,000 of the tribal funds of the Menominee Indians of Wisconsin and to spend the same in clearing the land, building of homes, purchase of seeds, machinery tools, etc., so as to protect the timberlands of the Indians where they seek their allotments by requiring first a survey and certification of the forest service 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.

On No. 108: Corrects the section number.

On No. 109: Increases the appropriation for the irrigation system within the diminished Shoshone or Wind River Indian Reservation, Wy., and indicates two partly 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.

On the following amendments the House conferees reconciled with modifying or substitute amendments:

1. On No. 2: Strikes out the $3,000 appropriated for the investigation provided for and substitute $1,000 and directs the expenditure from the lump-sum appropriation for the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands to Indians.

2. On No. 6: Provides that the automobiles used in introducing or attempting to introduce intoxicating liquor into Indian country in violation of law shall be subject to seizure, libel, and forfeiture as provided in section 2130 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.
On No. 9: Decreases the amount allowed by the Senate for the support of Indian day and industrial schools from $1,550,000 to $1,600,000.

On No. 10: Increases the amount allowed by the Senate for the construction, lease, and repair of school and agency buildings from $800,000 to $1,600,000.

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 mechanics.

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. 24: Decreases the appropriation for reimbursing Indians for loss of stock infected with dourine and other contagious diseases from $100,000, as it passed the Senate, to $75,000, and provides that the same shall be immediately available and remain available expended.

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. 55: 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. 49: 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 Tribe of Indians in Iowa.

On No. 46: Authorizes certain expenditures for the support and education of Chickasaw Indians at the Indian School, Piptoster, 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 the Senate passed it, to $75,000.

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., with 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. 55: Authorizes the payment of 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. 80: 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. 82: Decreases the appropriation for the Indian school at Carver, Minn., from $80,100, as it passed the Senate, to $97,430, this decrease being necessary by the action of the Senate in conferring in receding from Senate amendment No. 62.

On No. 84: Changes the wording of the amendment appropriation $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 the allotment shall not interfere with rights of the Umatilla Indians as guaranteed by treaty.

On No. 92: Corrects the section number and reinstates the language 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 elect of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth Congress, makes the appropriation immediately available and 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. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was no objection.

Mr. LINDBERGH. 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. 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?
Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, favoring the lowering of water level of Lake Tahoe; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River; to the Committee on the Public Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction and maintenance of military highways along the Pacific coast; to the Committee on the Public Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River; to the Committee on the Public Roads.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the construction of a railroad along the north bank of the Columbia River; between Fort Canby and Fort Vancouver; 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. SINNOTT: 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. 20848) granting an increase of pension to William Kidd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 20835) 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. PESS: A bill (H. R. 20832) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Cloud; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 20850) granting an increase of pension to George Gunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 20850) granting an increase of pension to John Richards; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20833) for the relief of R. M. Bioust; 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. RASMESYER: A bill (H. R. 20855) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KUHR: A bill (H. R. 20832) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Waldorph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SISSON: A bill (H. R. 20850) 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 F. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 20861) granting a pension to Harry E. Snyder; to the Committee on Pensions.
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.

By Mr. ESCH: 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 S234; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CARLY: Petition of employees of the Post Office Department, favoring any fair and equitable taxation necessary to the protection of American lives and property; 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 John Schuette, of Manistowoc, Wis., relative to discontinuance of the package-freight business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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 partnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of B. B. Droungold, of Lansburgh, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 18531, to increase pensions of maimed soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of ex-Confederate soldiers of Holyoke, Mass., to increase of pension for James Mackall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' Union No. 11 of Peru, Ill., opposing any declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry farmers in the State of Wisconsin, relative to advance in price of hither 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, Ill., against proposed tax on excess profits of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOUSE: Petition 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, 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 Pulaski, Colo., opposing any fair and equitable taxation necessary to the protection of American lives and property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of sundry members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College, relative to the United States' participation in a league of nations to prevent future wars, etc.; 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 Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Miss Luella Meloy and 48 other members of the Pennsylvania College for Women, of Pittsburgh, Pa., with others, favoring the migratory-bird treaty act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, 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. HILL: Petitions of sundry members of the faculty of Mount Holyoke College, relative to the United States' participation in a league of nations to prevent future wars, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of L. O. Miller and 65 citizens of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring passage of House bill 20204; to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, 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. 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, Veal, and sundry citizens of Bismarck, N. Dak., opposing any policies, etc., tending to war, etc., with foreign nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.