Clay, Laura

Page 2156

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1956 No. 24

Senate

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal Spirit, whose holy purposes are beyond defeat, we come seeking Thy righteous will and craving Thine enabling strength to do it. Thou knowest that constantly we pray "Thy kingdom come," but we confess that often the flaming hope of that kingdom of love has grown dim, as hatred and selfishness and man's inhumanity to man have desecrated the earth which could be so fair. But, in spite of temporary rebuffs, give us to see that wherever hatred gives way to love, wherever prejudice is changed to understanding, wherever pain is soothed and ignorance banished, there Thy banners go and Thy truth is marching on.

And so, with all our inadequacy we pause this quiet moment that amid the din of conflict we may keep step with the distant drum beat of Thy sure victory. We ask it in the name of that One who has changed a cross of defeat into a crown of triumph and whose kingdom has no frontier. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C. February 10, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALAN BIBLE, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BIBLE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 8, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 336)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems submitted to me through its Chairman, covering its operations from January 1 to June 30, 1955, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1956.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2667. An act to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 (Public Law 287, 83d Cong.); and

H. R. 7054. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 514) relating to the compensation of the executive director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 6790. An act for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin;

H. R. 6857. An act to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.; and

H. R. 7156. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION PLACED ON CALENDAR

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 514) relating to the compensation of the executive director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce that he has appointed the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy, pursuant to Public Law 301, 78th Congress.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested by

the Vice President to announce that he has appointed the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, pursuant to Public Law 38, 78th Congress.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON BILLS RELATING TO INSURANCE AGAINST LOSS DUE TO FLOODS AND SIMILAR NATURAL DISASTERS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Securities of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who is absent from the Senate by leave of the Senate, I desire to give notice of a public hearing to be held by the subcommittee on pending bills relating to insurance against loss due to floods and similar natural disasters. Presently pending before the subcommittee on this matter are three bills, namely, S. 2768; S. 2862, together with an amendment in the nature of a substitute for that bill; and S. 3137. The hearing will begin at 10 a. m., Thursday, February 16, 1956, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, 303 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., telephone: National 8–3120, extension 865, as soon as possible, and, in any event, before the close of business on Wednesday, February 15, 1956.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, there will be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that no statement made in connection therewith exceed 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, before the Senate proceeds with the transaction of routine business in the morning hour, I should like to announce that the first order of business today, at the conclusion of the morning business, will be the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, as was announced on Wednesday.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports from the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, on the overobligations of appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to include natural children of the spouse of a member in the definition of "children" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by repealing the prohibition on payments to survivors of former members for unused leave credit (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report to the President of the United States, by the Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics, dated February 1, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission on the operation of the trade-agreements program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of that Commission, for the period July 1–December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTIFICATION OF ADEQUATE SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification that an adequate soil survey and land-classification had been made of the lands in the Shafter-Wasco Irrigation District, and that lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of December 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to readjust postal rates; establish a Commission on Postal Rates; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolution memorializing Congress relative to taking census of citizens of the United States

"Whereas the constitution of this State requires that the readjustment and alteration of senate districts and the reapportionment of members of the assembly be based upon the number of inhabitants, excluding aliens in the State and in the political subdivisions thereof, and further makes the last preceding Federal decennial census controlling as to the number of inhabitants in the State and in the various political subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas no provision is made under the law of the United States for ascertaining in connection with the taking of the Federal decennial census, the number of inhabitants excluding aliens in the several States and in the political subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas as a result thereof, each time the Federal decennial census is taken, it is necessary for this State, at considerable expense, to arrange with the Bureau of the Census to ascertain and report to this State the number of inhabitants excluding aliens in the State and in its various political subdivisions, so that compliance may be made with the above described provisions of the constitution of this State in the next succeeding readjustment and alteration of the Senate districts and reapportionment of members of the assembly: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to make provision by Federal law for ascertaining in the taking of each Federal decennial census the number of inhabitants excluding aliens in each of the States and in the political subdivisions thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to Members of Congress elected from New York State, urging them to devote their efforts to accomplish the purposes of this resolution.

"By order of the senate,

"WILLIAM S. KING,
"*Secretary.*

"In assembly January 30, 1956, concurred in without amendment.

"By order of assembly,

"ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
"*Clerk.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass and adopt legislation denying Federal ownership of unappropriated water of natural streams in Colorado and the West and confirming the rights of appropriation thereof under the State laws

"Whereas the United States of America has, from time to time, claimed the ownership of the unappropriated waters of the Western States, including the unappropriated waters of the State of Colorado; and

"Whereas the Western States, including Colorado, deny that the United States of America is the owner of said waters; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado by its constitution has declared 'the water of every natural stream, not heretofore appropriated, within the State of Colorado, is hereby declared to be the property of the public, and the same is dedicated to the use of the people of the State, subject to appropriation as hereinafter provided';

"Whereas it is highly desirable that Congress by legislation confirm and declare that the water of every natural stream in Colorado and other Western States are reserved for appropriation for beneficial uses under the laws of the States and that all uses of the Federal Government and its agencies, permittees, licensees, employees, and wards shall be acquired in conformity with and under State law; and

"Whereas the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, United States Senator from the State of Wyoming, has introduced into the United States Senate a bill numbered S. 863, which is designed to accomplish the above purpose: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 40th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the purpose of S. 863 be and the same is hereby approved by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado and the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to pass and adopt said legislation or similar legislation whereby the claims to Federal ownership of unappropriated waters in the Western States shall be denied and that the unappropriated waters of Colorado and the West shall be confirmed to have been dedicated to the public subject to appropriation for use under and in conformity with State law; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Colorado and to Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, Senator from Wyoming.

"STEPHEN L. R. MCNICHOLAS,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a resolution adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., relating to the exchange of delegations between the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. and the parliaments of foreign states; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Elizabeth, N. J., favoring the sale of war materials and supplies to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. THURMOND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide social-security coverage for the municipal policemen and firemen of South Carolina

"Whereas municipal policemen and firemen are not entitled to social-security coverage under the present social-security law; and

"Whereas the municipal policemen and firemen of South Carolina desire social-security coverage because their present retirement coverage is inadequate; and

"Whereas the municipal policemen and firemen of certain other States do not wish social-security coverage because they have adequate retirement coverage without social security: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact suitable legislation to amend section 218 of the Federal social-security law so as to provide for the extension of social-security coverage to municipal policemen and firemen of the State of South Carolina on a State and local option basis; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each United States Senator from South Carolina, each Member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in Congress, and the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 12. An act to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk; and for other purposes; without recommendation.

PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO HAVE PRINTED MAJORITY REPORT AND MINORITY VIEWS ON THE FARM BILL DURING THE RECESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this morning, a little after midnight, the Commtitee on Agriculture and Forestry voted to report a farm bill. I was informed a few minutes ago that the staff is now at work preparing the bill for submission to the Senate. It may be that it will not be completed until after the Senate concludes its business today. I should like to have it printed as soon as possible, so that it may be read and studied by all persons interested.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as well as the report, may be filed during the recess of the Senate.

The report will not be ready at the time the bill is reported, but I should like permission to file the report as soon as may be possible so that Senators who may desire to study the report as well as the bill may have ample opportunity to do so.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Louisiana wishes to file his report during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator's request include the minority views as well as the majority report?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana would want to modify his request to include both the minority views and the majority report.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Subsequently, the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program was received, read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3175. A bill for the relief of Jose Ramon Perez Doalto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. BENDER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3176. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 3177. A bill to provide for the preservation of acreage history for the purpose of future wheat acreage allotments where such allotments are underplanted because of unfavorable weather conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 3178. A bill to waive section 143, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina holding court at Bryson City, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 3179. A bill for the relief of Redentor Ligot Romero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 3180. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of two United States commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3181. A bill to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCHOEPPEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 3182. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cheng-en Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 3183. A bill to provide an improved farm program; an original bill, placed on the calendar.

(See statement concerning the above bill, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3184. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to farmers and stockmen for the purpose of refinancing existing debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and

S. 3185. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to adjust the loan limitations of title II so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. NEUBERGER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted, considered, and agreed to:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. Res. 210. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ four additional clerical assistants for the month of February 1956.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLEMENTS when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. Res. 211. Resolution relative to the death of Representative CHAUNCEY W. REED, late a Representative of the State of Illinois.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMPULSORY INSPECTION OF POULTRY AND POULTRY PRODUCTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the major and vital health needs of the Nation today is legislation to provide for the compulsory inspection of poultry.

It is amazing, but true that today, 50 years after the enactment of the Meat Inspection Act, poultry still need not be inspected to assure the consumer a clean and wholesome product. Filthy and diseased poultry may be, and often is, sold with immunity.

This intolerable situation has had dire results. For example, the Public Health Service reports that an average of one-third of the reported cases of food poisoning are traced each year to poultry or poultry dishes.

Some 26 diseases have been found transmissible from poultry to man and they are taking their toll annually. These illnesses include the influenza-like and sometimes deadly psittacosis or ornithosis; the infection, salmonellosis; the viral Newcastle Disease and fungus infections.

Periodically, and cyclically, diseased poultry causes a large outbreak of disease. Thus, for example, in 1954, an ornithosis epidemic broke out among turkeys in Texas. Several hundred men and women, especially in poultry processing plants, became ill. Several persons were fatally stricken.

Equally dangerous and despicable are the filthy conditions in which some poultry is processed. Some plants are rodent-infested. Sewage disposal is primitive and even nonexistent. Dust, dirt and fecal matter are allowed to stick to the birds. Slimy and rotting poultry is processed.

These are not imaginary horrors. These are facts from affidavits of poultry workers and from the reports of Food and Drug Administration inspectors.

Contamination of poultry processed under these unsanitary conditions may result in some extremely serious diseases in man. These include typhoid fever, paratyphoid fever, dysentary, infectious hepatitis and chemical poisonings.

The overwhelming majority of the industry, of course, attempts to maintain good standards of product wholesomeness and sanitation. But there are a sufficient number of chiselers in this fast growing industry to make legislation necessary. Not only do these men who are after the fast buck endanger health, but they are unfair competition to the honest poultry processors who go to great expense to maintain modern and sanitary plants and sell only healthy poultry.

The difficulty is the absence of a compulsory inspection system with power to stop these abuses. A voluntary program does exist, but it covers only 21 percent of poultry in interstate commerce and is ineffective in assuring wholesomeness of even this comparatively small amount.

The Food and Drug Administration currently has neither the authority nor the appropriations to stop this serious health problem. Further, very little effective State and municipal legislation on the subject exists.

The problem is clearly one for new legislation from Congress.

Literally dozens of organizations have long recognized this need. For example, such widely varying groups as the Conference of State and Territorial Health Officers, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO), the Institute of American Poultry Industries have called for mandatory inspection. Trade associations, labor unions, public health groups, veterinary groups, women's clubs have all asked for legislation.

Therefore on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome or adulterated poultry or poultry products. The measure would establish a Poultry Inspection Service in the Food and Drug Administration. It would be the task of this unit to inspect poultry for wholesomeness and poultry plants for sanitation.

Wholesomeness would be assured by inspection both before and after slaughter. According to health authorities, this is the only means for truly protecting the consumer. Inspection after slaughter alone will not do the job.

All poultry will be labeled after inspection. The healthful birds will be marked as wholesome by the inspector. Only poultry with such a tag will be allowed in interstate and foreign commerce.

Diseased, adulterated or otherwise unfit poultry would receive another marking. It will be denatured or destroyed at the processing plant under the inspector's supervision.

In addition, the bill provides for reinspection if that should be necessary. Suspect and condemned poultry will be quarantined or segregated to prevent the possible infection of healthy birds.

The detailed rules and regulations for the inspection will be prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The bill establishes the basic policy and framework from which he would develop those regulations.

The Secretary is also empowered to develop standards for plant sanitation and for sanitary practices in processing. If an inspector finds a plant to be violating these standards, he will refuse to mark that establishment's poultry as wholesome until the firm complies with the sanitation rules nad regulations. Without the inspection tag, the poultry will, of course, be barred from interstate commerce.

The bill provides for injunction proceeding and penalties of up to 3 years imprisonment and a $10,000 fine in case of violations. Among the prohibited and punishable acts are refusal to allow inspectors access to poultry processing plants; the delivery, receipt, or sale in commerce of uninspected poultry and the forgery or counterfeit of inspection marks.

In short, this bill will effectively meet the health hazards posed by filthy and diseased poultry. It will guarantee consumers wholesomeness of product and provide them with the protection they badly need.

I believe the measure deserves the careful consideration and support of every Senator. Its enactment will be a significant step forward in public health. I intend to do everything in my power to see to it that the Congress approves this legislation promptly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be reecived and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3176) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome, or adulterated poultry or poultry products, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REDENTOR LIGOT ROMERO

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Redentor Ligot Romero. The bill would grant Mr. Romero permanent residence in the United States. This young man, a na-

tive Filipino, a distinguished concert violinist, is threatened with deportation because of a technical violation of our immigration laws.

Mr. President, I request that a very heartwarming article by J. Campbell Bruce which appeared January 12, 1955, in the San Francisco Chronicle accompany my remarks in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3179) for the relief of Redentor Ligot Romero, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The article, presented by Mr. NEUBERGER, is as follows:

IMMIGRATION LAW INJUSTICE—MUSICIAN FACES DEPORTATION

(By J. Campbell Bruce)

Redentor Ligot Romero arrived in San Francisco in December of 1952 with an old violin under his arm, and visa in his pocket and a song in his heart.

He was at last in the land of his dreams, bent on soaking up Western musical culture and taking it back to the Philippines. Since then—though many a day passed without a meal—he lived happily in the world of music.

But he didn't read the fine print—the fine print of the 301-page McCarran-Walter Act, the organic immigration law of the United States. He did not even know about section 248.

And so he's got to get out of the country by February 1.

Why?

Just one of those quirks in the law. Nothing the immigration officials here can do about it—they've got to enforce the law.

VISITOR'S VISA

It seems that Romero arrived on a visitor's visa. He was told he could later change to a student's visa, and in due course he applied for such a change.

That's where section 248 came in. It says an alien "lawfully admitted to the United States as a nonimmigrant, who is continuing to maintain that status," can change to another nonimmigrant status. That is, from a visitor to a student.

But Romero hadn't been just window shopping, gawking at the cable cars and maybe wondering at Yosemite's granite walls.

For one thing, he was studying music—Mozart, harmony, composition and such, at San Francisco State College. Visitors can't study.

For another thing, he got mighty hungry after a while. So, for several months, he sold kitchen utensils on week-ends. Visitors can't sell kitchen utensils, or anything else. It deprives American salesmen of a livelihood.

RECITAL, TOO

And then there was the recital at the Marines Memorial Theater. An immigration official said it would be all right—and even attended the concert. But still, under the law it might have deprived an American musician of a job.

Equally as bad, he played violin solos during Sunday services at various churches in the East Bay.

Romero, a frail, myopic young man of 25, is bewildered and confused by it all.

"Ever since a little boy, I had a dream of studying music in America. My father's promise, even in the guerrilla days, was to send me after the war. Then he had money. After the war, we had none."

His father, a prominent Manila lawyer, fought at Bataan as an American Army officer, escaped, was later killed as a guerrilla. His mother also lost her life. Young Romero still has the scar of a bayonet wound—he was only 13 at the time.

ORIENT TOUR

He kept alive his dream to study in the United States and "acquire the techniques to help my country culturally." At 18 he toured the Orient as a concert violinist; at 20 he was conductor of the Guam Symphony Orchestra.

He has already studied here under Henri Temianka, of the Paganini Quartet; is now studying under Sidney Griller, of the Griller Quartet; and hoped to study under Darius Milhaud at Mills. For the past year and a half he has been concert master (principal player) of the San Francisco Civic Recreation Symphony Orchestra.

Says Griller: "He has a remarkable talent as a musician and great promise as a composer. His main desire in life is to absorb the music of the West and take it back to his people."

Says Josepha Heifetz, pianist, who has accompanied him: "It's plain stupid to send him back to the Philippines. Why should this young person be treated as a criminal?"

COSTLY TRIP

Romero, of course, isn't a criminal. He isn't a dope peddler, nor an addict; isn't diseased, nor insane; isn't a subversive. He's admissible for entry. But not for a change of status from visitor to student. So he has to go all the way to the Philippines to pick up a student's visa, at a round-trip cost of $1,338.70 by air, $1,175 by steamship.

He hasn't got that kind of dough. But if he doesn't go voluntarily, he'll be deported—and then he can never return.

Perhaps this was the sort of thing that President Eisenhower had in mind when in his state of the Union address the other day he called for revision of the McCarran-Walter Act.

APPOINTMENT OF TWO COMMISSIONERS FOR CUMBERLAND GAP NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of two United States commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park.

Section 631 of title 28, United States Code, authorizes the appointment of park commisisoners for Big Bend, Crater Lake, Glacier, Hawaii, Isle Royal, Lassen, Mesa Verde, Mammoth Cave, Mount Ranier, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia, Shenandoah, Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Great Smoky Mountain National Parks.

On December 14, 1955, under authority of title 16, United States Code, section 261, the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park was established with lands lying within the States of Tennessee, Virginia, and Kentucky, with more than half of the park area lying in the latter State.

The bill proposes to amend section 631, title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize two park commissioners for the Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, one to be named by the District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky and the other to be named by the joint action of the District Court of the Eastern District of Tennessee and the District Court of the Western District of Virginia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3180) to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointmnet of two United States commissioners for Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, introduced by Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN SHIPMENTS OF FARM PRODUCE FROM TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PROPERTY

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have received a number of letters calling attention to the 3-percent transportation tax, which is imposed on agricultural products including livestock which the farmer delivers to the market.

The tax was a war-time measure and it creates a great deal of discrimination against farmers in getting merchandise to market.

The Senate is quite familiar with the present plight of the farmer, and I think the time has come when this provision of the law should be repealed.

I therefore introduce a bill which will repeal this provision of the law, and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3181) to exempt certain shipments of farm produce from the tax on the transportation of property, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

IMPLEMENTATION OF ADMINISTRATION'S FARM PROGRAM

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to implement the administration's farm program. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, relating to the bills be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

S. 3184. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make or insure loans to farmers and stockmen for the purpose of refinancing existing debts, and for other purposes; and

S. 3185. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to adjust the loan limitations of title II so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers.

The statement presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

SUPPLY MORE CREDIT TO WORTHY FARMERS

In his special agricultural message sent to the Congress nearly a month ago, President Eisenhower stated that "the administration is determined to see to it that an adequate supply of credit remains readily available to our farmers at all times."

Private local credit institutions are doing a good job of providing credit to farmers who can meet the credit standards required to insure repayment. Most of those farmers who produce the bulk of our annual marketable crop value are not experiencing difficulty in obtaining credit.

But even many of these farmers are borrowing increasing amounts. For example, the Federal Land Bank System and its 1,100 local farm loan associations lent farmers who had adequate collateral some $487 million in 1955. This represented a 59-percent increase, however, over 1954. Of this $487 million, nearly $338 million represented "new-borrowed money." During 1955 also, local production credit associations, some 498 in number, which form the other part of the Cooperative Farm Credit System of the Farm Credit Administration loaned to farmers an additional $1.4 billion dollars, secured by adequate collateral.

However, the responsibility of "assuring adequate and sympathetic coverage of agricultural credit requirements which cannot be met by private financial institutions" as President Eisenhower expressed it in his special agricultural message, belongs to the Farmers Home Administration. Loans made to farmers, by the Farmers Home Administration, who cannot meet the collateral and other credit standards of private banks, etc., and the lending institutions of the Farm Credit Administration, increased in value from $212 million in 1951 to well over $300 million in 1955.

But due to the cost-price squeeze which farmers have been experiencing for several years now, a large number of FHA and other borrowers, especially those in drought disaster areas and young farmers just getting started, are having extreme difficulty meeting their credit obligations. In the intermountain States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, the Federal Government has made economic and production disaster and special livestock loans, during the period 1953–55, totaling $20,142,855. It appears quite certain that many farmers who got these loans will be forced from agriculture not because they are not good, efficient farmers, but because they haven't adequate financial resources to see them through the temporary crisis agriculture is experiencing. As Secretary Benson pointed out in his February 1, 1956, talk before the Minnesota-Iowa Swine Producers Association at Austin, Minn., "It takes money to make money in farming as in other businesses."

Because I have faith in the American farmer, I send to the desk two bills which would enable the Farmers Home Administration to make a more adequate supply of credit available to farmers.

The first would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, to—

1. Make or insure loans for the purpose of refinancing, consolidating, renewing, or extending all, or part, of the existing debts of the applicant for farm operating and subsistence expenses, whether secured or unsecured by real or personal property.

2. Such loans are to be made to farmers operating family-type farms who are unable to repay their existing indebtedness in accordance with present repayment schedules and who cannot secure refinancing through private or cooperative sources on terms that they could be expected to meet under present circumstances.

3. Such loans are to be repaid when it appears that the borrower can obtain a loan from cooperatives or private sources, including the local loan associations and Production Credit Associations under the terms borrowers can meet.

4. Such loans are to carry such interest rates and conditions of repayment as the Secretary of Agriculture deems advisable under the circumstances, provided, however, that the total principal indebtedness of a borrower shall not exceed the fair value based on earning capacity or the normal market value of the farm.

5. The aggregate total of such loans shall not exceed $45 million in any 1 fiscal year.

The second bill will permit the Farmers Home Administration to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers by providing that—

1. The term of any such loan shall not exceed 11 years from the date the original loan was made. This extends from 7 to 11 years the repayment period.

2. No person who has failed to liquidate his indebtedness in 11 consecutive years shall be eligible for additional loans until such indebtedness has been paid.

ELIMINATION OF HAZARDS CAUSED BY A CANAL IN THE CITY OF KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I introduce a joint resolution directing the Interior Department to find the best and most feasible means of eliminating the terrible dangers caused by a deep and swift Bureau of Reclamation canal which winds through the heart of the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg. The joint resolution carries a $5,000 appropriation to finance this humanitarian and urgent undertaking.

The project is humanitarian because during the past 30 years a total of 25 unfortunate persons have lost their lives by drowning in this canal. The project is urgent because every hour that this canal exists in its present form, some man, woman, or child may die.

Last October, I inspected this canal, with a group of public-spirited and responsible Klamath Falls citizens known as the Fence the Canal Committee. I saw for myself this hazard. The canal twists through the very core of Klamath Falls, a community of some 16,000 people. It touches backyards and school playgrounds. In some places the canal banks are low. In other reaches, the canal is in a virtual gorge. Naturally, such a flow of water is especially tempting and inviting to children. When I was in Klamath Falls, a child of 3 had just perished in the canal's cold flow. The grief-stricken parents were members of the committee. No force on earth can bring that little boy back to life, but it is within the authority of the Congress of the United States to take steps to make sure that other little boys will not share his sad fate.

At the time when I toured this perilous canal, it was felt that fencing with cyclone fences was the most practical means of eliminating the danger. Since then, other solutions have been recommended. Some citizens fear that children could still surmount the fence. Others think covering the canal completely might be a more permanent remedy. Still others advocate a complete relocation of the canal, entirely outside the city limits of Klamath Falls.

Because of these conflicting proposals, it has seemed to me advisable to order the Interior Department to survey and review the situation, and to suggest the most practical solution. Such a study, I am told, will cost approximately $5,000. This small expenditure is amply justified when we consider that human life is at stake, particularly the lives of little children. Had the canal been fenced or covered or moved prior to last fall, 3-year-old Patrick Callahan, the most recent of its 25 victims, would not have drowned.

Fred B. Robinson, of Klamath Falls, is chairman of the Fence the Canal Committee. He and his associates have kept me informed on the gravity of the problem. Many families in Klamath Falls, the instant they cannot locate their children out of doors, are terrified. They immediately think the canal has claimed another young life. I believe, Mr. President, that this menace must be ended. The United States Government has a direct responsibility, because it is a Bureau of Reclamation canal. Perhaps the United States Government should finance the entire project, ultimately. Perhaps it should be cooperative among National Government, city, and county. I am not yet prepared to recommend the exact formula. That will have to wait on the survey proposed by the joint resolution I am introducing today.

There are about 5.6 miles of an open ditch through the most densely populated sections of Klamath Falls. Would any city tolerate for long such a peril, if it already had cost the community 25 precious lives? I do not blame the good citizens of Klamath Falls for their indignation and outrage. I only wonder that they—and particularly the parents of children living in the city—have endured the menace as long as they have. Furthermore, think of the psychological problem which this situation poses to teachers and school authorities, in view of the proximity of the Bureau of Reclamation canal to schools and school-recreational facilities.

Mr. President, this ditch is a monstrous hazard, and it must be eliminated. I commend the good citizens of Klamath Falls, and particularly the Fence the Canal Committee, for the initiative and leadership they have shown in trying to do something to goad us in Government into exercising our responsibility in this matter.

So that the Senate will realize I am not exaggerating when I discuss this menace, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, together with my remarks, a statement by Dr.

S. M. Kerron, health officer of Klamath County, detailing the number of deaths each year since 1925, and the ages of the victims, through drowning in this watery graveyard. I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed a report of the Fence the Canal Committee, as summarized by its chairman, Mr. Fred B. Robinson; and that a copy of the joint resolution be likewise included in the RECORD.

My own personal inspection of the so-called A canal of the Reclamation Bureau in Klamath Falls has convinced me that this resolution should be speedily enacted, if the Federal Government is to do its duty to the people of this major community in southeastern Oregon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, statement, and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to determine the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by a canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in the approximately 38 years during which the A canal, under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, has been in operation within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., 25 persons have drowned in such canal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for an investigation and study for the purpose of determining the best means of eliminating the hazards within the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg., caused by the A canal under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such amount not in excess of $5,000 as is necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The statement and report, presented by Mr. NEUBERGER, are as follows:

AFFIDAVIT CONCERNING DEATHS FROM DROWNING IN THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION CANAL AT KLAMATH FALLS AND VICINITY

STATE OF OREGON,
County of Klamath, ss:

I, S. M. Kerron, M. D., being first duly sworn, depose and say:

That I am the duly appointed, qualified, and acting health officer for Klamath County, State of Oregon; that by virtue of such position I have in my possession a record of the deaths occurring in Klamath County, State of Oregon.

That from said record I have compiled the following list of persons who have drowned in the United States Bureau of Reclamation Canal from its source, through the city of Klamath Falls, and through the most populated portion of the suburbs of Klamath Falls, and to Homedale Road, Klamath County, beginning from the year 1925 and to and including October 14, 1955, including the ages of the persons who drowned, to-wit:

Year	Number	Ages
1925	0	
1926	2	40 and 66.
1927	1	5.
1928	0	
1929	0	
1930	1	10.
1931	1	10.
1932	1	33.
1933	1	6½.
1934	0	
1935	1	10.
1936	0	
1937	1	65.
1938	0	
1939	1	35.
1940	0	
1941	5	1, 30, 48, 40, and 49.
1942	2	8 and 41.
1943	1	10.
1944	0	
1945	2	22 and 15.
1946	1	36.
1947	1	46.
1948	0	
1949	0	
1950	0	
1951	0	
1952	1	47.
1953	1	63.
1954	0	
1955	1	3.
Total	25	

That the purpose of this affidavit is to show from the official records of Klamath County, State of Oregon, the true and correct number of persons who have drowned in the said United States Bureau of Reclamation canal, and to point up the need for remedial action.

S. M. KERRON, M. D.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Sacramento, Calif., December 13, 1955.

Mr. FRED B. ROBINSON,
Klamath Falls, Oreg.

MY DEAR MR. ROBINSON: In response to your letter of November 7, 1955, I wish to inform you that the Bureau would require funds in the amount of about $5,000 to investigate the practicability and feasibility of the various proposals you have made with regard to the "A" canal.

As stated in my letter of October 28, 1955, the Bureau does not have the funds nor the authority to make such studies.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. SPENCER,
Regional Director.

REPORT OF THE FENCE THE CANAL COMMITTEE

(By Fred B. Robinson)

Following the drowning of little Patrick Callahan, age 3, in the Government A canal on September 28, 1955, Mayor Paul Landry appointed a Fence the Canal Committee on October 4, 1955.

This committee, as it started to function, consisted of eight citizens; namely, Fred B. Robinson, chairman; Mrs. Kathy MacDonald, Mrs. Mike Holland, Mrs. Jack Elliott, Mrs. Josephine Kittridge, Mr. Frank Z. Howard, Mr. M. L. Shepherd, and Mr. Robert D. Puckett. Our specific task, emphasized by Mayor Landry, was to study not only the matter of fencing, but any and all other remedial measures that appeared feasible.

One of the first steps in studying a problem of this kind is to find out just how big a proposition it really is. Proceeding along this line, the following facts emerge:

1. Total length of canal under consideration, from headgate to Homedale Road, 6.2 miles.

2. Headgate to west portal of tunnel at Conger Field, 2,200 feet.

3. Length of tunnel under hill (west edge Conger Field to Prospect Street), 3,300 feet.

4. East portal of tunnel (Prospect Street) to city limits at Washburn Way, 2.2 miles.

5. Washburn Way to Homedale Road, 3 miles.

6. Total length of open canal, from headgate to Homedale Road, 5.6 miles.

In other words, deducting the 3,300 feet of canal already underground between Conger Field and Prospect Street, from the 6.2 miles total, leaves 5.6 miles of open, dangerous ditch through our most thickly populated area.

With the size of the problem thus outlined, the next step becomes one of studying the several possible things that can be done to and with the canal. The remedial measures appear to be four in number, although there may be others. These 4 can be listed under 4 general headings, namely:

1. Fence it.
2. Put it underground.
3. Move it elsewhere.
4. Use some combination of the first three.

Each of the four will be discussed briefly; advantages and disadvantages cited, cost figures given where available, pertinent facts cited, where known, followed by a statement of status—or progress—to date and a suggested plan of community action to secure the relief we want.

At this point it might be well to emphasize that there probably is no one single, perfect, happy solution to the problem. There will be good and valid objections to every one of the suggested remedial measures, just as there are good and valid reasons for each one. Some of the proposals may seem utterly fantastic, from a cost standpoint. They should, nevertheless, be brought up and weighed for what they are worth in any long range, permanent plan of solution. The fact that they are mentioned does not necessarily mean that the committee is recommending or endorsing them. We're keeping in mind that whatever is done must be eventually paid for by somebody, and it may end up by being local dollars that will do it. Whether it is ours or someone elses, it is going to cost money, whatever is done.

Furthermore, this is a long, long range proposition, not a stop-gap problem. The A canal has now been in operation 38 years. It will probably continue in operation 10 times that long—380 years. This is something to be figured in terms of 2, 3, or 5 centuries hence, as well as the immediate present. A permanent solution is needed, so let's not be too anxious to settle for just any cheap compromise that is offered.

* * * * *

CONCLUSION

With the majority of the fence-the-canal committee present, it was unanimously voted to present the foregoing as our committee report, together with the following:

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We find that something can be done to eliminate this canal danger from our community.

We find that the Bureau of Reclamation has already made somewhat of an engineering study of the very same measures we are suggesting. Also, that they are willing to proceed further with this study, to the end of finding ways and means of remedying this dangerous and hazardous situation, providing they can get funds and authority to do so. This is proven by a letter from Mr. C. H. Spencer, regional director of their Sacramento office, dated December 15, 1955, in which he says:

"The Bureau would require funds in the amount of $5,000 to investigate the practicability and feasibility of the various proposals you have made with regard to the A canal."

We know that Senator NEUBERGER and Congressman COON are aware of our problems, through first-hand inspection. Also, that both are ready to help us in every way possible, once they know what we want.

The recommendations follow naturally. First we should cooperate with the Bureau of Reclamation by having our Congressmen get them the necessary $5,000, plus whatever additional is needed, for an immediate, complete, and thorough engineering survey.

Secondly, as a community, we should insist that any and all surveys be aimed at getting the A canal out of town entirely.

Third, we should ask for a revision in the Bureau of Reclamtaion timetable, to the end that disposition of the A canal be made both a "next" and a "must" in their program.

Fourth, we should insist on speedy action all along the line, to the end that funds for construction work on the substitute for the A canal be included in the 1957–58 fiscal year budget of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Lastly, we should settle for nothing less than moving the A canal out of town, and abandonment of its present right-of-way, providing an engineering survey shows this to be feasible.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide for termination of social-security benefit payments to any person upon his conviction of espionage, sabotage, treason, sedition, or subversive activities.

The subject has been brought to my attention by an article in the Washington Daily News of October 27, 1955, in which it is pointed out that a convicted man, who was one of the top Communists in the country, is drawing social-security benefits while serving his term in the Atlanta Penitentiary.

Unless my amendment is adopted, after this man has served his time and is deported to Russia, his social-security payments will follow him to Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

The article, presented by Mr. WILLIAMS, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RED INMATE GETS $88.10 MONTHLY SECURITY FROM HAND HE TRIED TO BITE

(By Jack Steele)

The Social Security Administration each month mails a check for $88.10 to a Communist inmate of the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta, Ga.

It goes to Alexander Bittelman, a high-ranking Red now serving a 3-year sentence there for conspiring to advocate overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence.

The $88.10-a-month payment is made to the 65-year-old Mr. Bittelman under the Government's old-age insurance program. He can cash the check and spend the money. And, furthermore, it isn't subject to income tax.

DOUBLE SECURITY

His monthly check is a sort of double security from the hand of the Government he tried to bite.

Even that isn't the whole story.

Mr. Bittelman gets the check even though he hasn't paid a penny of the $6,000 fine imposed when he was sentenced on February 3, 1953, for violating the Smith Act.

And the Government keeps on paying his social security even though it expects to deport him to his native Russia as soon as he finishes serving his sentence.

Government officials did a lot of stuttering today trying to explain the Bittelman case. They were partially tonguetied because the social-security laws bar disclosure of details of the cases of individual beneficiaries.

HYPOTHETICAL

This picture was pieced together from what they could and would say about a hypothetical case similar to Mr. Bittelman's.

Social security laws and regulations do not bar payments to prisoners. Old-age insurance is based on taxes paid by both employees and employers in covered industries. The theory seems to be that it is a statutory right which is not canceled—as many others are—by conviction for a serious crime.

(The only exception, which does not apply to the Bittelman case, is that payments may not be made to a person who would thus benefit from his own crime, such as a woman who murdered her husband and thus became eligible for social security.)

There is no legal bar to payments to persons convicted under the Smith Act or other antisubversive laws. Presumably, anyone serving a sentence for treason would receive social security if eligible.

Social security checks cannot be seized or garnisheed by the Government or any other creditor.

Both the Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments are investigating the Bittelman case—presumably to see if there is any way these loopholes in the law can be closed.

If not, they may ask Congress to amend the law next year.

CREDIT

Credit for bringing the Bittelman case to light goes to William H. Hardwick, warden of the Atlanta Penitentiary.

Warden Hardwick declined to talk about the case today, but it was learned that he did some vigorous eyebrow raising when Mr. Bittelman's social-security checks began to turn up at the prison several months ago.

He reported the situation to the Bureau of Prisons, which told him to continue delivering the checks until further orders and bucked the case along to the Social Security Administration.

Mr. Bittelman is one of the founders of the Communist Party in this country. He came to the United States in 1912 after having been deported to Siberia by the Czar for revolutionary activity. He attended an underground meeting in 1920 at Kingston, N. Y., at which the party was supposedly formed, and later served as a member of the party's national committee.

Mr. Bittelman was one of 13 second-string Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act in January 1953. He began serving his sentence last January 11. His home was at Croton-on-Hudson, N. Y. He once worked for a New York publishing house, but it is not known whether this is where he earned his social security.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

Article concerning Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, written by Col. Hubert Lee, editor, Dixie Business magazine.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Statement by Mr. George B. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business,

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Paul Patterson," published in the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, Oreg., on February 2, 1956.

Article entitled "Censorship in Washington," published in the November 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

ADDRESS BY MISS LAURA CLAY AS TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF KENTUCKY CONVENTION ON NOVEMBER 27, 1933

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday was the anniversary of the birthday of one of the outstanding women of Kentucky, Miss Laura Clay, who lived in Lexington. She was a daughter of Cassius M. Clay, who was our Ambassador to Russia, appointed as such by President Lincoln nearly a century ago.

Miss Clay was one of the ablest among all that fine galaxy of women in Kentucky who have contributed so much to the educational, political, and moral atmosphere of our State.

Her father, Cassius M. Clay, was one of the most colorful men who ever lived in Kentucky, and belonged to that rather amazing Clay family for which Kentucky has been famous for more than a century and a quarter.

Cassius M. Clay built a magnificent mansion in Madison County, Ky., not far from Richmond, on an estate of 1,200 or 1,500 acres of bluegrass land. That magnificent house has been in a state of disrepair for a number of years. I myself visited it last year, just to see it in all its beauty and magnificence, and it really struck me as a pity that, in view of its historic interest and significance, nobody had restored the old Cassius M. Clay mansion, and saved it from becoming entirely a wreck.

Miss Laura Clay was an outstanding advocate of woman suffrage, and she was at one time a member of Susan B. Anthony's cabinet, as it was called. She was also an active member of the Women's Christian Temperance Union. In spite of that fact, however, she presided over the convention in Kentucky which ratified the constitutional amendment repealing the 18th amendment.

I have received from Dr. Mary Scrugham, of Lexington, a sister of former Senator Scrugham, of Nevada, who served in the Senate a great many years ago, a copy of the speech Miss Laura Clay made to the convention held in the State of Kentucky on the 27th day of November 1933, assembled for the purpose of ratifying the amendment repealing the 18th amendment.

I have been requested to have the address printed in the RECORD, and I take

great pleasure in asking unanimous consent that the address by Miss Clay which is very short, be printed at this point in the RECORD. It shows that notwithstanding Miss Clay's sentiments otherwise, she advocated the repeal of the 18th amendment to the Constitution for the reasons she gave in the speech.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

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

Friends, delegates, and fellow citizens, I have the honor to extend greetings to you on this historic occasion. The people of Kentucky have voiced at the ballot box their mandate to repeal the 18th amendment to the Federal Constitution and to adopt the 21st amendment.

Whatever other motives may have been mingled in giving this mandate it is evident that it expresses widespread and deep-rooted conviction among our people of the right of States to govern their internal and local affairs. And it designates that one office of the Federal Government is to uphold the States in their authority by protecting them from certain outside violations of their laws.

With this renewed affirmation of the rights of the States, we may go forward with courage in solving the problems which face us on our way to better and higher social conditions under our State constitution and laws.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees the Secretary will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sigurd Anderson, of South Dakota, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1952.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coast and Geodetic Survey nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Coast Guard nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

Without objection, these nominations are confirmed.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

IMPROVEMENT IN BENEFITS FOR NEEDY OLDER CITIZENS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself, I submit, and send to the desk, an amendment to H. R. 7225, and the request that it be printed and referred to the appropriate committee. I am especially pleased to have the senior Senator from Georgia join me in sponsoring this amendment, because it deals with a type of legislation with which he has had more experience than has any other Member of this body. As I have said many times, it has been one of my greatest privileges to serve and work with the senior Senator from Georgia; and I know of no matter on which I would rather work with him than this one.

What we are proposing, Mr. President, is an improvement in the welfare benefits for our needy older citizens. Under the amendment, the Federal matching formula would be revised. Instead of the present formula under which the Federal Government pays four-fifth of the first $25, it would be required to pay five-sixths of the first $30.

In other words, instead of $20 out of the first $25, the Federal share would be $25 out of the first $30 per month. Above the initial $30, there would be 50–50 matching of State and Federal funds up to a maximum of of $65, instead of the present maximum of $55.

Although the technical details are not yet completely worked out, we are planning to redraft the amendment so that no State will be able to use the new formula except with the effect of increasing benefit payments in the particular State. In other words, a State could elect to continue to use the present formula without an increase in benefit payments, or to adopt the proposed new formula and increase benefit payments $10 a month or some fraction thereof. The necessary technical means for accomplishing this must be worked out in the Finance Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that throughout next week this amendment may be open for the addition of the names of cosponsors. I believe that Senators will find, upon examination, that this proposed legislation is of great importance and is extremely timely. Therefore I should like to afford Senators who may so desire an adequate opportunity to add their names as cosponsors.

I also ask that the proposed amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, temporarily held at the desk, be printed, and be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. LONG, for himself and Mr. GEORGE, is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

"TITLE III—PROVISIONS RELATING TO PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

"AMENDMENTS TO MATCHING FORMULA FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 301. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1956, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $65—

"'(A) five-sixths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $30 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month; plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and (2) in the case of Purto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assitsance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30, and (3) in the case of any State, an

amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall be effective on and after October 1, 1956."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this amendment will be of substantial benefit to more than 2,500,000 aged persons who are in need of assistance. These people can well be described as the least of them all in that while they have contributed much in work and effort to the growth of this Nation, they are no longer productive in an economic sense. Undoubtedly many individuals have made great profit and accumulated riches as a result of the work of these 2,500,000 aged citizens. However, they themselves have little to show for their contribution.

This will be the first forward step to improve the condition of these 2,500,000 aged people since the year 1951—5 years ago—when a Democratic Congress under the leadership of the then Democratic leader, Ernest McFarland, the then junior Senator from Arizona, on behalf of himself and a large number of his colleagues, offered a successful amendment to the public-welfare program which had the effect of increasing the matching funds for the needy people of the Nation.

I have undertaken to prepare a certain amount of basic information which I am sure most Senators would want to have available in the study of this proposal. The complete data for old-age and survivors insurance payments in 1955 are not yet available. Therefore, I have been compelled to rely upon the figures for 1954 in order to obtain a nationwide comparison of welfare and social-security payments. I am, therefore, making available for the record three charts I have prepared.

The first is a tabulation of the cost of my proposed amendment to the Federal Government, assuming that each State in the Nation were to avail itself of the opportunity to participate in the liberalized matching formula and further assuming that State expenditures for public welfare purposes are approximately the same as they were in the year 1954. While neither assumption may be entirely correct, I feel that the national average will be within 5 percent of the figures I have prepared in table I.

This table shows approximately the amount of additional Federal funds which would be made available to the welfare programs of the various States and Territories of this Nation, assuming that each one elected to qualify for liberalized matching formula.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table I may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE I

WE CAN AFFORD LIBERALIZATION NOW

The cost to the Federal Government of liberalizing the matching formula for assistance to our aged needy would not be great. The increases available to the States and the cost to the Treasury are outlined in the chart below, based on present caseloads:

Proposal: Raise Federal matching funds for old-age assistance to five-sixth of $30 plus one-half up to $65.

Annual increase in Federal funds, assuming each State complies

Alabama	$5,306,524
Arizona	1,181,914
Arkansas	33,332,189
California	23,443,405
Colorado	4,335,355
Connecticut	1,477,922
Delaware	106,751
District of Columbia	245,983
Florida	5,333,196
Georgia	5,910,900
Idaho	706,496
Illinois	7,827,809
Indiana	2,468,337
Iowa	3,330,871
Kansas	2,766,006
Kentucky	3,326,460
Louisiana	7,571,225
Maine	993,792
Maryland	779,425
Massachusetts	7,660,071
Michigan	6,075,485
Minnesota	4,173,656
Mississippi	4,236,660
Missouri	7,946,640
Montana	748,964
Nebraska	1,433,124
Nevada	231,995
New Hampshire	522,675
New Jersey	1,689,152
New Mexico	662,695
New York	8,359,794
North Carolina	3,105,900
North Dakota	655,631
Ohio	8,689,873
Oklahoma	7,848,302
Oregon	1,603,993
Pennsylvania	4,134,156
Rhode Island	657,133
South Carolina	2,596,860
South Dakota	640,260
Tennessee	3,893,820
Texas	13,436,460
Utah	788,803
Vermont	534,604
Virginia	1,092,749
Washington	5,128,057
West Virginia	1,430,160
Wisconsin	3,419,253
Wyoming	340,656
Alaska	144,578
Hawaii	132,653
Total United States	184,459,372

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the second tabulation undertakes to show the number of people in each State who are receiving old-age assistance payments under the public-welfare program and also those receiving payments under the old-age and survivors insurance phase of the social-security program. In this table the third column of figures is particularly important because it demonstrates the percentage of aged persons receiving neither old-age assistance nor old-age and survivors insurance payments in 1954.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that a study recently completed by the Twentieth Century Fund has demonstrated that nearly three-fourths of the persons aged 65 or above have either no income or an income of less than $1,000 a year. Referring to the nationwide average of 45 percent of individuals who are receiving payments from neither old-age assistance nor old-age and survivors insurance, it is rather obvious that there are millions of aged people in this Nation today whose continued existence depends upon such meager assistance as their children or relatives are able to provide.

I feel sure that both great political parties desire to make progress in reducing the wretchedness and penury that are all too prevalent in this, the greatest and wealthiest Nation on the face of the earth.

We are told that the broadened social-security program will result in a gradual reduction of public-welfare cases. We are further told that within 20 years practically all aged persons of 65 years or over will be entitled to receive old-age and survivors insurance or other retirement income, amounting to at least $75 a month. But that does not meet the present problem. That does not solve the personal problems of the 14 million aged persons who are with us today.

I am sure my colleagues would agree with me that we would be derelict in our duty were we to overlook the millions of aged citizens who are in need of additional income today and take the irresponsible attitude that many of these problems will solve themselves after these worthy citizens who have contributed much to the growth and wealth of this Nation have passed out of this world and into the next.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD table 2, which I have prepared.

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

TABLE II

State	Per capita income as percent of average per capita income for United States, 1954 ($1,770)	Population aged 65 and above 1954 (estimate)	Percent of aged receiving neither OAA nor OASI, 1954	Percent of aged on OASI rolls, 1954	Percent of aged on OAA rolls, 1954	Percent of aged receiving OASI or OAA or both 1954 [1]	State	Per capita income as percent of average per capita income for United States, 1954 ($1,770)	Population aged 65 and above 1954 (estimate)	Percent of aged receiving neither OAA nor OASI, 1954	Percent of aged on OASI rolls, 1954	Percent of aged on OAA rolls, 1954	Percent of aged receiving OASI or OAA or both 1954 [1]
Alabama	61.6	214,000	41.4	29.7	29.6	58.6	New Jersey	125.4	450,000	47.0	49.5	4.6	53.0
Arizona	72.4	53,000	40.0	40.1	26.2	60.0	New Mexico	78.4	39,000	45.4	27.0	31.2	54.6
Arkansas	55.3	163,000	42.4	27.1	32.3	57.6	New York	122.2	1,430,000	48.8	45.8	7.3	51.2
California	122.2	1,044,000	39.4	44.2	26.0	60.6	North Carolina	67.2	253,000	53.2	28.0	20.4	46.8
Colorado	95.3	129,000	37.9	34.6	40.9	62.1	North Dakota	67.0	54,000	67.6	18.8	15.3	32.4
Connecticut	133.4	201,000	44.1	50.2	8.4	55.9	Ohio	112.0	785,000	47.3	42.3	13.2	52.7
Delaware	134.0	29,000	50.9	44.2	5.8	49.1	Oklahoma	82.9	209,000	35.1	26.6	25.7	64.9
District of Columbia	125.4	63,000	64.2	32.0	4.9	35.8	Oregon	99.3	153,000	42.9	48.0	13.2	57.1
Florida	91.0	297,000	33.3	48.9	23.4	66.7	Pennsylvania	100.9	978,000	48.2	46.8	6.0	51.8
Georgia	69.9	243,000	36.9	26.3	40.1	63.1	Rhode Island	103.0	78,000	37.5	54.9	10.7	62.5
Idaho	81.0	49,000	50.6	35.5	18.1	49.4	South Carolina	60.1	130,000	43.0	25.5	33.1	57.0
Illinois	121.8	854,000	50.9	40.0	11.4	49.1	South Dakota	75.3	63,000	61.7	23.2	17.4	38.3
Indiana	103.6	392,000	51.2	40.1	9.6	48.8	Tennessee	68.5	254,000	48.2	27.2	26.6	51.8
Iowa	94.2	293,000	58.6	29.5	14.5	41.4	Texas	88.9	591,000	40.1	27.0	37.6	59.9
Kansas	95.4	209,000	56.7	29.6	16.5	43.3	Utah	83.8	49,000	46.7	37.4	36.9	53.3
Kentucky	68.7	251,000	50.1	30.0	22.3	49.9	Vermont	79.6	40,000	45.3	41.5	17.2	54.7
Louisiana	73.6	193,000	22.7	27.2	62.0	77.3	Virginia	83.6	237,000	59.9	33.2	7.3	40.1
Maine	84.3	95,000	40.1	50.3	14.3	59.9	Washington	110.1	240,000	37.2	45.3	25.3	62.8
Maryland	109.6	181,000	54.3	40.8	5.9	45.7	West Virginia	69.6	152,000	41.9	42.6	16.7	58.1
Massachusetts	108.6	510,000	39.6	49.0	17.9	60.4	Wisconsin	96.4	346,000	49.9	40.2	12.8	50.1
Michigan	114.0	534,000	45.0	44.3	14.3	55.0	Wyoming	100.5	22,000	54.0	32.4	18.5	46.0
Minnesota	92.9	304,000	52.7	33.1	17.1	47.3							
Mississippi	49.3	159,000	39.2	20.4	42.6	60.8	Alaska	----------	4,742	27.2	47.6	25.2	72.8
Missouri	98.7	434,000	43.3	33.2	30.7	56.7	Hawaii	----------	25,000	51.4	42.4	7.3	48.6
Montana	97.7	59,000	55.4	32.2	15.8	44.6	Puerto Rico	----------	85,578	32.0	15.7	52.5	68.0
Nebraska	92.4	144,000	62.0	27.4	12.6	38.0	Virgin Islands	----------	2,011	56.6	9.7	33.9	43.4
Nevada	136.4	13,000	47.7	40.3	20.4	52.3							
New Hampshire	90.7	60,000	42.2	49.8	10.7	57.8	United States	100.0	13,729,000	45.3	39.7	18.7	54.7

[1] Net total, does not duplicate concurrent recipients of both.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of the Census.

Mr. LONG. The third table demonstrates the actual numbers of individuals drawing old-age and survivors' insurance payments and old-age assistance. It further shows the percentage of State and Federal contributions to public welfare for aged persons for the year 1954. In addition, this column shows the average monthly payment per recipient during the year 1954.

Several facts should be particularly noteworthy to most Senators. One of these facts is that States with low per capita income are generally States of a predominantly agricultural economy. It is in those States that the lowest percentage of persons are protected by old-age and survivors' insurance. These classes, farmers and farm laborers, are not protected by social security. It is true that those who are presently productive will have the benefit of social-security coverage in the future. However, that does not meet their problem today.

Those who are no longer able to work do not now and will not in the future have the benefit of old-age and survivors' insurance payments. Therefore, we have a high percentage of aged persons drawing old-age assistance payments under State public-welfare programs. In addition, there are many aged persons who are not receiving any sort of assistance, although they need it very badly, because of the inability of the States to make even a modest contribution toward adequate welfare payments for these persons.

Senators will note that the old-age assistance payments were substantially higher in 1954 in States with low per capita income than the payments in those same States were several years before. Much of this result can be explained by the McFarland amendment, which a large number of my colleagues joined in cosponsoring in the year 1952. It was this amendment that caused the Federal Government to put up $20 to match the first $5 of State contribution. Such liberal Federal matching as provided by the McFarland amendment made it possible for low-income States, like Mississippi, Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, and others, to make genuine headway in meeting the tremendous problems of poverty of the aged existing within those States.

The amendment the senior Senator from Georgia and I are offering will make possible further progress in that direction. At the same time our amendment will meet another problem. States with higher per capita income, particularly those States where a large percentage of their aged people are already protected by old-age and survivors' insurance, have found themselves able to advance public-welfare payments to the aged beyond the $55 at which Federal matching ceases.

To provide an extra $5 of Federal matching for those States of high income, States which make large contributions to Federal revenues and relatively small withdrawals against the public-welfare programs, would not permit those States to benefit in any genuine way. If those States cared to advance welfare payments to their general welfare citizens, the additional $5 of Federal matching would be offset by the fact that the additional contribution of the State above $55 would not be subject to Federal matching.

Therefore, in justice and fairness, those States with higher per capita income, in return for their support of a program that assists those with low per capita income, are entitled to demand and expect that the Federal Government will match State contributions to old-age assistance, at least as high as $65. Therefore, the amendment being offered by the senior Senator from Georgia and myself recognizes this fact and undertakes to provide additional matching to the extent of $65.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the third table to which I have referred.

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

TABLE III

State	Per capita income as percent of average per capita income for United States, 1954 ($1,770)	Population aged 65 and above, 1954 (estimate)	Number of aged persons receiving OASI benefits, December 1954	Number of aged persons receiving OAA grants, December 1954	Number of aged persons receiving OASI or OAA or both, December 1954 [1]	Number of aged persons receiving neither OASI nor OAA, December 1954	Federal payments for OAA, 1954	Federal percent of OAA payments, 1954	State and local payments for OAA, 1954	State percent of OAA payments, 1954	State per capita expenditure for OAA, 1954	Average OAA monthly payment per recipient, 1954	Average OASI (primary) benefit, December 1954
							Millions		*Millions*				
Alabama	61.6	214,000	63,560	63,353	125,361	88,639	$16.7	76	$5.4	24	$6.85	$30.23	$51.55
Arizona	72.4	53,000	21,228	13,890	31,770	21,230	5.4	58	3.9	42	10.01	55.34	58.19
Arkansas	55.3	163,000	44,164	52,703	93,815	69,185	14.9	73	5.6	27	10.61	33.79	48.58
California	122.2	1,044,000	461,653	271,347	632,928	411,072	107.8	48	117.3	52	18.53	67.44	58.73
Colorado	95.3	129,000	44,623	52,793	80,089	48,911	19.7	39	30.4	61	35.36	90.50	56.43
Connecticut	133.4	201,000	100,975	16,805	112,308	88,692	6.6	40	9.8	60	7.21	83.23	65.67
Delaware	134.0	29,000	12,819	1,675	14,234	14,766	.6	69	.4	31	2.22	39.40	59.67
District of Columbia	125.4	63,000	20,139	3,057	22,536	40,464	1.1	59	.8	41	2.12	52.75	57.73
Florida	91.0	297,000	145,347	69,461	198,064	98,936	24.4	65	13.2	35	10.91	45.90	59.44
Georgia	69.9	243,000	63,978	97,489	153,331	89,669	30.3	70	12.9	30	11.85	37.51	50.60
Idaho	81.0	49,000	17,406	8,862	24,195	24,805	3.3	57	2.5	43	9.71	54.55	53.62
Illinois	121.8	854,000	341,400	97,753	419,698	434,802	37.3	55	30.4	45	7.88	59.69	61.94
Indiana	103.6	392,000	160,664	37,712	191,398	200,602	12.5	58	9.1	42	5.20	47.58	58.31
Iowa	94.2	293,000	86,508	42,577	121,223	171,777	16.3	55	13.2	45	11.52	57.02	54.60
Kansas	95.4	209,000	61,792	34,464	90,573	118,427	13.4	50	12.4	50	13.28	64.52	54.06
Kentucky	68.7	251,000	75,309	55,965	125,475	125,525	16.6	71	6.7	29	7.83	34.91	53.95
Louisiana	73.6	193,000	52,539	119,634	149,141	43,859	46.8	64	26.5	36	25.48	50.71	51.54
Maine	84.3	95,000	47,788	12,619	56,879	38,121	4.7	66	2.4	34	7.93	46.38	55.25
Maryland	109.6	181,000	73,839	10,652	82,751	98,249	3.6	63	2.1	37	2.22	44.82	58.03
Massachusetts	108.6	510,000	249,907	91,220	308,028	201,972	35.7	43	47.5	57	17.08	75.93	62.36
Michigan	114.0	534,000	236,372	76,453	293,815	239,825	28.1	57	21.6	43	7.36	54.43	64.37
Minnesota	92.9	304,000	100,749	52,074	143,796	160,204	19.1	47	21.2	53	12.95	65.12	57.41
Mississippi	49.3	159,000	32,351	67,799	96,674	62,326	16.9	77	5.0	23	9.82	28.04	47.19
Missouri	98.7	434,000	144,186	133,398	246,277	187,723	51.8	65	27.9	35	19.37	49.47	56.62
Montana	97.7	59,000	18,972	9,340	26,293	32,707	3.6	55	3.0	45	11.11	57.67	55.75
Nebraska	92.4	144,000	39,506	18,164	54,694	89,306	6.7	62	4.2	38	8.89	49.77	53.69
Nevada	136.4	13,000	5,243	2,654	6,801	6,199	1.1	58	.8	42	8.75	56.32	56.70
New Hampshire	90.7	60,000	29,860	6,464	34,663	25,337	2.5	53	2.2	47	8.94	58.65	57.50
New Jersey	125.4	450,000	222,850	20,718	238,689	211,311	7.6	48	8.2	52	2.97	66.80	64.09
New Mexico	78.4	39,000	10,530	12,181	21,297	17,703	4.2	64	2.4	36	8.45	45.96	52.24
New York	122.2	1,430,000	654,934	104,496	731,836	698,164	39.8	42	55.6	58	6.17	77.04	61.36
North Carolina	67.2	253,000	70,725	51,597	118,308	134,422	14.0	74	4.8	26	4.40	31.21	52.11
North Dakota	67.0	54,000	10,152	8,276	17,514	36,486	3.0	50	3.0	50	9.56	60.65	50.57
Ohio	112.0	785,000	332,128	103,443	413,642	371,358	39.5	55	31.9	45	8.41	57.59	62.20
Oklahoma	82.9	209,000	55,512	95,616	135,713	73,287	36.8	56	28.8	44	29.56	57.56	52.62
Oregon	99.3	153,000	73,419	20,207	87,363	65,637	7.7	49	8.1	51	9.90	64.82	58.51
Pennsylvania	100.9	978,000	457,792	58,780	506,513	471,487	20.3	61	12.9	39	3.20	45.81	62.72
Rhode Island	103.0	78,000	42,829	8,361	48,749	29,251	3.1	52	2.8	48	7.23	57.36	61.63
South Carolina	60.1	130,000	33,182	43,017	74,138	55,862	12.1	73	4.5	27	7.51	31.84	51.98
South Dakota	75.3	63,000	14,640	11,010	24,143	38,857	4.0	67	2.0	33	9.13	44.58	52.14
Tennessee	68.5	254,000	69,159	67,527	131,693	122,307	20.4	71	8.3	29	8.50	34.54	50.93
Texas	88.9	591,000	159,572	221,927	354,079	236,921	72.3	70	30.9	30	12.34	38.75	52.67
Utah	83.8	49,000	18,334	9,542	26,130	22,870	3.7	55	3.1	45	9.32	59.59	58.18
Vermont	79.6	40,000	16,605	6,860	21,888	18,112	2.4	67	1.2	33	9.60	44.29	55.88
Virginia	83.6	237,000	78,757	17,340	95,089	141,911	4.5	74	1.5	26	1.65	29.56	54.53
Washington	110.1	240,000	108,623	60,609	150,638	89,362	23.2	50	22.9	50	19.06	61.55	59.52
West Virginia	69.6	152,000	64,685	25,310	88,358	63,642	7.1	74	2.5	26	4.79	30.96	58.81
Wisconsin	96.4	346,000	139,110	44,325	173,296	172,704	16.0	49	16.9	51	9.47	62.44	59.73
Wyoming	100.5	22,000	7,127	4,061	10,126	11,874	1.6	55	1.3	45	9.47	58.45	56.49
Alaska		4,742	2,256	1,679	3,452	1,290	.6	52	.6	48	5.85	62.94	56.15
Hawaii		25,000	10,609	1,822	12,138	12,862	.6	64	.3	36	1.78	44.25	56.49
Puerto Rico		85,578	13,410	44,923	58,189	27,389	1.6	39	2.6	61	1.84	7.79	40.71
Virgin Islands		2,011	195	682	872	1,139	.1	50	.06	50	4.15	13.89	42.11
Foreign				34,162									
United States	100.0	13,729,000	5,454,174	2,564,686	7,514,830	6,214,170	893.6	56	696.6	44	9.86	51.90	59.14

[1] Net total, does not duplicate concurrent recipients of both.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bureau of the Census.

Mr. LONG. One further point deserves the attention of my colleagues. Our Nation is already reaching the point where the enormous productive capacity of our workers and our factories is exceeding the ability of our people to consume. These surpluses are being accumulated and cutbacks in production are in prospect. Already our agricultural surpluses are one of our most perplexing problems of government.

I might point out that studies of the spending pattern of persons in low income brackets show that most of their income is spent for food. The additional $185 million of Federal funds distributed in welfare programs will be of considerable benefit to the American farmer in solving the surplus problem. It will also contribute in a small measure to the problem of overproduction in other aspects of the American economy.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a résumé of a study of the spending of persons in low income families.

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

Percent of family [1] income spent on food, 1953

Family income:	*Percent*
Below $2,000	59.4
$2,000–$4,000	31.2
$4,000–$7,500	27.2
Over $7,500	17.8

[1] Includes single person and multiperson families.

Source of basic data: Departments of Commerce and Agriculture; Fortune magazine.

FOOD EXPENDITURE DEFICIENCY IN LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

The estimate of the food expenditure deficiency of families with incomes of less than $2,000 is based on family budget requirements for an adequate diet purchasable at moderate cost in March 1955, published by the Department of Agriculture. Data on actual family food expenditures by income brackets were taken from various scources. The income distribution data are those for 1953 from the Department of Commerce. The summary computations follow:

Data for low-income groups

Estimates for 1955	Below $1,000 [1]	$1,000 to $2,000 [1]	Total or average
Numbers:			
Individuals, unattached	2,000,000	2,600,000	4,600,000
Families	980,000	3,400,000	4,380,000
Average adequate expenditure: [2]			
Individuals, unattached	$570	$570	$570
Families	[3] 1,090	[4] 1,150	1,136
Average expenditure deficiency:			
Individuals, unattached	$220	----------	$96
Families	365	265	286
Aggregate deficiency:	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
Individuals, unattached	$440.0	----------	$440.0
Families	357.7	$901.0	1,258.7
Individuals and families combined	797.7	901.0	1,698.7

[1] Disposable income in 1953 dollars.
[2] At March 1955 retail prices.
[3] Estimated amount required for 3.0 members.
[4] Estimated amount required for 3.5 members.

ESTIMATED FOOD CONSUMPTION DEFICIENCIES AMONG LOW-INCOME FAMILIES, 1953

The data underlying the computation of food consumption deficiencies for low-income families appear in the 1949 Food Consumption Surveys of the Department of Agriculture. Though relating to the spring of 1948, they were considered representative of 1953 consumption differences between low- and high-income groups. The standards used to measure adequacy of family consumption were taken from the moderate-cost food plans published by the Department of Agriculture in Helping Families Plan Food Budgets (October 1952), and supplements thereto. The latest available supplement showed adequate family diets purchasable at September 1954 prices. Both types of data were converted to 1953 population and income distribution data. The resulting food consumption deficiencies for eight food categories were as follows:

Food category	Annual deficiencies in millions of pounds for families with disposable incomes: [1]			Total deficiency as percent of total civilian consumption
	Below $1,000	$1,000 to $2,000	Below $2,000	
Leafy vegetables	372	1,400	1,772	10.9
Citrus fruits and tomatoes	240	516	756	4.3
Potatoes (including sweet)	255	660	915	5.5
Other fruits and vegetables	296	714	1,010	2.9
Milk equivalent (million quarts)	708	2,233	[2] 2,941	7.6
Meats, poultry, fish	168	346	514	1.9
Eggs (million pieces)	662	2,110	2,772	4.4
Flour and cereals	112	124	240	1.0

[1] Included in the below $1,000 category are some 980,000 multiperson families. In the $1,000 to $2,000 category are some 3.4 million multiperson families, and also included are 2 million unattached individuals whose incomes fell in the below $1,000 group; these latter were so classified because of greater per capita comparability, and correspondingly those individuals with incomes above $1,000 were excluded entirely.

[2] A quart of milk weighs 2.15 pounds. Therefore, the annual deficit for the 2 lowest groups combined was about 6.3 billion pounds.

APPAREL-COTTON CONSUMPTION DEFICIENCY, 1953

In the case of civilian apparel-cotton consumption, the 1953 estimated average consumption by families with incomes between $3,000 and $4,000 was used as a standard of adequacy. This quantity was derived from the 1953 average consumption of all civilian families (30 pounds), by adjusting for the percentage difference between the average consumption in dollar expenditure terms for apparel by all groups and that of the above-mentioned income group. The resulting deficiencies in the two lowest income groups were as follows:

Family disposable income	Per family		Aggregate	
	Percent inadequacy	Quantity (pounds)	Million pounds	Bales (net) (thousands)
Below $1,000	81	24.0	23.5	49
$1,000 to $2,000	58	[1] 13.2	71.5	149
Total			95.0	198

[1] Includes an estimated average deficiency of 17.5 pounds for 3.4 million multiperson families and 6 pounds for 2 million unattached individuals.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, it was my understanding that during the address of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], when he submitted an amendment on the social-security bill, he left the sponsorship of the amendment open for a few days, so that other colleagues might join in submitting it. The Senator from Louisiana has spoken to me about the matter during the past week on several occasions. I wish to commend him for offering the amendment.

At this time I wish to associate myself with this proposal, and, after having spoken to the Senator from Louisiana about it, to become a cosponsor, along with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] of the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I not only wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, but, like the Senator from Minnesota, I desire to become a cosponsor of the proposed amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD will so show.

INCREASED AIR STRENGTH DISPLAYED BY COMMUNISTS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President after the astounding presentation of increased air strength displayed by the Communists in extensive flights over Moscow last May 17, I said on the floor of the Senate that the United States might well be in the process of losing control of the air.

The next day, May 18, President Eisenhower said:

It just isn't true that the United States has lost in a twinkling all the great technical excellence and development of its airpower.

Later that same day I said:

Where the President got the expression "in a twinkling" I do not know. That was not my expression. That is his expression.

My remarks resulted from information about Communist airpower which was released last Friday by the Department of Defense.

If that information was true, then my statement "the Communists are at least in the process of surpassing the United States" was correct.

It is interesting to note that only last night the second ranking officer in the Air Force, Vice Chief of Staff Gen. Thomas D. White, told an audience in Cincinnati that Russia has "almost closed their air power gap by beating the United States at our own game—production."

In airplane after airplane—

Continued General White—

they are approaching us in quality and surpassing us in quantity.

In other words, Mr. President, what I predicted last year is now being formally acknowledged by this administration as only too true.

Now I should like to dwell for a few minutes on a press conference President Eisenhower held day before yesterday.

At that conference a reporter asked:

Two Democratic Senators have charged in the last week, sir, that the United States lags seriously behind the Soviet Union in the production and development of guided missiles. Do you agree with that opinion, sir, and if not, could you give us your view?

To this the President stated:

Well, I am always astonished at the amount of information that others get that I don't.

The report of this press conference shows that at that point there was laughter.

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

My SYMINGTON. I am very glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Montana, who is always interested and wise with respect to our national defense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the Senator from Missouri is making this speech at this time, because he is being consistent in his efforts over the past 3 years to bring home to the people of the country the truth.

The President was surprised, and the American people are being surprised, at the fact that we are in such a weakened position today, not only in the field of missiles, but in the air, under the sea, diplomatically, and otherwise, on a worldwide basis. I think the President ought to know that we do read the newspapers, and that we get what is public information. We put the pieces of the pattern together and come up with a fairly complete story.

Furthermore, it should be brought home to the American people, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri is doing and has been doing, that for 3 years this administration has been practicing economy at the expense of the national security of the Nation. The people are entitled to know the truth; and they will not find it in rosy state of the Union messages, or in glowing reports issued by the State Department.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his wise remarks.

If the President is surprised at what the Congress knows that he does not know, I suggest that he receive from the Department of Defense the same briefings that Department gives to the proper congressional committees.

Later in the press conference the President said:

> Now there are only so many scientists; there are only so many channels you can pursue, and, indeed, one of the things you have to watch is this: Don't try to develop too many at once or you get in each other's way, and you block them all through the confusion and the demands you make on the scientific pools and every other kind of thing that you have in this whole field.

One of my chief concerns is that what the President says should not be done is exactly what is being done today.

The missile-development picture is being spread around to the point where concentration on the most important weapon of all, development of long-range ground-to-ground missiles, is being sacrificed so more people may have a finger in the new pie.

The President then proceeded to describe the horrors of atomic war—and I am sure all of us agree any such possible war would be horrible.

That is why we have been urging so long that our current defenses, especially our retaliatory power, should be both adequate and modern.

That is why we are so worried by the fact that our Strategic Air Force, because of the current thin trickle of new bomber production, is now obsolescent and rapidly becoming obsolete.

That is why we should, now, do everything possible to increase this bomber production, just as we should also do everything possible to overcome the current Communist lead in the long-range ballistic missile field.

The President then continued in his press conference:

> This thing is being researched and developed as rapidly as it can be done in this country so far as my experts and my people in the Defense Department tell me.

But who is the expert who has been telling him? Is it the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Trevor Garner, under whom the long-range missile program was being developed, and who has just resigned in protest against the "figures before forces—money dominant" approach still being used, plus the growing confusion incident to the whole missile picture?

Or is it the Secretary of Defense, who not so long ago expressed himself as believing the development of an atomic airplane was comparable to finding out why potatoes turned brown when fried?

Regardless of source, the President is badly informed if he believes this country could not move faster in the missile field.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I am pleased the Senator from Missouri is addressing himself to this subject. Although sometimes I have disagreed with him on the question of Armed Forces spending, one thing we have always agreed upon, and that is the importance of giving priority to the guided missiles program. Undoubtedly that is the weapon of the future.

As the Senator well knows, since I left the Committee on Armed Services and he became a member of that committee, I have from time to time taken him aside and pointed out to him the extent to which I was worried about the serious problem confronting us in connection with guided missiles. Often I particularly pointed to the threat of submarine-launched guided missiles.

Now we are confronted with the danger of long-range missiles, which can be launched without warning, and from which, apparently, there is no defense. Such missiles can practically wipe out the largest cities and most populated areas of our country in one fell stroke.

That is a situation to which we must be alert. Certainly we have lost a great deal of ground and a great deal of time. So far as can be determined, the program is far behind the point where it should be. Although my knowledge of the subject is no better than that of any other Senator's, my impression has been that Russia has always been ahead of us in this area, and undoubtedly still is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I agree with what he has said, especially about submarines. We all realize that submarines could provide excellent launching platforms for missiles.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the great Senator from Kentucky, who, based on his long experience, is so often the voice of wisdom.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was very much disturbed last evening to read about a speech made in Cincinnati by General White.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I previously mentioned that speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. General White's remarks, seem to confirm, at least my analogy, the protest of Mr. Trevor Gardner, which resulted in his resignation.

It disturbs me profoundly to be told by a person partially in charge of the program that the only respect in which we are ahead of Russia is in having more bases than Russia, but that otherwise she is ahead of us, particularly in the number of planes. In other words, we are apparently ahead only in the number of bases and in the technical knowledge of our operators. Russia has overtaken us within the past few years in other fields, and she might well overtake us in the matter of qualification of her personnel. Certainly she is ahead of us in the number of pilots and in all items of equipment.

It disturbs me profoundly to be told by those in charge of our program that our only advantage now is in the fact that we have many more bases from which we can inaugurate defensive and offense operations.

Does the Senator feel that General White's statement confirms the protest of Mr. Gardner?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not think there is any question about it. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator from Kentucky by saying that slowly but surely all circumstances give credence to the belief that the position of the administration is, money is more important than security.

Mr. BARKLEY. I also wish to call attention to the analysis of the news last evening by Mr. Eric Sevareid, who is a very intelligent newspaperman and analyzer of conditions. I do not believe anyone could listent to his analysis of the news last evening without becoming profoundly disturbed at what seems to be a lackadaisical attitude of many officials in our Government, if not most of them, toward the gradual creeping up to our position by our only potential enemy, without our Government doing what is necessary to be done to prevent closing the gap between Russia and the United States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I heard the broadcast to which he has rereferred, and I also heard the broadcast along the same line by one of the great deans of radio broadcasting, Earl Godwin. The distinguished junior Senator from Montana in effect summarized what was said by both these gentlemen, and I am very glad the Senator from Kentucky also was aware of it. I thank him for his constructive observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask for an additional 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from North Carolina, that very able Senator with whom I have the honor to sit on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ERVIN. We hear a great deal of boasting by the adherents of the administration with regard to reducing the expenditure of Federal funds. I should like to ask the distingiushed Senator from Missouri if I am correct in the conclusion that virtually the only way whereby national expenses have been reduced by the present administration has been at the expense of national defense.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from North Carolina is entirely correct. In the three years of this administration there has been a decrease in the cost of government of $4 billion. Yet, the fact is that between seven and eight billion dollars have been cut from the national security portions of the budget. Therefore, the cost of government under the present administration in the past 3 years, except for what the administration has taken out of national-defense expenditures, has increased by more than $4 billion.

Very few people are aware of that fact. I thank my distinguished colleague from North Carolina for bringing it out.

Later in the same press conference the President was asked the following question:

Mr. President, to go back to that missile situation for a moment, Senator SYMINGTON said that Russia has tested an intercontinental missile which will travel hundreds of miles further than anything we have tested. Do you know that to be a fact?

To this he replied:

You are asking questions now—you are asking a question—that I have habitually refrained from remarking on.

Now I did say this: That there are various kinds of missiles, and in certain fields I am sure we are well ahead of the other side. In certain fields I think they are probably ahead of us. But those are limited fields in a great big field. I think overall, we have no reason to believe that we are not doing everything that human science and brains and resources can do to keep our position in a proper posture.

This statement might lead some people to believe that our being ahead in some missiles and the Communists being ahead in others is nothing to worry about—sort of a balance.

The facts are that our missile development may be ahead in the short-range area, but their missile development is ahead in the area that counts by far the most—the long-range area.

Another erroneous opinion the American people might gather from this press conference is that this country is in fact doing all it can in the missile field.

That is not correct. As of today, we are operating almost on a business-as-usual basis.

Not enough of the brains and resources of this country are being used in this major challenge to our survival—and that amount is being reduced in effectiveness by being spread too thin.

In summary, therefore, neither in organization, nor in effort, is the United States doing anywhere near what it should be doing, in modernizing our current combat forces, or in the long-range missile field.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an able editorial, Missiles and Services, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune as of today.

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

MISSILES AND SERVICES

The resignation of Mr. Trevor Gardner as Assistant Air Force Secretary for Research and Development has given new impetus to the controversy over the American missile program. Mr. Gardner has attributed his resignation to "an honest difference of opinion over the importance and scope" of his work; he has claimed that Air Force research and development should receive $200 million more than it has been granted and has called for "a very highly accelerated program" on both the intermediate range ballistic missile, which is being developed by the Army, and the long-range missile, which falls within the Air Force's jurisdiction.

The sum of Mr. Gardner's statements suggests that the overall potentialities of missile development have not yet been fully exploited by the Untied States. There is also the broad hint that differences among the services—among which guided missile research is divided—may be among the factors hindering greater progress. Defense Secretary Wilson has virtually conceded this last possibility by creating a new post in his Department, with overall supervision of missile work. Presumably the President had this new post in mind when, after acknowledging that the Russians are probably ahead of us in some fields of missile development, he said, "we have no reason to believe that we are not doing everything that human science and brains and resources can do to keep our position in a proper posture."

The importance of the missiles race—the race toward that ultimate weapon that could carry a hydrogen bomb to a point 5,000 miles away at 10 times the speed of sound—cannot be overstated. To be sure, from the summit meeting in Geneva there emerged a general agreement that hydrogen warfare, as such, could mean only mutual suicide. But this did not, as Sir Anthony Eden told the Senate, end the indirect threat—"and its consequences can equally be mortal."

The Soviet Union has adopted a new technique. Its offers of military and economic aid to such nations as Afghanistan, India, Burma, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and, most recently, Pakistan are an effort to break up existing alliances of free nations and woo the uncommitted peoples to the Soviet side. They are an attempt to alter the balance of power to communism's advantage by methods short of war—but not without the possibility of armed conflict.

In this contest the ultimate weapon could play a decisive part, even although never employed against an enemy. If the Soviet Union should be the first to obtain a long-range ballistic missile it would unquestionably have a deleterious effect upon the moral fiber of the free world, sapping the resolution of many nations, weakening their will to self-defense. The situation would be similar to that of free Europe before NATO, when the huge Red army was a dominant military fact on the continent. But then the American A-bomb was a deterrent. What, except another ultimate weapon, could deter a missile that could strike with a speed and power and range beyond anything man has experienced?

Obviously, the United States and its allies must develop means of sustaining and exporting freedom, and of presenting the moral values, the practical advantages, of a system of human dignity and liberty to the uncommitted peoples. The free world must obtain the initiative in this contest, instead of merely answering the Soviet thrusts. This requires a strong economic base at home—fiscal integrity, wise use of resources.

But, it is equally obvious, the United States cannot fall behind in the missiles race, for that might mean the balance of power would be tipped against us definitively. A broad attack on the scientific front is one essential—scientists and engineers to meet the increasing Russian competition in this field (with the Soviet Union producing more than twice as many engineers in a year than the United States); diversified research and development in both pure and applied science.

The idea has been broached in several quarters that the most efficient means for achieving a breakthrough on the decisive missile sector is another Manhattan project—a concentration of scientific effort similar to that which produced the atomic bomb, under a direction wholly separate from the armed services. It is difficult for laymen to decide whether this method, or the present organization, headed up by a new chief in the Defense Department, would be the best solution. But the nations can be sure that the President will give serious consideration to all the possibilities. If "crash programs" under a "Manhattan district" are essential, budgetary considerations and service interests should by all means be subordinated to the great aim of assuming definite leadership in the search for the ultimate weapon. It is essential to world peace.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe a Manhattan project to correct the current unfortunate missile program along the lines of that project which concentrated on an entirely new weapon in World War II would be inadvisable.

A committee headed by 1 of the Secretaries of the 3 services, with a chairman who had the power of coordination and decision, reporting directly to the Secretary chosen, would be far better than a Manhattan project.

A Manhattan project setup would first take this new-weapons system—not new weapon, but new-weapons system—out of the services; and then, at some later date, be faced with the effort of working it back into the services, with all the attendant delays and misunderstandings.

Mr. President, at this point I ask that a significant column, The Gardner Story, by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, appearing in the Washington Post this morning, also be inserted in the RECORD.

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

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE GARDNER STORY

The reasons for the resignation of Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Trevor Gardner are like the layers of an onion. The outside layer involves matters of personality and organization, as well as dusty old Pentagon rivalries. But when you peel down to the heart of the onion, you find a nugget of fact which involves the very survival of the United States.

The real turning point in the Gardner story came several months ago, when almost certain knowledge became available to the American Government that the Soviets had produced missiles with ranges up to 1,500 miles. Gardner was himself responsible for the successful American effort to find out where the Soviets really stand in the missile race and this grim knowledge, in turn, led rather directly to his resignation.

Before the Soviet success was known, the American long-range missile program had been very much of a one-man show. When Gardner came on the scene in the spring of 1953, as Air Force research and development chief, the intercontinental missile, or ICBM, program had been a limping, low-priority affair.

It was wholly in the research stage, and Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson, who then tended to regard all research as wasteful nonsense, was getting ready to cut it out entirely. But Gardner, a man of strong views, protested loudly. Wilson at length agreed to submit the whole matter to a high-level committee of scientists, headed by Dr. John Von Neumann. The Von Neumann committee in turn recommended not only against cancellation of the project, but in favor of giving it the highest priority.

Wilson thereupon put Gardner in charge of the program. In this capacity the strong-willed Gardner made numerous enemies in the Pentagon and the aircraft industry. He also alienated the implacable Lewis Strauss, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission when he publicly supported Dr. Robert Oppenheimer for his contributions to national security. Gardner's large array of

enemies undoubtedly explains in part the charge of conflict of interest which has been brought against him.

While making his collection of enemies Gardner spurred important break-throughs in the long-range missile field. Then came the knowledge of the Soviet success in producing the intermediate 1,500-mile missile, known as the IRBM. This grim evidence that the Soviets were far ahead of this country in the missile field simply could not be disregarded.

The Pentagon reaction took two forms. First a whole cat's cradle of missile committees was formed. There is a top level coordinating committee headed by Under Secretary of Defense Reuben Robertson, another committee under Secretary of the Air Force Donald Quarles, an Army-Navy coordinating committee, and so on.

Having run his own show, Gardner now had to report to this array of committees, as did others working in the long-range missile field.

The result was the maximum of organizational confusion.

At the same time, Wilson approved a decision to undertake a crash program to produce an IRBM, and thus match the Soviet success.

Because the Army had produced the much-publicized Redstone missile—actually little more than an improved version of the German V–2—the Army was assigned the IRBM project. The Air Force automatically resisted the Army's claim. So did Gardner, but not on the usual strictly bureaucratic grounds.

Gardner argued that the IRBM, while strategically of enormous value to the Soviet Union, would have far less value to the United States. He conceded that it was probably a mistake not to have tried for the intermediate missile in the first place. But now, he argued, the only way to trump the Kremlin's ace was to be first in the field with the true ultimate weapon, the 5,000-mile intercontinental missile. A crash program for the IRBM would only cut into the limited technical manpower and resources aavilable for the ICBM, to which every available man and dollar ought now to be devoted.

But Gardner lost this fight, and, partly as a result, his recommended budget for long-range missile and other Air Force research and development work was out on the order of $200 million. At the same time, when Wilson at length decided to appoint a "czar" to make some sense out of the organizational cat's cradle, Gardner was passed over as "too controversial."

Altogether, the man who almost single-handed saved the American long-range missile program from total extinction may be said to have been poorly rewarded. But such personal considerations aside, it is worth pondering the somber nugget of fact which is found at the heart of the Gardner story—the fact that the Soviet Union is unquestionably ahead of the United States in the life-and-death missile race in the area where it really matters.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at this point also I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an able editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 6 bearing on this subject.

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

THE SYMINGTON WARNING

Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri, caps a long series of criticisms of the administration for a dilatory guided missile program with the declaration that Soviet Russia is well ahead of the United States in developing an intercontinental ballistic missile. Since he is a former Secretary of the Air Force and is a member of the important Senate Armed Services Committee, his words demand the utmost consideration. He certainly should know whereof he speaks.

The Missouri Senator says that Russia has fired a long-range ballistic missile "hundreds of miles farther" than anything the United States has been able to produce thus far. And he says that he makes this statement from positive knowledge. So it would be foolish not to take his statement with utmost seriousness.

If the Defense Department is guilty of all the neglect and the "coasting along" on the guided-missile program that Senator SYMINGTON alleges, Secretary of Defense Wilson has a lot to account for and President Eisenhower should see that an accounting is made.

Back in early 1954 the Senate Appropriations Committee charged that the guided-missiles program was "disorganized" and gave Secretary Wilson several months in which to straighten out matters and report back. The report, when it finally was made after long delay, was stamped "secret."

Since that report there have been many charges by Members of Congress and military men and scientists to the effect that the United States is lagging and also that confusion exists. Among critics is Senator JACKSON, of Washington, also a member of the Armed Services Committee, who warned last week that the Soviets might be first with a 1,500-mile intermediate missile. If so, he said, the balance of world military power would shift against the West.

Major interest in the missile field has been centering on the intercontinental missile, which most scientists and military men assert may turn out to be the ultimate weapon. Some say that such a weapon, equipped with atomic warhead and traveling at 16,000 miles an hour, might be achieved in as short a time as 5 years.

The immediate danger is that Soviet Russia may use the long-range missile it now possesses—once it is in full production—to threaten our allies in Europe. After that it may develop the missile into a true intercontinental weapon against which there now is no known defense. If Russia should beat the United States in this race it would have a powerful ace in the hole.

Senator SYMINGTON recognizes these dangers when he urges an all-out effort in this country, 7 days a week, night and day, to recapture the lead in the guided missile race. The Senate Armed Services Committee should take heed of his warnings and, if necessary, call Secretary Wilson before it.

Senator SYMINGTON served the cause of peace in his Meet the Press interview, also by underscoring the necessity of "waging peace" and he righly enough saw no conflict in being on guard militarily and sponsoring at the same time a proposal for eventual disarmament. All the while an adequate defense deters potential aggressors, the goal of the United States should be to win a permanent peace through the channels of negotiation and international agreement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the people should know the facts.

With that premise, I ask that at this point an able editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 6, entitled "How Does He Know?" be placed in the RECORD.

And also I ask that an able editorial entitled "An Answer Required" from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 7, be placed at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask that an able editorial from the Providence Journal of February 7 calling for a prompt accounting be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 6, 1956]

HOW DOES HE KNOW?

The bare facts of record are enough to rebut any challenge of Senator SYMINGTON'S motives in his attack on the administration's handling of the defense program. No one in public life has made a greater contribution to the building and maintenance of our strategic air arm which, for 10 dangerous years, has held the Russians in check. And we do not believe that Senator SYMINGTON, at this late hour, would be trying to make a partisan issue out of the vital question of American airpower.

Nevertheless, many watchers must have come away from his appearance on Meet the Press yesterday with a certain sense of bafflement.

Senator SYMINGTON said the Russians have tested a ballistic missile that went hundreds of miles farther than any we have tested. And he stated, not as a belief but as a fact, that the Russians are ahead of us in ballistic missiles.

How does he know this? Does he have exclusive sources of information, or is the same information on which he relies available to the Defense Department? If so, what is the explanation of the reassuring statements which have come from the Pentagon? If the Russians are ahead in this critical field, why are we operating our own missile program, as Senator SYMINGTON puts it, on a 5-day week basis?

This could well be a life-or-death matter for this country. But we do not see how any worthwhile national decision can be reached on the basis of undocumented accusations by Senator SYMINGTON or equally undocumented statements to the contrary by defense officials. Senator SYMINGTON says that Congress should conduct a full, frank, open hearing and tell the people everything, so that we can get to work and do the job that must be done. Perhaps this is the answer. But if such a hearing is held, the Missouri Democrat and those who agree with him ought to be ready and willing to produce the evidence on which they base their accusations.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 7, 1956]

AN ANSWER REQUIRED

Senator SYMINGTON'S charges that the Communists are in the process of winning the effort to produce a long-range missile, and that they are actually ahead of this country, deserve an answer by the administration.

Senator SYMINGTON is not the usual critic who will say anything for a headline. He is a fully competent and thoughtful student of our defense program. In his years of experience as Secretary of the Air Force and in other high Government positions, he has seen both sides of the defense picture.

Perhaps this Nation has maintained, or even widened, its lead in the new era of defense and attack techniques, as the administration claims. Certainly every American hopes so. On the other hand, the American people have been fed so much misinformation over the years, by both Democratic and Republican administrations, on the state of our preparedness that the public has a right to be frankly skeptical.

There is a considerable feeling that the administration's statements on the state of our defense are almost too good to be true. Some of Secretary Wilson's assurances sound too much like Louis Johnson when he was Secretary of Defense, that we are cutting the fat and not the sinew.

Mr. Johnson was proved wrong; though fortunately, Mr. Wilson's statements have not been put to the test of war.

There have also been fears that the Eisenhower administration is too interested in a balanced budget, or that needless risks are

being taken in our necessary defense spending to provide a balanced budget. If it is so, it is a fearful chance for no objectives, no matter how praiseworthy, is worth risking the strength of a Nation which alone can deter attack.

In any event, Senator SYMINGTON and the American people deserve an answer. We hope Senator SYMINGTON is wrong and our guess is that no one hopes so more than the Senator himself.

It is too grave a problem, however, to be dusted under the rug for on its answer could rest the very lives of millions of Americans.

Consonant with national security, the administration must answer the charges which Senator SYMINGTON has raised.

[From the Providence Journal of February 7, 1956]

SYMINGTON CALLS FOR A PROMPT ACCOUNTING

In the running controversy over the relative positions of the United States and Soviet Russia in development of guided missiles, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, Missouri, has filed the most positive charge yet heard from a responsible official:

"I don't believe that they are ahead of us in ballistic missiles," he recently said in a nationally televised interview. "I state that they are ahead of us."

Such a claim of positive knowledge of Soviet superiority in this crucial area demands positive comment on behalf of the Eisenhower administration. Senator SYMINGTON is a member of the Armed Services Committee and a former Secretary of the Air Force, which must be presumed to mean that he has sources of information and technical understanding to support his allegations. The deeply disturbing questions he has related cannot be left hanging in midair, whatever political overtones may be detected in the controversy.

Mr. SYMINGTON himself wants his charges and the administration's answers thrashed out as publicly as possible through a congressional investigation. Because of the extremely sensitive nature of the subject, he suggests that the method of the MacArthur hearings of 1951 be used to screen testimony for security requirements before its release.

Such an investigation would doubtless seek not only to answer the central question of whether the United States is lagging in the missile race, but to find out whether the reasons for this alleged situation are as Senator SYMINGTON describes them. The principal reason, he charges, is simply that the administration has failed to "concentrate" its efforts in guided missile development and to authorize the overtime payments needed to get the work off a "5-day week" basis. He indicates he could produce testimony from major private contractors for the Defense Department proving they are being held in check.

Senator SYMINGTON implies that the reason for this policy, in turn, is the administration's desire to hold down military spending for budgetary and political purposes. And in order to conceal the resulting American lag in missile development, he charges that deliberately misleading reports of relative United States and Soviet capacities are being issued to the public. Here again, the Senator indicates he can cite admissions by high administration figures that they believe in giving the American people an optimistic picture of the defense situation.

Whether or not a congressional investigation is the best way to consider these serious matters, it seems to us President Eisenhower has a responsibility to volunteer some answers at the first opportunity. It may be, of course, that the billion-a-year level to which our guided missile program has now moved represents the most efficient expenditure of money and effort we can make. Perhaps Secretary of Defense Wilson's recent announcement that he will appoint a czar for missile development means we are going over to a "crash" program.

In any event, the administration has plainly got to take account of these recent reports of Soviet superiority in ballistic missiles and jet bombers. They come not only from Senator SYMINGTON but from Senator JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, who asserted last week that the Russians already have a missile with a 1,500-mile range. This would represent a considerable step toward the so-called ultimate weapon, the intercontinental ballistic missile (IBM) fitted with an H-bomb warhead, against which there is now no apparent means of defense.

The disruption of the balance of power that would result if the Soviet Union should perfect such weapons before we do would indeed, as Senator SYMINGTON says, give the Communists an excellent chance of blackmail of many of our allies. Beyond that, decisive Soviet superiority in systems for delivering nuclear weapons could conceivably mean a threat to the survival of the United States itself.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with these editorials; and I believe the American people should be given promptly all truth about this grave matter which would not help a possible enemy.

May I again quote our great leader Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, who said last year that "the strength of a nation depends upon the will of the people—and that in a democratic form of government that will can only function if the people are informed."

Mr. President, these facts and these editorials should be examined carefully by all those men and women who wish to remain free.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Again, I wish to commend the Senator from Missouri for his consistent efforts, and I wish to propound this question: Is it significant that General White was allowed to make his speech last night in Cincinnati without its being in any way screened, censored, or red penciled, as seems to have been the case in previous years?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I hope the new Secretary of the Air Force will not attempt to hold up the frank statements and beliefs of the people in his service; and I hope the same is true of the Secretaries of the other services. I understand that the talk made by General White last night was actually made for General Twining, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and that is good. It looks as if by fighting force we may get more of the truth with respect to our relative strength against the Communists than what has been dished out to the people in the past 3 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it true that at the present time the Soviet Union exceeds us in strength under the sea, on land, in the air, and is very likely ahead of us in the development of long-range intercontinental missiles, perhaps intermediate-range missiles, and is perhaps also at least up with us so far as quality and need are concerned, in the development of A- and H-bombs? Is that a fairly accurate statement of fact as the Senator understands the situation today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. To be sure that I have the Senator's question in mind—it has a number of component parts—let me say that it is now conceded that the Soviets are ahead of the United States in quality and quantity of newest fighters. It is now conceded that the Communists are far ahead of the United States in quantity of jet bombers. It is conceded the United States is well ahead of the Communists in the number of medium jet bombers. It is now generally conceded the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States in the production of modern long-range intercontinental jet bombers.

We believe we are ahead in the technical training of our crews, and we believe we are ahead in base structure. So far as the missile picture is concerned, we are ahead in some, but behind in the long-range ballistic missile field, the most important new weapon the world faces today.

So far as the atomic and hydrogen bomb situation is concerned, to the best of my knowledge the Communists have a large number of atomic bombs, as well as late type hydrogen bombs.

It should be remembered that the relative number of bombs is becoming less important. What is becoming evermore important is having enough bombs plus the capacity to deliver them in a sudden and devastating attack. The current military advantage in surprise is so tremendous we must recognize that our only hope in the future is certain knowledge on the part of any possible enemy that if he attacks us, we, in turn, can destroy him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may have 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Montana, but at this time I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask 1 or 2 more questions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Missouri answered most of the points I raised. What about our strength as compared with that of the Soviet Union so far as craft under the sea and our land forces are concerned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations have both stated that the Soviets have more than 400 submarines. A large percentage of them are modern, of the latest type. The Soviet therefore, is far ahead of us under the sea. The Communists have hundreds more submarines in use than we have, and hundreds more than Hitler had when he started his all-out attack against the free world. Again I say that no better base for slinging

long-range missiles could be found than a submarine, concealed until it surfaced to fire.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What about land forces?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Soviet has 175 divisions of which some 60 to 70 divisions are considered to be mechanized. The The Chinese Communists have some 200 to 400 divisions, smaller than ours. Against that the United States has 19 divisions, of which 4 are training divisions.

We cannot lift and support properly a single division overseas without cutting into our strategic Air Force lift. Therefore much of our very small Army comparatively is nevertheless not modern. Some of it is obsolescent and some of it is obsolete.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to thank the Senator. I hope the figures he has laid before the Senate will be read and studied with care by the American people. I hope the administration itself will take another look at the situation in which we find ourselves today and will take action which will make it absolutely certain that insofar as it is possible to do so the security of this country will always be adequately safeguarded.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank with deep appreciation my distinguished colleague from Montana.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been deeply impressed by the statement, very careful and very guarded in nature, of the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I think it is time the administration and the American people awaken to the great danger in which we are placed. I hope the press will play its part in making certain that the facts as stated by the Senator from Missouri are made known to the people.

It is not true, however, that the force which has been working for the reduction of expenditures is commonly believed to be the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George M. Humphrey?

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, who has been a great leader in the fight for adequate military strength, for his kind remarks. As to who is responsible for placing money ahead of security, he would know more about that than I would. It is my understanding however, that there are two groups in the Government. One believes that figures are more important than forces; the other believes forces are more important than figures. I have heard that Secretary Humphrey is one of those who think the most important consideration is a balanced budget, this as against national security. But the Senator from Illinois would know more about that than I.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that Secretary Humphrey has consistently taken credit for the reduction in expenditures, which, as the Senator from Missouri has shown, has been confined to military outlays?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That may well be correct. In that connection, in support of the Senator's position, much of the increased cost of Government, aside from reductions in defense strength, is the result of the increased interest rate which the Government has been willing to pay for money to finance the greatest increase in national debt this country has ever experienced in 3 consecutive peacetime years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the increased interest rate, for which the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board are at least partially responsible, has caused greater outlays by the Federal Government.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Illinois is entirely correct.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the very able and distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I take this opportunity to commend the Senator from Missouri for again bringing to the attention of the American people the importance of keeping our strength at the position where it should be in relation to the strength of the other nations of the world.

One reason why I think it is so important that the Senator speak as he does is that on every occasion when he has brought matters of this kind to the attention of the American people, some benefits have come to our defense posture as a result.

I remember 3 years ago, when the Senator first made statements on the floor of the Senate about the weakening of the Air Force of the United States. There were those who made light of his remarks. In the budget for the fiscal year 1954 the appropriations for the Air Force were cut materially. But the next year the executive branch of the Government saw the mistake it had made in the previous year, and there was a restoration of the funds in the budget. However, the unfortunate part was that we had lost a year. We had lost a year in developing the planes which were needed, and we had lost a year in training the manpower which was necessary to operate those planes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct, and I am very grateful to the Senator for bringing it out.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What the Senator from Missouri has pointed up this morning is information which should be given to the American people not merely from the floor of the Senate. It should be given to the American people by the responsible administrative officials of the Government who are entrusted with that phase of the Government's activities.

I commend my friend from Missouri for his statement in the interest of the security of the country. I hope that he will continue his efforts from time to time to enlighten the American people with relation to their security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I again thank the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky. The American people are not being given all the facts. Despite the protestations in the recent press conference, and notwithstanding the emphasis laid on research and development, it is a fact that in this year, 1956, we will spend $27 million less for research and development than was spent in 1955.

I close my remarks, Mr. President, by saying, in the words of the chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, that there has never been a free government which was secret; and there has never been a secret government which was free. As free people, we must know the truth if we are to do what is necessary to preserve that freedom.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my very able colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to express my gratitude and thanks to the Senator from Missouri not only for bringing to the attention of the Senate, as he has done consistently throughout the years some of the weaknesses in our defense structure, but also for citing what could be done to improve the situation.

The Senator from Missouri is like the old Roman senator, Cato, who consistently reminded the Romans of what would happen to their country unless Carthage was destroyed. He kept repeating the cry: "Delenda est Carthago"—Carthage must be destroyed. What the Senator from Missouri says is that we must strengthen our defenses and make them realistic in terms of the struggle for power in the world.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator and thank him. As he has indicated in his speech, the United States of America continues to extend itself by commitments all over the world; and commitments have to be placed against the ability to back them up.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are signing more and more treaties, and we are talking about negotiating even more treaties than the ones to which we are signatory at the present time.

It seems as though the administration is burdened with a kind of legal mentality. They seem to feel that if we sign a document, the security of the world becomes absolutely perfect. With all due deference to my lawyer friends, that is a lawyer's complex. In other words, the feeling seems to be that if we sign a contract for peace, we can then dismiss another division of troops. It is beyond me how the administration can feel that way.

When we signed the SEATO treaty, we began to withdraw our power from the Far East.

When we have inspired the Middle Eastern Treaty Organization, as the Secretary of State said today—he said he

was the inspiration of the Middle Eastern Treaty Organization; but, of course, he denies having done anything except to inspire—we start to withdraw some of our forces from the Middle East and the Mediterranean.

There seems to be a strange dedication to the theory that every time we sign a treaty, we should withdraw just a little more of the forces in being. As I understand, the Senator from Missouri is concerned about that. He feels that if we are making commitments, we ought to back them up.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true. Would not the Senator from Minnesota, a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, agree with me that one of the probable reasons why we have lost so much ground in recent years is that other nations know we are not keeping up our guard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am confident the Soviet Union realizes the very fact to which the Senator has adverted, namely, that we have permitted ourselves to become weakened proportionately to the advances which have been made by the Soviet Union and her satellites.

The single major international political factor today is the sense of confidence which the Soviet Union exhibits. Until 3 years ago the Soviet Union exhibited a sense of insecurity in her international relations. Today, under Bulganin and Khrushchev, with the forces in being which the Soviet Union has, and with apparently the economic strength which the Soviet has been able to bring to bear upon its military for the first time, every political writer of any consequence throughout the world points out that the Soviet Union is marching with a confident stride.

Frankly, they are simply telling us to take a sneak every once in a while, such as in the Middle East. Three years ago they would not have dared to do what they have done recently in the Middle East.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my distinguished colleague.

WORDS OF ANDREW JACKSON TO REMEMBER

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, many of my distinguished colleagues will be busy this month recalling the words of a great President, Abraham Lincoln. I think it appropriate, without specific reference to any acts of the 84th Congress, that we also recall a few words of another great President, Andrew Jackson. Therefore, I shall read a brief quotation which appeared in the February 1 Studebaker Weekly News. It reads:

RIGHT TO COMPLAIN

When the laws undertake * * * to make the rich richer and the potent more powerful, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics, and laborers * * * have a right to complain of the injustice of their Government.

THE AL SARENA MINING CO. CASE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 8, in addressing the Senate, I discussed the Al Sarena mining case in some detail. I shall not plow furrowed ground by detailing the case again. I was severely critical of the Interior Department for which I consider shameful negligence in its custodianship of valuable natural resources in that case.

However, Mr. President, I have a proposal to make to Secretary McKay by which I believe he can show whether or not the Al Sarena decision was in good faith. Let me state my proposal.

In January of 1954, over 2 years ago, the Interior Department granted the Al Sarena Mining Co. patent to 15 controverted mining claims in the Rogue River National Forest of Oregon, based on the assertion that these claims were sufficiently mineralized to warrant operation of a mine. Since that time, the Al Sarena Co. has done no mining. However, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has just received severance-tax and fire-protection-tax statements from the Oregon State Tax Commission indicating that during 1954 alone the company cut on its claims some 2 million board-feet of fir and pine timber. Perhaps 3 or 4 times as much timber is still growing on this land.

Mr. President, I propose that Secretary McKay publicly and forthwith request the Al Sarena Co. to operate a mine on these 15 disputed mining claims. I also propose that the Secretary accompany his request with a plea to the company to stop cutting the timber still standing on these claims.

In that way, Mr. President, Secretary McKay could show the good faith claimed for his department. The proof of every pudding is in the eating. Mr. McKay granted the Al Sarena claims for operation of a mine. There has been no mining; there has been only the commercial logging of trees in the Rogue River National Forest—trees which were a virtual gift to the mining company.

I recommend that Secretary McKay tell the Al Sarena Co. to operate a mine. I recommend that Secretary McKay tell the Al Sarena Co. to stop cutting fir trees and pine trees. I recommend that, unless his requests are complied with, Secretary McKay bring suit in Federal court to recover these claims for the Government.

Let us ascertain whether our Secretary of the Interior is interested in ore mining or in tree mining.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 180) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8107. An act to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, relating to electrical and mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, to remove officers and committees from certain limitations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H. R. 2667. An act to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7054. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8107) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CHANGES IN THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we waited a long time for the President's recommendations as to how the Immigration and Nationality Act should be revised to remove the inequities and institutionalized bigotry contained in the present law.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration brought to the attention of the Senate last July 30 the continued lack of success he had had in his efforts to learn the administration's proposals in regard to changing the McCarran Act.

Appended to the statement of the Immigration subcommittee's chairman were a number of statements made by President Eisenhower during the 1952 presidential election campaign. In 1952, Mr. Eisenhower made such eloquent statements as this:

No man's race or creed or color should count against him in his economic or civil or any other rights. Only second-class Americanism tolerates second-class citizenship. It's time to get rid of what remains of both, and that includes rewriting the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act.

That is what President Eisenhower—then candidate Eisenhower—told the large crowd assembled on Boston Common on October 22, 1952. A week later

he said to an audience in the Bronx, in New York City:

We need to rewrite the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act to get the bigotry out of it.

But, Mr. President, I am afraid this was merely one more example of how eloquence can outrun performance.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration documented for us quite fully last July his inability to get any response from the President providing specific recommendations as to how to eliminate from the McCarran Act the bigotry of which he spoke during the election campaign. Further, the Subcommittee on Immigration had an equally singular lack of success in its attempts to get testimony from those administration officials responsible for administering the immigration and nationality law.

Let me quote the statement of the chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee to the Senate on July 30, 1955:

It is highly desirable for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and initially its subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization to have the current attitudes of the executive branch of the Federal Government before them. It is important to further orderly study of the subjects for the Senate committee members to hear first from authorized spokesmen for the administration. To this end, on behalf of the subcommittee of which I am chairman, I have invited the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to appear before us in person and present the views of the administration relating to the immigration and nationality matters coming within the range of operations of their executive departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired. The Senate is still operating under the 2-minute rule.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been reading from the statement of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration. This is not the statement of the junior Senator from Minnesota. I continue to read from the statement of the chairman:

Also, I have written the President of the United States suggesting that he direct certain Cabinet officers to testify before our subcommittee. In addition to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, I suggested the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, and Agriculture.

A curious situation exists in relationship to policies of our basic immigration and naturalization laws: While it is true in the main that we have fairly clear ideas of the stands on the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 taken by private citizens and organizations working in those fields, we do not have anything approaching a clear understanding of the present attitude of the present administration regarding immigration and naturalization.

It is true, Mr. President, that President Eisenhower did send a letter in response to an inquiry by the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], on April 6, 1953. But as the present chairman of the subcommittee rightly pointed out:

It does not contain a single recommendation from the President for positive legislation but instead it lists 10 points "among the administrative provisions of the law which it is claimed may operate with unwarranted harshness.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], said:

Instead of recommending legislation, the President suggested a study of the operation of many of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

Well, Mr. President, the long wait is over. It is amazing what wonders can be worked every 4 years, though, in this case, I am afraid it is a rather small wonder.

The President has sent to Congress his recommendations on how the Immigration and Nationality Act should be revised. But are they recommendations which would "get the bigotry out of it"—to use the words of Candidate Eisenhower?

I am afraid not, Mr. President. The President has sent to us a recommendation that the Congress study the Immigration and Nationality Act. Then his message states:

Pending the completion by the Congress of such study and investigation, it is essential that we take interim measures to alleviate as much as possible inequities in the present quota system.

And then the President enumerates for us the interim measures he proposes we take. Some of them are good interim measures, Mr. President.

But this subject has been studied to death. In case the President does not know it, a Presidential Commission on Immigration and Naturalization made its report on January 1, 1953. It had taken oral testimony on the subject from some 400 persons all over the Nation, and received written statements from approximately 234 others. Its testimony runs to some 2,100 pages, and can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, if the President should care to see it. The report of the commission is 304 pages long, and is a very excellent report. It is the definitive work on what is wrong with the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

I cannot understand what could have been going on in the executive branch during the last 3 years that would lead the President to think that we should study the Immigration and Nationality Act some more.

It so happens that I proposed some interim measures of my own—'way back in 1953. Some of the President's interim measures are suspiciously like the interim measures I proposed on July 31, 1953.

At that time I wrote President Eisenhower a letter. It contained the interim measures I had introduced in the Senate. In the letter I called for President Eisenhower's support for a bipartisan ecort to ease some of the harsh and discriminatory provisions of the present law.

Noting, at that time, that both candidates during the 1952 campaign had been agreed on the ned for revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act, I described my proposal to the President as "a fair beginning bill, on which reasonable men of both parties could agree at this time without the necessity of overhauling our immigration laws drastically, desirable as that may be."

My letter stated:

My bill does not constitute a complete revision of the present Immigration and Nationality Act. It does not go as far as I would like it to go and as some of us are suggesting in other legislation. In all probability, it does not go as far as you would wish it to go. However, it seems to me to be a fair beginning.

That was in 1953, Mr. President. I never intended that the interim measures of 1953 would still be the interim measures of 1956. When I proposed those measures, I thoroughly expected that by 1956—3 years later—all the studies would have been made, all the administration spokesmen would have been heard from, and all the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act would have been rewritten. I never knew that an interim could last quite so long.

The President's message does not contain a recommendation that would eliminate the national origins quota system, which fixes into our immigration law the discriminatory assumption that the people of some nations are less worthy of coming to our country than are the people of other nations. Instead, the President has taken over the proposal I made back in 1953—namely, that unused quotas be pooled, so that they can be used in a succeeding year for the people of countries whose quotas are filled. As an interim measure, this proposal has merit. But it does not eliminate the national origins quota system.

In fact, Mr. President, the proposals sent to the Congress by the President would add a new concept to our immigration policies. In utilizing the unused quotas which are pooled, the President proposes that this be done on a regional basis, and that quota numbers be pooled in each of the following areas: Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Ocean area. This, I suggest, adds to the national origins quota system a regional origins quota system.

In making such a proposal—even as a temporary palliative—those in the executive branch who thought of this idea prove themselves to be peculiarly insensitive to what is fundamentally wrong with the national origins quota system. I shall not put it more strongly than that. They would preserve the worst characteristic of the quota system; in fact, they would bring it forth in new form.

Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary for me to spell out why the national origins quota system is discriminatory. I have spoken and written on this subject at considerable length in the past. Now we have proposed a regional origins quota system for the utilization of unused quotas.

As regards the quota system, I should like to call the attention of the Senate

to only one point which is not always sufficiently emphasized. That is its consequences for us, in our relations with the peoples of other nations. If we wonder why many of the people of Asian nations, especially, have become suspicious of us and no longer regard us as their friends, we should not overlook the part our Immigration and Nationality Act has played in promoting this hostility. Can we expect the people of India or the people of Burma or the people of any other Asian country to have friendly feelings toward us, when we have embodied in our immigration law a quota system under which we seem to consider them inferior in some way to the people of other nations? Not only is this inherent in the national origins quota system, but as if to emphasize this attitude, the Asian-Pacific triangle concept was added to the 1952 act. This makes a determination of an applicant's admissibility for immigration to the United States on the basis of whether more than half of his ancestry is traceable to Asia. This is racist doctrine of the most blatant sort. There is no room for it in the laws of our land.

I say we cannot disregard the significance these discriminatory features of our immigration law have for our relations with other peoples, Mr. President. It is most regrettable that the proposals sent to Congress would add a regional origins quota system to what was already bad enough.

The national origins quota system could be eliminated through adoption of the unified quota system contained in Senate bill 1206, introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and other Senators, including myself. I am happy to be a cosponsor of this bill. It would truly rewrite the unfair provisions of the McCarran Act and get the bigotry out of it.

I deeply regret that after 3 years, the President could not have come up with something better than interim measures, although many of them, as I have said, are excellent recommendations, worthy of our consideration and adoption.

But I think that after a 3-year wait, we could have rightfully expected from the administration something more than "interim measures." I presume that the interim—in this instance—lasts only through November.

I respectffuly suggest to the President that he instruct those in the executive branch responsible for the administration of this law—the Secretary of State and the Attorney General—to cooperate with the Congress and to appear before the Subcommittee on Immigration. Then we can proceed with the business of passing S. 1206, and so eliminate the national origins quota system which brings such shame upon this Nation throughout the world.

Mr. President, I hope the interim immigration proposals I have recommended will quickly be enacted. I certainly pledge my support to that end. I say most kindly, but with very positive force, that for 3 years, now, we have been waiting for a basic revision of the act; and that 3-year period could have been used to good avail.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, so far as I know, there is no further morning business to be transacted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9063, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9063) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the secretary will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 2, after line 13, to insert:

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY FUNCTIONS

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Maintenance and operations

Notwithstanding the proviso under the heading "Maintenance and operations" in title III of the Department of Defense Appropration Act, 1956, the Murphy General Hospital in Boston (Waltham), Mass., may be utilized during the fiscal year 1956 to meet any requirements of the military, naval, and air forces and other Government agencies, including the requirements of the New England Division of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, I am advised that the emergency which we were led to believe existed does not actually exist, and that in reality the Corps of Engineers are now occupying a part of the hospital. Since it appears that the provisions of the amendment authorizing an exchange are no longer necessary and the transfer can be handled administratively, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, to change the chapter number from "II" to "III."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Defense—Civil Functions," on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

General expenses

For an additional amount for "General expenses", $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 17, to change the chapter number from "III" to "IV."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia—Operating Expenses—Executive Office," on page 3, line 24, after the word "conventions", to strike out "$43,500" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 7, to change the chapter number from "IV" to "V."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Legislative Branch," on page 4, after line 8, to insert:

SENATE

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Vice President

Office of the Vice President: For an additional amount for clerical assistants to the Vice President, $6,270;

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators: For an additional amount for administrative and clerical assistants for Senators, to provide additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of California, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of over 13 million, the population of said State having exceeded 13 million inhabitants, $4,780;

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For an additional amount for office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $8,350: *Provided*, That effective August 1, 1955, the basic annual rates of compensation of the following positions shall be: superintendent, press gallery, $5,340; first assistant superintendent, press gallery, $4,740; second assistant superintendent, press gallery, $3,840; third assistant superintendent, press gallery, $3,300; fourth assistant superintendent, press gallery, $2,580; secretary, press gallery, $2,100; superintendent, radio press gallery, $5,220; first assistant superintendent, radio press gallery, $4,020; second assistant superintendent, radio press gallery, $3,540; third assistant superintendent, radio press gallery, $3,000; and superintendent, periodical press gallery, $4,320;

In all, salaries, officers and employees, $19,400.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Reporting Senate proceedings: For an additional amount for reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, $5,465.

Furniture: For an additional amount for materials for, repairs of, and the purchase of furniture, $5,000.

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1955, $40,000.

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $900,000.

Motor vehicles: For an additional amount for maintaining, exchanging, and equipping motor vehicles, $5,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the appropriations under the heading "Senate" shall be held and considered to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about this amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice an item for an "additional amount for clerical assistants to the Vice President." Why is that necessary?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because the Vice President does not have the proportionate amount of money Senators have for the employment of clerical assistants; and the volume of work in the Vice President's office has been greatly increased. Upon consideration, the committee decided that the Vice President was entitled to have additional funds.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me, so that I may make an observation in regard to the question asked by my friend, the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. First, Mr. President, let me say that, as my good friend, the Senator from Arizona, well knows, I am normally in constant attendance on the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve. However, ever since this session convened, I have been very busy with the farm bill. I am glad to say that a little after midnight—in fact, it was early this morning—the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry voted to report the new farm bill; and I hope to report the bill today, and to submit the report thereon a little later.

I do not like to ask questions of my good friend, the Senator from Arizona, about a bill with which I should be familiar; but because of the fact that I have been so busy with the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was unable to attend the hearings of the Appropriations Committee on this bill. Therefore, I hope the Senator from Arizona will excuse me if I ask certain questions about the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me at this time, so that I may make an observation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course.

Mr. CLEMENTS. At the time when an upward adjustment was made in the clerical staff allocations to Members of the Senate, a corresponding allocation adjustment was not made to the Vice President.

Mr. ELLENDER. So this amount is proposed merely because Senators received an increased amount? Is that the way this amount was determined?

Mr. CLEMENTS. In this connection, I may say that the Vice President made what the chairman of the committee thought was a good case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Vice President request it; did he appear?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes; the Vice President asked for it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

I also notice an additional amount for the Senators from the State of California. Is that due to an increase in population?

Mr. HAYDEN. Solely.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Architect of the Capitol", on page 7, after line 3, to insert:

Capitol buildings and grounds

Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, materials, and all necessary incidental expenses, to provide improved facilities for the Senate restaurants, Capitol Building, $20,000, to remain available until expended and to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that item for the purpose of paying an operating deficit?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. It is for the installation of better equipment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it necessary to install additional equipment there, when we are now in the process of building a new Senate Office Building, which I understand will be equipped with a fine restaurant.

Mr. HAYDEN. This item is for improvements in the restaurant in the Capitol Building. Certain worn-out equipment needs to be replaced.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as everyone knows, we have been spending considerable amounts of money on that restaurant.

Mr. HAYDEN. But in view of the complaints, perhaps better equipment would result in better service.

Mr. ELLENDER. What sort of equipment will be obtained by means of the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. The following equipment:

Serving pantry, refrigeration, $2,200.
Chef's refrigeration, $3,750.
Produce refrigeration, $3,750.
Meat refrigeration, $3,750.
Dairy refrigeration, $2,500.
Salad refrigeration, $950.
"O" box dual compressor, $800.
"O" box thermobank, $300.
Electric feeder cable and miscellaneous, $1,500.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will that be in addition to the facilities now in the restaurant?

Mr. HAYDEN. The new equipment to be replaced has been in use for 20 years. Modern refrigeration is needed, in order to keep the food fresh, for consumption by Senators and their guests.

Mr. ELLENDER. At present there is a move to extend the east front of the Capitol Building. It is my understanding that project has reached the point where that addition may be built soon. As the Senator from Arizona well knows, when the new Senate Office Building was first proposed—I refer to the one now being erected—I suggested that the east front of the Capitol be extended, and that provision be made for a restaurant in which the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives could dine together, and thereby make the restaurant a paying concern.

However, as the Senator knows, we have a separate restaurant at present, which costs the taxpayers from $45,000 to $50,000 a year to maintain. I call it a subsidy.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is considerably less than the cost a few years ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, but it should not cost a dime. If we are to build the proposed addition to the Capitol, it strikes me that we ought to be able to install in it a large restaurant to accommodate both Senate and House Members. I believe a joint restaurant would be a paying venture. Instead, we continue these expenses, and continue to pay what I call a subsidy, in order to feed hungry Senators 1 or 2 meals a day.

Mr. HAYDEN. The principal patronage in the present Capitol restaurant is at noon. If there were 3 full meals served during the day, the restaurant could be paying for itself. The restaurant cannot pay its way on a noon-lunch basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the reason why I contended, before the Committee on Appropriations, that instead of building the new Senate Office Building, which will cost more than $20 million, and which will cost the taxpayers the equivalent of $10,000 for each Senator, in addition to what is will cost merely to operate it, we should complete the east front of the Capitol. If we extend the east front of the Capitol building, space could be provided for a restaurant adequate to take care of both Senate and House Members. It would pay for itself. Instead, we continue to make appropriations to cover the expenses of two restaurants—one for the Senate and one for the House. Sooner or later I hope the present separate restraurant facilities will be disposed of. The space could probably well be utilized for office rooms for Senators or committees, and the restaurant could be located, as I have said, in the area which will be available by the erection of the addition to the east front of the Capitol. Are we to continue to spend money on the old restaurant? Did the committee take that question into consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. It did. The equipment of the restaurant is so antiquated that it cannot render efficient service; it is constantly deteriorating, and must be replaced. I have stated the respective items and their cost.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 7, beginning in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 8, to insert:

CHAPTER VI

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

ACQUISITION OF SITE, CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT, ADDITIONAL SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Acquisition of site: In addition to the real property contained in square 725 in the District of Columbia heretofore acquired as a site for an additional office building for the United States Senate under the provisions of the Second Deficiency Appropriations Act, 1948, approved June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1028), the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is hereby authorized to acquire, on behalf of the United States, by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, for purposes of extension of such site or for additions to the United States Capitol Grounds, all other publicly or privately owned real property (including alleys or parts of alleys and streets) contained in said square 725 and all publicly or privately owned real property (including alleys or parts of alleys and streets) contained in square 724 in the District of Columbia, and there is hereby appropriated for such pur-

poses $4,500,000, which, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for Acquisition of Site contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, shall be available for such purposes until expended, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required for such purposes: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this chapter and of the aforesaid act of June 25, 1948, squares 725 and 724 shall be construed to extend to the outer face of the curbs of sidewalks surrounding such squares: *Provided further,* That any proceeding for condemnation brought under this chapter shall be conducted in accordance with the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of land in the District of Columbia for the use of the United States," approved March 1, 1929 (16 D. C. Code, secs. 619–644): *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, any real property owned by the United States and contained in squares 725 and 724 shall upon request of the Architect of the Capitol, made with the approval of the Senate Office Building Commission, be transferred to the jurisdiction and control of the Architect of the Capitol, and any alley, or part thereof, contained in such squares, shall be closed and vacated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in accordance with any request therefor made by the Architect of the Capitol with the approval of such Commission: *Provided further,* That upon acquisition of any real property pursuant to this chapter, the Architect of the Capitol, when directed by the Senate Office Building Commission to so act, is authorized, under the funds appropriated hereunder, to provide for the demolition and removal of any buildings or other structures on, or constituting a part of, such property and, pending demolition, to lease any or all of such property for such periods and under such terms and conditions as he may deem most advantageous to the United States and to provide for the maintenance and protection of such property: *Provided further,* That the jurisdiction of the Capitol Police shall extend over any real property acquired under this chapter: *Provided further,* That the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Senate Office Building Commission, is authorized to enter into contracts and to make such other expenditures, including expenditures for personnel and other services, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter and to obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding that this section, chapter VI, will be stricken from the bill. There is opposition to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wish to explain to the Senate that, opposition having developed to chapter VI, and it being highly important that the bill become a law at the earliest possible date, it was decided to let this particular provision be stricken on a point of order. It is subject to a point of order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The point of order must be conceded. I had filed a motion to suspend the rule, but evidently that course is impracticable today, so I shall not resist the point of order, and the Chair may sustain it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I raise the point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is well taken, on the ground that chapter VI is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 16, to change the chapter number from "V" to "VII."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the previous action with respect to chapter II and chapter VI, this amendment should be rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 10, line 16.

The amendment was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What has been the disposition of the proposed appropriation of $4.5 million for additional land for a new Senate Office Building?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That provision was stricken out on a point of order, on the ground that it was general legislation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in this connection I wish to state that if this amendment had been adopted, it would permit the purchase of the half-block which remains in the rear of the new Senate Office Building, which is now in the process of construction. It would entail an expenditure for the purchase of square 724, in which the Carroll Arms, the Plaza Hotel, and a number of other buildings are now located.

I point out that the total assessment on this property—and the assessment seems very low to me—is about $2,191,805 for the various lots included in these two blocks. If this land were purchased by the Government, the city fathers would lose a little more than $50,000 annually in taxes.

It is my hope that before any further land is acquired in connection with the Senate Office Building we may go into the subject thoroughly and—if the proposal can be justified—that the authorization be included in a regular bill, instead of a deficiency bill. It will be recalled that during the closing days of the 80th Congress some member of the Senate Appropriations Committee brought forward a proposal for an appropriation to build the Senate Office Building, which is now in process of construction. It was not until the next day that some of us learned that the project had been authorized in a deficiency bill.

We now have before us a similar situation. It is sought to add to the bill the unnecessary expense of $4.5 million, which, in my opinion, would be but a drop in the bucket. The property could not be acquired for that sum.

I understood that this half-block was to be used to provide parking space to accommodate the officials, clerks, and administrative assistants who serve Senators. I think we are going "haywire." The national budget is now in an unbalanced condition. It has been in that condition for practically all of the past 24 years. Under those circumstances, we ought to cut corners at every opportunity. Every time appropriations such as the one here proposed come before us, it is my intention to oppose them.

I think we have enough facilities now. As I pointed out, for 8 years, with the assistance of my good friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I was able to prevent the construction of the new Senate Office Building. However, it is now being built today. I repeat that the erection of this building will entail expenses to the taxpayers which will be the equivalent of an additional $10,000 for each Seantor. I believe that such costs are unconscionable, and I hope they will be eliminated hereafter.

Mr. HAYDEN. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that legislation will be properly introduced and referred to the appropriate committee in connection with this project. A bill will be introduced, and it will be considered in the regular way.

I may add that if Senators had not made the grave mistake we made 8 years ago of delaying actions, we would now have a new Senate Office Building, at half the cost.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there was one question which I overlooked asking. It relates to the amendment containing the item under the head of "Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper." I should like to have the situation clarified. Are we providing for another doorkeeper?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. This item merely comes under the title of the office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper. It relates to the pay of employees in the Press Gallery. Senators will remember that on the closing night before adjournment last year the Senate adopted a resolution, which was sent to the House, to equalize the pay of employees in the Senate Press Gallery with the pay of corresponding employees in the House. However, the resolution was so drawn that the actual pay scales were based upon the House schedules rather than ours. This proposed change in language, whereby the Senate base is adopted, will make a difference of $360.35 a year. It will accomplish exactly what the Senate sought to accomplish in the closing hours of the last session of Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the increase in salaries will amount to only $360.35?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. The increase in salaries which was agreed to will equalize the pay of those occupying similar positions in the Senate with the pay schedules for corresponding positions in the House. The equalization was provided just before the Congress adjourned last year. The amendment we are discussing would add $360.05 to what was provided then, so as to make the base pay the Senate base pay, not the House base pay.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that it would do exactly the same as was done by resolution in the closing hours of the last session?

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It would increase the overall pay of the Press Gallery by $360 a year and bring it in line with the $60 multiple formula which is used. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. It is a matter of convenience in the bookkeeping operations of the financial clerk of the Senate.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refer to page 6, to the item of $40,000 for inquiries and investigations. How does that item differ, from the item for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $900,000, just below on the same page?

Mr. HAYDEN. The $40,000 is a hangover from last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the Senator mean by a hangover? Is it the same item?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is the same item.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it for the same purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, last year we provided $1,200,000 for inquiries and investigations.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate authorized inquiries and investigations at a cost of $2,124,120. The appropriation for that purpose $1,224,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. The sum of $40,000 is the remainder of what was authorized? Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, there are pending quite a number of resolutions which, contrary to what I thought would be done, carry increased amounts in many cases, and quite a number of the special subcommittees are continued, although in some cases there had been promises made that they would come to an end.

After the holiday period those resolutions will be taken up by the Senate. I hope we can trim some of them, and perhaps do away with some of the subcommittees. That is my hope, and I also hope that I shall have some assistance in that regard from the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is one other matter I wish to mention. I have received a letter, dated February 9, 1956, from Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. It contains a recommendation adopted by unanimous vote of that committee, that there be included in the pending bill $700,000 to provide for the planting of trees. A part of the letter reads as follows:

> As you are aware, most of the seedlings available to farmers are produced by State and private nurseries in connection with the United States Forest Service under the provisions of section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act.

The letter goes on to state that the examination showed that a sufficient number of acres were available to call for the expenditure of $700,000, and that that sum would enable 200 million additional trees to be planted.

I took the matter up with the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, who stated that, inasmuch as his committee would consider a series of supplemental estimates which were submitted this week in House Document 390, covering about $565 million, which are urgent deficiencies of one kind or another, and because he was satisfied a second supplemental bill would be promptly reported to the House, he would prefer to have hearings before his committee on the proposal to appropriate funds for tree planting.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I have not offered an amendment as requested but I should like to have the letter from Chairman COOLEY included in the RECORD at this point.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1956.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I hate to approach you at this late hour with a proposed amendment to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 9063) which I understand is to be considered in the Senate tomorrow. However, there appears to be no other alternative if we are to prevent a serious setback in our reforestation program.

There are a large number of bills now pending before the Congress to encourage reforestation and the planting of trees. The mere introduction of these bills and the public discussion connected with them has so stimulated public interest in this kind of a program that, I am informed, the demand for tree seedlings has already increased in many States beyond the present capacity of nurseries to supply.

As you are aware, most of the seedlings available to farmers are produced by State and private nurseries in cooperation with the United States Forest Service under the provisions of section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act. In the routine process of obtaining information from the Forest Service with respect to available tree seedlings, in preparation for hearings on some of these bills by the House Committee on Agriculture, our staff discovered day before yesterday that there is a present unused capacity in State and private nurseries that could result in production of more than 200 million additional seedlings this year if funds were available.

The production of tree seedlings is, however, a seasonal business. In most instances tree seeds, like other agricultural seeds, are planted in the spring. No matter how much money might be available in the next fiscal year for this purpose, the trees which it will make possible cannot be planted until the spring of 1957.

On the other hand, if an item of $700,000 could be made available to the Forest Service for this work within the next 2 or 3 weeks, seeds could be planted this spring and more than 200 million seedling trees could be made available a year earlier than would be possible if we wait for the next regular appropriation bill.

I am informed by the House Appropriations Committee that there will be no bill except the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, reported by your committee yesterday and scheduled for Senate consideration tomorrow, through which this money may be made available in time for its use this spring.

This appeal to you to offer an amendment to this bill on the Senate floor adding an item of $700,000 for the cooperative production of tree seedlings is made by direction of the House Committee on Agriculture pursuant to unanimous action of the committee in executive session yesterday, February 8, 1956.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill (H. R. 9063) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not believe it will be necessary to go to conference on the bill. If it is necessary to do so, I have taken the precaution of asking that the conferees be appointed.

In the event that it is not necessary to go to conference on the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the adjournment or recess following today's session, duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions passed by the two Houses.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR DAMAGING OR DESTROYING AIRCRAFT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar 1489, S. 2972.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2972) to punish the wilful damaging or destroying of aircraft and attempts to damage or destroy aircraft, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide suitable punishment, first, for the willful damaging or destruction of air carrier aircraft used in interstate, overseas, or foreign commerce; second, for attempts to damage or destroy such aircraft; and, finally, for knowingly imparting or conveying false information concerning such attempts.

The recent disaster at Longmont, Colo., in which a United Air Lines plane was destroyed by the explosion of a time bomb placed in the baggage carried on the plane, killing all 44 persons aboard, has

focused attention on the need for such legislation. While there are Federal statutes now in effect which may be applicable in some cases of this type, none of these statutes was drafted with this type of problem specifically in mind, with the result that the statutes now in effect either do not adequately cover the subject matter or do not provide penalties commensurate with the magnitude of the offense.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That section 902 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, be further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"DAMAGING OR DESTROYING AIRCRAFT

"(i) (1) As used in this subsection, the term 'destructive substance' means any explosive substance, flammable material, infernal machine, or other chemical, mechanical, or radioactive device or matter of a combustible, contaminative, corrosive, or explosive nature.

"(2) Any person who willfully sets fire to, damages, destroys, disables, or wrecks any civil aircraft used, operated, or employed by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in interstate, overseas, or foreign air commerce; or

"Any person who willfully sets fire to, damages, destroys, disables, or wrecks any aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, or spare part with intent to damage, destroy, disable, or wreck any such aircraft; or

"Any person who, with like intent, willfully places or causes to be placed any destructive substance on, about, in or near any such aircraft, or any aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, spare part, fuel, lubricant, hydraulic fluid, or other material used or intended to be used in connection with the operation of any such aircraft, or any cargo carried or intended to be carried on any such aircraft, or otherwise makes or causes to be made any such aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, spare part, fuel, lubricant, hydraulic fluid, or other material unworkable or unusable or hazardous to work or use; or

"Any person who, with like intent, willfully sets fire to, damages, destroys, disables, or wrecks, or places or causes to be placed any destructive substance on, about, in or near any shop, supply, structure, station, depot, terminal, hangar, ramp, landing area, air-navigation facility or other facility, warehouse, property, machine, or apparatus used or intended to be used in connection with the operation, loading, or unloading of any such aircraft or making any such aircraft ready for flight, or otherwise makes or causes to be made any such shop, supply, structure, station, depot, terminal, hangar, ramp, landing area, air-navigation facility or other facility, warehouse, property, machine, or apparatus unworkable or unusable or hazardous to work or use; or

"Any person who, with like intent, willfully incapacitates any member of the crew of any such aircraft; or

"Any person who willfully attempts to do any of the aforesaid acts or things—

"shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

"Any person who is convicted of any such crime, which has resulted in the death of any person, shall be subject also to the death penalty or imprisonment for life if the jury shall in its discretion so direct or in the case of a plea of guilty if the court in its discretion shall so order.

"IMPARTING OR CONVEYING FALSE INFORMATION

"(j) Any person who imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed information, knowing such information to be false, concerning an attempt being made, or to be made, to do any act or thing which would be subject to criminal penalty under subsection (i) of this section, or concerning the existence of circumstances or conditions which are likely to damage, destroy, disable, or wreck, or which would render unworkable or unusable or hazardous to work or use, any civil aircraft, used, operated, or employed by an air carrier or foreign air carrier in interstate, overseas, or foreign commerce, or any aircraft engine, propeller, appliance, spare part, fuel, lubricant, hydraulic fluid, or other material used or intended to be used in connection with the operation or any such aircraft, or any shop, supply, structure, station, depot, terminal, hangar, ramp, landing area, air-navigation facility or other facility, warehouse, property, machine, or apparatus used or intended to be used in connection with the operation, loading, or unloading of any such aircraft, or making any such aircraft ready for flight, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

LLOYD BOHLKE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Drew Pearson column published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, February 9, contained the following item:

FIRED FOR TALKING

It doesn't pay to express your views against the Benson farm program if you want to keep a job with the Government. That is what Lloyd Bohlke, of Prosser, Wash., has just discovered, after he appeared on a television program, Questions Before the House.

Bohlke had been trying to operate an 80-acre potato farm near Prosser, but couldn't make both ends meet and had to quit. He knew the truth of what Secretary Benson had said about the difficulty of small one-man farming. But he got a job with the Kennewick Irrigation District near Yakima on January 2. The job paid $7,500. On January 3, however, Bohlke made the mistake of appearing with Miss Virginia Burnside on her television program and spoke out frankly about the difficult problem the small farmer faces today. He also wasn't too complimentary to Benson policies.

Shortly thereafter Bohlke was fired by Reclamation Bureau officials working for Secretary of the Interior McKay. They replaced him with Van E. Nutley, at $10,000 annually.

NOTE.—Bohlke was former master of the Rattlesnake Grange, had been a farmer for years, belonged to no left-wing groups.

Mr. President, I could not believe that this could possibly be a correct account, with all the insinuations involved, of the firing and hiring of Lloyd Bohlke, of Prosser, Wash., the gentleman involved in the story.

I made an inquiry of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay's office, requesting their comment on the incident. Today I received a letter from Secretary McKay in answer to my inquiry. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: I am grateful to you for calling to my attention the allegation in the Drew Pearson column this morning that an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation had lost his job because he criticized the policies of another Government department. Your interest in this matter is understandable, since you are a member of the Reclamation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

When you called me, I told you I could not believe that there had ever been any such episode as that described in the Pearson column. I am happy to report to you that I find upon inquiry my confidence was fully justified.

Pearson asserted that Lloyd Bohlke was fired from the Kennewick Irrigation District by Bureau of Reclamation officials and replaced by Van E. Nutley at $10,000 annually.

I am informed that Mr. Bohlke is not and never has been an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Nutley has been a career employee of the Bureau of Reclamation for 20 years. He is chief of the Field Engineering Office of the Bureau for the Kennewick Division.

The Kennewick Irrigation District is an independent organization of water users who contract with the Federal Government for repayment of the cost of a share of the Kennewick Division of the Yakima project. The Bureau of Reclamation has no jurisdiction over the Kennewick Irrigation District nor are district employees on the payroll of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Recently the directors of the Kennewick Irrigation District approached the Bureau of Reclamation, requesting the services of Mr. Nutley. Mr. Nutley was reluctant to leave the Federal service. However, because of his experience on construction of the Kennewick Division, it was recognized that he would be of particular value to the Kennewick Irrigation District in its operation.

Accordingly, he has been granted a 6 months' leave of absence without pay from the Federal payroll to enter the service of the Kennewick Irrigation District.

The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation are not informed as to whom he replaced or why.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, in connection with the reference to the Secretary of Agriculture in the Pearson article, let me say that I have had a personal acquaintance with Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson running back many years. I have known him to be honest and upright and a man who does not take vindictive action against anyone who may criticize him. Such actions would be completely contrary to his nature. In the interest of truth and fairness I thought the article and the answer to it ought to be placed in the RECORD. The facts speak for themselves.

MEDALS AND DECORATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1490, Senate bill 2711.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2711) to authorize medals and decorations for outstanding and meritorious conduct and service in the United States merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to give official recognition to acts of heroic conduct or extraordinary skill or service on the part of members of the United States merchant marine, or for service on merchant marine vessels in time of war or national emergency under certain conditions of danger to life; and to issue citations as public evidence of deserved honor and distinction to United States or foreign ships which participate in gallant or outstanding action in marine disasters, and other emergencies.

The bill would also repeal, effective July 1, 1954, three laws which provided somewhat similar authority in years past, but which are now inoperative, inasmuch as the periods in which rights could accrue under those statutes have expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide and award with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury: A merchant marine distinguished service medal to any person serving in the United States merchant marine who distinguishes himself by outstanding act, conduct, or valor beyond the line of duty, and a merchant marine meritorious service medal to any person serving in the United States merchant marine for meritorious act, conduct, or service in line of duty, but not of such outstanding character as would warrant an award of the distinguished service medal.

(b) No more than one distinguished service medal or meritorious service medal shall be awarded to any one person, but for each succeeding act, conduct, or service justifying such an award, a suitable device may be awarded to be worn with the medal or ribbon. In case any person who so distinguishes himself or so acts or serves as to justify the award of a medal under this section, dies before the award can be made to him, the award may be made and medal presented to such representatives of the deceased as the Secretary of Commerce deems proper.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to provide and issue, under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time prescribe, a distinctive service ribbon bar to each master, officer, or member of the crew of any United States ship who serves or has served after June 30, 1950, in any time of war, or national emergency proclaimed by the President or by Congress, or during an operation by Armed Forces of the United States outside the continental United States, for such period of time and in such area or under such conditions of danger to life as the Secretary may set forth in regulations issued hereunder. Such bars shall be provided at cost by the Secretary or at reasonable prices by private persons when authorized for manufacture and sale by the Secretary. Whenever any bar presented under the provisions of this section is lost, destroyed, or rendered unfit for use, without fault or neglect of the owner, such bar may be replaced at cost by the Secretary or at reasonable prices by private persons authorized by him.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to issue, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, a citation as public evidence of deserved honor and distinction to any United States ship or to any foreign ship which participates in outstanding or gallant action in marine disasters or other emergencies for the purpose of saving life or property. The Secretary of Commerce may award a plaque to a ship so cited, and a replica of such plaque may be preserved, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, as a permanent historic record. The Secretary of Commerce may also award an appropriate citation ribbon bar to the master or each person serving on board such ship at the time of the action for which citation is made, as public evidence of such honor and distinction. Whenever such master or person would be entitled hereunder to the award of an additional citation ribbon, a suitable device shall be awarded, in lieu thereof, to be attached to the ribbon originally awarded. In any case of a proposed award or citation to a foreign ship or to a master or person serving aboard such ship, such award or citation shall be subject to the concurrence of the Secretary of State.

SEC. 4. The manufacture, sale, possession, or display of any insignia, decoration, medal, device, or rosette thereof, or any colorable imitation of any insignia, decoration, medal, or device, or rosette, provided for in this act, or in any rule or regulation issued pursuant to this act, is prohibited, except as authorized by this act or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto. Whoever violates any provision of this section shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $250 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both.

SEC. 5. (a) The following acts of Congress are repealed effective July 1, 1954:

(1) The act entitled "To provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors," approved May 10, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 81, 59 Stat. 511, 60 Stat. 884; U. S. C., title 50, War, Appendix, secs. 753a–753f).

(2) The act entitled "Providing for a medal for service in the merchant marine during the present war," approved August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 960; U. S. C., title 50, War, Appendix, secs. 754–754b).

(3) The act entitled "To provide reemployment rights for persons who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 162, 60 Stat. 905, 60 Stat. 945; U. S. C. title 50, War, Appendix, secs. 1471–1475).

(b) Notwithstanding the repeal of the acts of Congress in subsection (a) the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time prescribe to make replacements at cost or permit replacements at reasonable prices by persons authorized by him of the awards, medals, decorations, or other articles issued under such acts, if lost, destroyed, or rendered unfit for use, without fault or neglect on the part of the owner.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I submit an original resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 210), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1956, through February 29, 1956, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

GRATUITY TO MARGARET K. HAMMOND

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1494, Senate Resolution 207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 207) to pay a gratuity to Margaret K. Hammond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Margaret K. Hammond, sister-in-law of Nancy E. Hammond, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6½ months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

MEMORIAL TO GEN. JOHN J. PERSHING

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1497, Senate Joint Resolution 95.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) was considered, order to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the American Battle Monuments Commission, whose former Chairman was the late John J. Pershing, General of the Armies of the United States, is authorized and directed to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing, together with recommendations with respect to site, design, and materials, for submission to the Congress at as early a date as practicable. Such plans shall, prior to submission to the Congress, be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts with respect to the design and materials to be used.

PRINTING OF BIENNIAL REPORT OF THE CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1493, Senate Resolution 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 195) to print the 37th biennial report of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the proceedings of the 37th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held at West Hartford, Conn., June 26 to July 1, 1955, be printed with illustrations, as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 233, 81ST CONGRESS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1495, Senate Resolution 208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 208) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a revised edition of Senate Document No. 233, of the 81st Congress, entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the revised edition of Senate Document No. 233 of the 81st Congress, entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities" be printed as a Senate document.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE REED OF ILLINOIS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which the Secretary will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
February 10, 1956.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of 14 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk.*

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the resolution submitted by the Senator from Illinois.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 211), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, CHAUNCEY W. REED was a Member of the House of Representatives for more than 20 years. He served that body with fidelity, and became chairman of its Committee on the Judiciary. While I was not a personal friend of Mr. REED or a member of his political faith, I know that he was kindly in nature. I never knew him to do a vicious or vindictive thing. He served the country with fidelity to the principles in which he believed, and his death is a real loss to the Nation and to my State.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I did not know CHAUNCEY REED very long, but in the short time during which I was associated with him in the House of Representatives I knew him quite intimately. As a matter of fact, when I was assigned office space as a Member of the House, my office was directly across the hall from that of CHAUNCEY REED.

I remember very pleasantly the many kindnesses which I received at his hands. On my first day, his office staff was made available to help me obtain the necessary equipment and other facilities which are needed to put a Representative's office into operation.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] with reference to the fidelity with which Representative REED served any cause in which he believed.

Mr. President, I think this is the appropriate time for the Senate to take action on the resolution offered by the Senator from Illinois, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative REED.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect and honor to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate now adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 14, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1956:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be United States district judge for the western district of Oklahoma, vice Edgar S. Vaught, retiring.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

APPOINTMENTS, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS THEREFOR AS PROVIDED BY LAW AND REGULATIONS, EFFECTIVE DATE OF ACCEPTANCE

To be senior surgeons

Anibal R. Valle
Paul Q. Peterson
Trois E. Johnson

To be surgeons

Osamu Hayaishi
Gerald R. Cooper
Phyllis Q. Edwards
Henry K. Beye
Frank W. Mount
Jack Orloff
William L. Bunch, Jr.

To be senior dental surgeon

Clarence A. Eggler

To be dental surgeon

Paul H. Keyes

To be sanitary engineers

Arve H. Dahl
Paul W. Reed

To be senior scientists

Lloyd W. Law
Everette L. May

To be scientist

Melvin H. Goodwin, Jr.

To be veterinarian

Raymond J. Helvig

To be senior nurse officer

Mary O. Jenney

To be nurse officer

Doris E. Roberts

To be dietitian

Dorothy M. Youland

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress (Army-Navy-Public Health Service Medical Officer Procurement Act of 1947); and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Samuel W. Askinas, AO2238795.
Edward R. Beidelman, AO2023995.
James F. Crosby, Jr.
Edward R. Martin, AO2261130.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Arthur Barnes.
Kenneth H. Bleifer.
Walter M. Bowerman, O2273704.
Andrew W. Butchko.
Fred G. Conrad, AO3043227.
Cecil G. Edwards, AO2004061.
William M. Hammon, AO3043200.

John Y. Harper, Jr.
William E. Karnes, AO3043173.
Herbert H. Kaufmann, AO2260203.
John T. King, Jr.
Emanuel Milder, AO3044019.
Stephen A. Ockner, AO3043260.
Carl G. Peterson, Jr., AO3043263.
Roy E. Sawyer, AO3044369.
Kuno C. Schwarz.
John A. Shoener.
James H. Thorpe, AO2261694.
Eugene L. Weston.
Marion J. Williams, AO3001245.
Terrell R. Woodmansee, AO3043280.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Dental)

John A. Barton, Jr., AO3000497.
David O. Boxwell.
Ray L. Klaeser, AO2240544.
Fred L. Pavlikowski, AO2261841.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947), and section 307 (b), Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951), with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated:

To be captain, USAF (Chaplain)

James R. Sullivan, AO2217269.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Chaplain)

Ralph R. Monsen, AO2240489.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Charles P. Grahl, AO1905123.
James LaBar, AO2218429.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 101 (c), Public Law 36, 80th Congress (Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947), as amended by section 5, Public Law 514, 81st Congress, and Public Law 37, 83d Congress; with a view to designation for the performance of duties as indicated under the provisions of section 307, Public Law 150, 82d Congress (Air Force Organization Act of 1951):

To be first lieutenant, USAF (nurse)

Mary A. Chamberlin, AN2243728.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

To be first lieutenants

Lewis F. Acker, Jr., AO2252825.
Joseph Adamo, AO2232398.
Christopher S. Adams, Jr., AO2245431.
John O. Adams, AO1862767.
Jacques J. P. Adnet, AO2249429.
Lawrence C. Albers, AO589811.
Jesse M. Allen, AO1849843.
William E. Allen, AO2216716.
John V. Allison, AO1912135.
Donald M. Altman, AO590867.
Richard L. Anderson, AO1910131.
Robert C. Anderson, AO2226644.
Robert L. Anderson, AO2245202.
Stuart M. Andrews, AO2226645.
John J. Andrichak, AO1912024.
Richard C. Andrus, AO1860740.
Earl J. Archer, Jr., AO1908987.
Frank M. Areen, AO2222420.
Eugene C. Austin, AO760530.
Joseph C. Bailey, AO938619.
Ora J. Baird, Jr., AO1908990.
Robert C. Baldwin, AO1907836.
Theodore M. Ball, Jr., AO2249656.
Donald E. Bandow, AO2244802.
Alfred C. Barbee, AO1863888.
William R. Barber, Jr., AO2225906.
Elmer L. Barnes, AO1908491.
Kyle D. Barnes, Jr., AO2227181.
Robert J. Barnhill, AO2249168.
James E. Barrett, AO2231887.
John A. Bayless, AO2224838.
Glenn J. Beadle, AO2230628.
Weldon A. Behrend, AO2231246.
Thomas L. Beight, AO2250312.
Mortimer F. Bennet, AO2077693.
Robert A. Benz, AO2250898.
Paul E. Bergeron, AO2229038.
Paul A. Bergerot, AO1909032.
Robert J. Berns, AO2251193.
Robert L. Beyers, AO590746.
Vernon L. Biaett, AO2094093.
Howard S. Bialas, AO1865687.
Lloyd H. Black, Jr., AO2058403.
Ronald E. Black, AO1863946.
Albert R. Blair, AO2244592.
William M. Blakeslee, AO2225579.
Kennith W. Blan, AO2087013.
William H. Blankfield, Jr., AO2218241.
Paul L. Boger, AO2024019.
Paul J. Bonseigneur, Jr., AO838036.
William T. Booy, AO2226889.
George B. Box, AO1865252.
William C. Boyd, AO2074011.
Robert E. Brodersen, AO722272.
Arthur J. Brojer, AO591304.
Ralph L. Brooks, AO2225735.
Marion D. R. Brown, AO2223823.
Murray P. Brush III, AO2225914.
William R. Buice, AO956290.
Louis F. Burel, Jr., AO1855555.
Dale L. Burns, AO2238543.
John J. Burns, AO816991.
Joseph Burns, AO2086771.
Richard D. Burns, AO2237754.
Duncan R. Butts, AO2216807.
Bernard P. Byrne, AO936970.
Harry B. Cadwell, AO877940.
Alonza L. Caldwell, AO1864768.
Don L. Campbell, AO1853455.
Alan D. Campen, AO1903556.
Marvin J. Carcich, AO2218086.
Carl A. Carlson, AO2221601.
Ross L. Carson, AO1908890.
Harold W. Chapman, AO2218377.
Ben F. Chartier, AO2217395.
John P. Chervenak, AO2226590.
Lyle D. Clawson, AO1849756.
William L. Clutter, AO2224036.
Gomer W. Cochran, AO939515.
Ray E. Codding, AO947474.
Charles S. Cogburn, Jr., AO714028.
David B. Coleman, Jr., AO2065958.
John W. Collens III, AO774950.
Albert W. Conner, AO2023097.
Richard M. Connor, AO1911403.
Gilland W. Corbitt, AO945453.
Robert A. Cornetti, AO2218287.
Donald R. Cossman, AO2227808.
Daniel J. Cotter, AO2223322.
Arista H. Cowan III, AO2231709.
David B. Creekman, AO2218648.
Eugene P. Cunneely, AO2218533.
Robert W. Cunningham, AO826391.
Andrew R. Curtis, Jr., AO839948.
Edward A. Daigle, AO2230949.
James W. Dain, Jr., AO2249311.
Robert C. Damen, AO835157.
Charles T. Dancer, AO2227263.
Walter F. Daniel, AO935208.
William J. Daniel, AO714039.
Arcangelo M. D'Arcangelo, AO2223076.
Donald M. Davis, AO782198.
Loren W. Davis, AO841914.
William E. Deats, AO786900.
Thomas J. Deegan, AO2074352.
Louis C. Delisio, AO2249669.
Frank Delmerico, Jr., AO825588.
Raymond D. Deuschle, AO1853030.
Jack H. Devault, AO2226828.
Edwin D. Dodds, AO2226829.
Bruce A. Dolan, AO2226595.
George A. J. Doll, AO2074357.
William J. Donelan, AO2250600.
Theodore E. Dorris, AO2225827.
George C. Dostal, AO2237084.
L. E. Dowell, AO785174.
James J. Dowling, Jr., AO2238177.
Donald R. Drake, AO2075142.
Bill C. Driver, AO2237076.
William H. Drumm, Jr., AO930360.
Bernice A. Dubose, AO591125.
John C. Dunn, AO1847701.
Wallace E. Durst, AO2223208.
Harvey M. Dykes, AO2245924.
James H. Eaton, Jr., AO1846765.
Robert W. Elkins, AO2230649.
Robert C. Evans, AO2093472.
Walter E. Evans, AO1862488.
William A. Eveland, AO1861503.
Henry S. Faircloth, AO2220541.
James E. Falconer, AO2231470.
Joseph F. Falls, AO839503.
James R. Fay, AO2218166.
John M. Fear, AO2246768.
Warren P. Fisher, AO2226666.
Donald L. Flood, AO1905337.
Richard C. Fontaine, AO2216842.
William Ford, AO2247881.
Calvin L. Frederick, AO1909583.
John P. Frink, AO2232600.
William H. Fulton, Jr., AO2250269.
Frederick Funston III, AO2222545.
Darrell A. Gallenberger, AO2218891.
George A. Garcia, AO2227312.
Verne D. Gardina, AO940197.
Arthur J. Gardner, AO1853778.
Clyde H. Garner, AO2226302.
Joseph S. Garner, AO2067695.
Frederick J. Gavin, Jr., AO2222142.
George A. Genereux, AO2248212.
Robert J. Ginn, AO707040.
David N. Glancy, AO2231541.
Donald C. Glenn, AO2230523.
David A. Goodwin, AO2225407.
Miller Graf, AO2234404.
James I. Granger, AO2226040.
Harold L. Graybill, AO926553.
Arnold L. Grover, AO708680.
Lawrence A. Guenther, AO2227789.
Edward P. Gumphrey, AO2081443.
Paul E. Gushwa, AO2223385.
Walter B. Haaser, AO832134.
Gordon M. Haggard, AO2235291.
Patrick J. Halloran, AO1911414.
Thomas M. Hamilton, AO2216028.
Lester T. Hansen, AO2060979.
Orrin C. Harmon, Jr., AO1862491.
Charles A. Harris, AO2226339.
John C. Harris, AO1903210.
William B. Hartman, AO2237078.
Charles Hasert, AO1911845.
John W. Hatten, AO1857629.
Ernest A. Headberg, Jr., AO1908328.
Thomas M. Hedrick, AO2251269.
Gilbert L. Heller, AO2027100.
William B. Hellkamp, AO1853779.
Wallace D. Henderson, AO2223036.
George F. Hennrikus, Jr., AO771924.
Harold C. Henschel, AO722313.
Eldon L. Herron, AO2216606.
David W. Hess, AO2226932.
Maynard N. Heth, AO1909850.
Edward D. Higgins, AO1911305.
James R. Hildreth, AO2246477.
Kenneth D. Hill, AO2230768.
Roy E. Hilliard, AO2231135.
Joseph C. Hinman, Jr., AO1910882.
Victor R. Hollandsworth, AO2233885.
Robert D. Hook, AO2231229.
Raymond L. Hope, Jr., AO2231797.
Francis W. Howard, AO693210.
Edwin G. Hudspeth, AO926694.
Merrill W. Hulse, AO1857653.
Richard F. Hum, AO877298.
Calvin T. Hunt, AO2072757.
Robert E. Hunter, AO2229443.
George G. Hupp, AO2095417.
John W. Jaacks, AO2225296.
Donald A. Jabusch, AO1910242.
Bobby W. Jackson, AO1909315.
Larry H. Jackson, AO1862322.
Craig G. Jacobie, AO2224884.
Terrence C. James, AO1912358.
Robert D. Janca, AO2227008.
Victor A. Janega, AO2252924.
Jack J. Jeangerard, AO2223277.
Kay D. Jefferson, AO2235008.
Charles D. Johnson, AO1847622.
George H. Johnson, AO723368.

Jay J. Johnson, AO2217298.
John N. Johnson, AO782551.
Mahlon D. Johnson, AO2251234.
Basil R. Jones, AO2227215.
Herschel D. Jones, AO2057933.
Oscar W. Jones, Jr., AO2223193.
Robert L. Jones, AO763219.
Robin L. Jones, AO2246166.
Norman Karas, AO1865804.
Robert H. Kelley, AO2220192.
Virgil P. Kendall, Jr., AO2225095.
Paul M. Kennedy, AO1909327.
Clifford D. Kern, AO1341437.
John W. Kiernan, AO829875.
Vernon L. Kimler, AO2249455.
Robert L. Kinard, AO841726.
Robert S. King, AO1909605.
Karl F. Kinkel, AO2249762.
Charles W. Kinney, AO1908430.
James R. Kiser, AO1909329.
James R. Krause, AO2225121.
Paul M. Kunichika, AO2230127.
David T. Kuntz, AO2231799.
Leon Kyropoulos, AO2252802.
Thomas E. Lacy, AO2218719.
Chester C. Lamb, Jr., AO2224889.
James C. Lamiell, AO825203.
William M. Lamont, AO1909496.
Robert M. Law, AO2223285.
Eugene H. Lehman, AO2249232.
Melvin H. Lewin, AO1851000.
Donald H. L'Heureux, AO2247207.
Francis N. Libby, AO1910517.
William E. Lindberg, AO2060539.
Richard M. Linton, AO2225615.
Ian R. Little, AO2222326.
Stanley R. Little, AO1910622.
Donald E. Lockstrom, AO2238490.
Wendel W. Lorenger, AO2223634.
James S. Love, AO2232296.
Thomas C. Lowry, AO2225853.
Eugene W. Loy, AO2230065.
Erwin E. Luark, AO2227545.
Daniel H. Lufkin, AO2253052.
Carter P. Luna, AO2224483.
Herbert L. Lunsford, AO2246249.
Stanley R. Luther, AO1911582.
Allan E. MacNicol, AO2248062.
Mark W. Magnan, AO817490.
Theodore E. Majoros, AO1904462.
Michael M. Marker, AO770703.
Stanley N. Marker, AO2080746.
Lyle B. Marshall, AO1911034.
John A. Martin, AO2223223.
Rocci S. Mastroberti, AO2226159.
Alan Mateer, AO2092824.
Fred J. Maurada, Jr., AO2254577.
Calvin R. Maurer, AO1905225.
Oscar Mauterer, AO2078621.
Allen D. Maxwell, AO2233731.
John C. Mayers, AO2225192.
Robert G. Maynard, AO2225325.
Leon S. McAdams, Jr., AO2251339.
Douglas G. McComas, AO2223537.
William C. McCord, Jr., AO2224052.
Dalton W. McCullar, Jr., AO2224603.
John P. McDonough, Jr., AO2222955.
Walter J. McFarland, AO1852566.
Charles D. McManus, AO2220262.
Donald J. McNamara, AO2231898.
Starling Meahl, Jr., AO1905134.
David B. Means, AO2224978.
Alan S. Mencher, AO2233711.
Castor Mendez-Vigo, Jr., AO2249055.
Homer J. Merfeld, AO2224168.
Cyrus J. Merritt, AO2247031.
Robert F. Mielke, AO833956.
August A. Miller, AO2227281.
William E. Miller, AO1862295.
Robert W. Milling, AO1854082.
Hershal Mitchell, AO2218255.
Michael M. Mitchell, AO2223464.
Donald M. Moats, AO1848145.
Robert M. Mohr, AO2226941.
Joseph F. Moran, AO2223588.
Leonard M. Moreland, AO2225327.
James F. Morgan, AO1850852.
William F. Morgan, AO2225798.
Arthur H. Morrill, Jr., AO2222840.
Donald D. Moss, AO2219611.
Waldo J. Moulton, Jr., AO1851019.
Elmer E. Murphy, AO2070688.
Walter F. Murphy, AO1910766.
Pierce M. Myers, Jr., AO2069567.
William D. Myers, AO2075449.
Norman C. Nadon, AO824704.
Tollef O. Nasby, AO2220279.
Philip E. Neale, Jr., AO1864985.
Allen C. Neimeyer, AO1912037.
Albert L. Neuhauser, AO2100312.
Thomas J. Neville, AO2092323.
Gilbert O. Nicholson, AO821344.
Allen W. Nicola, AO768196.
Jerry A. Nohe, AO2227476.
John P. O'Gorman, AO 2237814.
Orren H. Ohlinger II, AO1911212.
Earl T. O'Loughlin, AO2224242.
Gerald M. O'Meara, AO2227063.
William C. Opfer, Jr., AO715302.
Wilbur L. Osborne, AO2082088.
Albertus B. Outlaw, AO1903944.
Norris W. Overton, AO2216660.
Phillip M. Ozenick, AO1847570.
Gerald C. Paquin, AO2064639.
Karl S. Park, AO2227720.
Arthur L. Parker, AO2229608.
Robert S. Parker, AO2225625.
Richard R. Parks, AO2223541.
Ralph S. Parr, Jr., AO823933.
Robert E. Pasekoff, AO2252633.
Alexander Patrick, AO2221856.
Dewey Patton, Jr., AO2090037.
Herbert J. Peck, AO2226490.
Herbert A. Pederson, Jr., AO1908355.
Daniel C. Perkins, Jr., AO2244752.
Michael Perrone, AO1849669.
Don A. Persons, AO591022.
James D. Pewitt, AO2225874.
Joseph L. Phinney, AO2223195.
Philip J. Piccione, AO2215996.
Robert E. Pierce, AO1856200.
Richard M. Pittenger, AO2015042.
George F. Pitzke III, AO2249410.
John W. Planinac, AO2073866.
Carwin J. Pomeroy, AO1907988.
Charles A. Post, AO2245001.
John K. Powers, AO2022997.
Joseph L. Price, Jr., AO715589.
William P. Procter, Jr., AO2094248.
Edwin L. Proctor, AO2225204.
Ray O. Pugh, AO2226867.
Frank D. Ramsey, AO1849130.
Robert P. Randall, AO2228826.
Thomas J. Reagan, AO2216697.
Morris D. Reed, AO2226763.
John R. Reeder, AO 2237528.
Joseph F. Regan, AO2071241.
Jack W. Reid, AO2218038.
William G. Reschke, Jr., AO2217405.
Sidney I. Richard, AO2248580.
Donald A. Riess, AO2084008.
Bob A. Roberts, AO2225880.
Donald E. Roberts, AO2224753.
Littleton S. Roberts, Jr., AO2082122.
William H. Roberts, AO1909525.
Earl B. Roehm, AO2223544.
Dow A. Rogers, Jr., AO832491.
Andrew F. Romanak, AO2224175.
Andrew C. Rowe, AO2223785.
Claude R. Rowell, AO2216087.
Judson H. Ruth, AO2226727.
Richard J. Sadorf, AO2076027.
Robert H. Sayre, AO1909769.
Lester J. Schaub, AO2080564.
Franklin E. Schneider, AO2094258.
Ray W. Schrecengost, Jr., AO1908449.
Mack D. Secord, AO2246189.
Jack K. Selden, Jr., AO2225332.
Eldon B. Severson, AO765849.
Billy E. Shannon, AO2217361.
Bryant M. Sharp, AO828343.
George R. Shipley, AO2081599.
Edwin F. Shippey, Jr., AO2098883.
Robert B. Siegel, AO2222867.
Ivan D. Skinner, AO2224619.
Niles F. Smith, AO2224983.
William G. Smith, AO2224361.
Lawson E. Snyder, AO722898.
Robert L. M. Snyder, AO1855533.
Thomas D. Soapes, AO1904190.
Robert F. Soergel, AO2249406.
Herbert L. Spear, AO2072372.
Frank E. Spieldenner, AO2222757.
Dameron R. Spruill, AO2225260.
Edward E. Stallcup, AO2072030.
Myles J. Standish, Jr., AO2076036.
James L. Stanley, AO591426.
James B. Stanphill, AO1904443.
Richard L. Starkel, AO940625.
James W. St. Cin, AO2217057.
Ronald A. Stinson, AO2226507.
Charles Storch, AO2225717.
William P. Sullivan, AO2226202.
William K. Sutton, AO1853644.
Thomas C. Swol, AO1849637.
Edmond P. Sykes, AO2066733.
John D. Tanner, AO2224682.
Henri L. Tapie, AO2087597.
Chester D. Taylor, Jr., AO2250851.
Eugene T. Taylor, AO2226509.
Llewellyn M Taylor, Jr., AO2223660.
Gerald E. Teachout, AO2080147.
John R. Thomas, AO2250671.
Paul D. Thompson, AO2227684.
Roland D. Thorson, AO2222576.
William A. Tilford, AO941672.
Thomas L. Titus, AO2221761.
Eduardo G. Torres, AO2220862.
Robert H. Troshynski, AO2226922.
Gene T. Tyner, AO590675.
Stephen J. Ungvary, Jr., AO2226946.
Louis E. Valenta, AO1909239.
Joseph A. Vaughan, Jr., AO1908606.
Emmett S. Walden, Jr., AO2245012.
James A. Watkins, AO2224029.
William H. Watkins, AO591445.
James E. Watson III, AO723486.
James W. Weber, AO2245601.
Sumner W. White, AO1910813.
Lawrence W. Whitford, Jr., AO2216895.
Lebaron Whittier, AO2226742.
Paul L. Wieland, AO2227254.
William A. Wiese, AO2235342.
Phillip M. Willer, AO2226089.
Alton C. Williams, AO2225274.
Henry B. Williams, AO755484.
G. B. Williford, Jr., AO2226743.
Stephen N. Willis, AO935201.
Carrol D. Wilson, AO589947.
Robert W. Wilson, AO2224757.
Carl P. Wittenberg, AO2224270.
John L. Wolfe, AO2215172.
James W. Wood, AO784258.
Charles E. Woodford, AO1910680.
Lennon E. Wright, AO1862274.
William J. Wright, AO941586.
Ralph A. Yates, AO2251148.

To be second lieutenants

Kenneth L. Abney, AO3006711.
Gerald J. Adler, AO3015750.
Fernando Alexander, AO3005671.
Fred R. Allen, AO3024936.
Owen W. Allen, Jr., AO3019261.
Gerald R. Almond, AO3036212.
Alvord V. P. Anderson III, AO3034153.
Gerald W. Anderson, AO3013996.
Henry T. Antoszek, AO3015248.
Charles L. Arndt, AO3010905.
Wallace E. Arrington, Jr., AO3034188.
Donald K. Artean, AO3023617.
Hubert L. Bain, AO3016094.
James K. Baisden, AO3003951.
James D. Baker, AO3005962.
Paul J. Balfe, AO3022881.
Daniel A. Ball, AO3007769.
Robert Ball, AO2248558.
Marc S. Barthello, Jr., AO3023596.
Thomas S. Bateman, AO3011616.
Jack Bath, Jr., AO3017130.
John M. Batten, AO3010381.
David S. Baugh, AO2205573.
Charles A. Beckwith, Jr., AO2205686.
Reagan H. Beene, Jr., AO3014944.
Rodney S. Belden, AO3020603.
Willis A. Belford, Jr., AO3008011.
Edward J. Bell III, AO3008052.
Donald N. Benbow, AO3016332.
Robert B. Bennett, AO3022124.
William V. Bierek, AO3021433.
Dwight E. Bigelow, Jr., AO3007783.
Earle M. Binckley, AO3022449.

Harley S. Black, AO3006248.
John M. Blake, AO3006165.
Thomas A. Blake, AO3006753.
Robert W. Bleier, AO3023675.
Lowell F. Bohn, AO3005996.
George T. Boone, AO2207677.
Richard D. Boswell, AO3024769.
Richard M. Bouchard, AO3035427.
Joe C. Boyer, AO3020652.
Gene Bradshaw, AO2210529.
William E. Branch, Jr., AO3019947.
Milton L. Brantly, AO3008327.
Michael H. Branz, AO2229933.
Brian Brewer.
Boris E. Bright, AO3019758.
Irwin Brooks, AO3022827.
Bill V. Brown, AO3008209.
Wendell L. Brown, AO3025853.
John R. Buehler, AO3017693.
William Burgdorf, AO3006679.
Gunning Butler, Jr., AO3014004.
James D. Butt, AO3011261.
Robert A. Byrkit, AO3010664.
Allen Byspiel, AO3019247.
Phillip I. Caleb, Jr., AO3004280.
Charles J. Carey, AO3018574.
Paul J. Carlton, AO3014706.
Charles R. Carney, AO3035028.
James E. Carver, AO3026162.
Albert W. Catlett, AO3008210.
Louis E. Catlett, AO3011115.
Elbridge G. Chadwick, AO3006785.
Albert J. Chasse, AO3025447.
Daniel R. Christian, AO3020966.
William C. Christman, AO3006317.
Robert S. Clark, AO3006790.
Forrest N. Cobb, AO3010750.
Charles O. Cole, Jr., AO3006797.
Wayne L. Combs, AO3019899.
Oscar C. Conway, AO3033823.
John A. Cosgrove, AO3011982.
William E. Couch, AO2251433.
Dennis E. Courtaney, AO3003841.
William J. Cullen, Jr., AO3007838.
Kenneth C. Culp, AO3022476.
Hugh J. Cunningham, AO3013105.
Leonard S. Czarnecki, AO3023444.
William M. Dalton, AO3035517.
Ervin F. Dauenhauer, AO3006817.
Barney A. Daughtry, Jr., AO3016679.
Frederick E. Davis, AO3021671.
James R. Davis, AO3008216.
Norman B. Davis, AO3009645.
Paul E. Davis, AO3017820.
Albert J. Degroote, AO3024569.
Robert F. Dellaripa, AO3033964.
Robert A. Delmar, AO3018178.
Vincent E. Delvecchio, AO3021797.
Armen Dermen, AO3012805.
Ralph L. Donaldson, AO3034099.
James K. Doyle, AO3008457.
Clyde E. Duncan, AO3007349.
William C. Dunn, AO3023335.
James L. Earl, Jr., AO2251804.
James F. Eberwine, AO3018696.
Kevin F. Eck, AO3021457.
Neil L. Eddins, AO3025399.
Hans A. Einstein, AO3026345.
John G. Eklund, AO3007860.
Andrew J. Eliopoulos, AO3017916.
John N. Elliott, AO3019540.
Willie E. Elmore, Jr., AO3022561.
James C. Enney, AO3006851.
Richard B. Enzian, AO3006852.
Ralph C. Erchinger, AO3012961.
Richard E. Evans, AO3006854.
Donald C. Falkner, AO3007365.
Robert W. Fanning, AO2253769.
William P. Feeley, AO3019733.
James L. Fisher, AO2207953.
Richard L. Fitzpatrick, AO3023304.
Charles R. Floyd, AO2205472.
Roland F. Fluck, AO3025691.
Wallace E. Fluhr, AO2208098.
Dudley J. Foster, AO3005828.
Joe T. Fox, AO3017658.
John F. Frazier, AO2229587.
Jack E. Freeman, AO3016916.
Gene A. Fronk, AO3016789.
Leonard L. Fross, AO3009293.
Arnold E. Furlong, AO3018318.
Thomas K. Gallagher, AO3007887.
Floyd E. Galloway, Jr., AO3019709.
Frank B. Garczynski, Jr., AO3035371.
John W. Garrett III, AO3012996.
Chester J. Gaseor, AO3002656.
Roy L. Gentry, Jr., AO3022458.
Richard A. Gerber, AO3023089.
Sterling D. Goode, AO3015238.
Norman Goodman, AO3033668.
Donald S. Goodrich, Jr., AO3024747.
Coe F. Gordon, Jr., AO3023415.
Douglas H. Gordon, AO3019819.
John N. Gordon, AO2206682.
James D. Gormley, AO3011418.
Darr L. Goss, AO3014022.
Robert S. Graff, AO3036111.
Campbell W. Gray, AO3018525.
Robert W. Grayson, AO3012660.
Robert C. Green, AO3034415.
George H. Greenleaf, AO3006899.
James R. Griffin, AO3023602.
Lindy C. Gunderson, AO3017694.
Frederick V. Habenicht, AO3017782.
Thomas G. Haggard, AO3013747.
Francis G. Halturewicz, AO3023246.
Gene E. Hamman, AO3026289.
Henry F. Hartsell, AO3021847.
Joe L. Harvell, Jr., AO2206828.
William T. Hascall, AO3018917.
John V. Hawkins, AO3008237.
Charles B. Hennessey, AO3009523.
Richard Hickenbottom, AO3010926.
James L. Hime, AO3008963.
Joe B. Hollingsworth, AO3018990.
William V. Holloway, AO3009524.
Joseph J. Hope, AO3006939.
Cecil M. Hook, Jr., AO3004108.
Sommers I. Howard, AO3026354.
Nicholas H. Howell, AO3022773.
John A. Hudson, AO3023023.
William D. Hughes, AO3007936.
John W. Humke, AO3023294.
Robert G. Hyden, AO3019093.
Orville D. Ingalsbe, AO3011102.
Donald L. Irwin, AO3023091.
Richard H. Jackson, AO3021316.
Henry J. Jenson, AO3022633.
Henry R. Johnson, AO3012078.
Richard D. Johnson, AO3035227.
Robert D. Johnson, AO3014075.
Ted S. Johnston, AO3008359.
Walter F. Jordan, Jr., AO2254983.
Brent Kaplan, AO3011997.
Karl S. Karrenbrock, AO3007949.
Henry D. Keenan, AO3019383.
Ernst J. Kellerstrass, AO2207831.
Charles R. Kennedy, AO3007465.
Thomas B. Kerr, AO3018107.
Billy J. King, AO3024265.
Billy J. Kittrell, AO3007954.
Willie A. Knight, Jr., AO2245565.
Frederick L. Knoke, AO3022901.
Kenneth M. Knox, AO3007956.
Richard J. Koelling, AO3022009.
Edward J. Kroen, AO3022200.
James N. Kulpan, AO3017263.
Robert J. Kuska, AO3023096.
Donald L. Lamberson, AO3017662.
Edward B. Landry, AO3011083.
Donald C. LaPorte, AO3022125.
Roland M. Larsen, AO3017183.
Herbert E. Larson, AO3010936.
Kirke LaShelle, Jr., AO3026222.
Wayne G. Lauten, AO3018498.
Jack G. Lee, Jr., AO3011058.
James W. Lee, AO3034534.
Vernon R. Lee, AO3022598.
Ercole R. Leomazzi, AO3026223.
George F. Lewis, AO3022729.
Omer H. Liefer, AO3023420.
Frederick S. Lockwood III, AO3011915.
Henry E. L. Luhrs, AO3014328.
Kenneth G. Lundie, AO3014394.
Albert E. Lyons, AO3017152.
Howard B. Mall, AO3023343.
John F. Mann, Jr., AO2255817.
Billy J. Martin, AO3014625.
Ward R. Martin, AO3010765.
Joseph P. Martino, AO3012972.
John A. Mason, AO3016463.
Billie J. Massey, AO3026408.
James R. Matthes, AO3022439.
Harrison W. Matthews, AO3025411.
Virgil C. McAmis, AO3008002.
Robert J. McClellan, AO3022753.
Earl D. McClintock, AO3006532.
Glenn H. McFadden, AO3002701.
Francis J. McGouldrick, Jr., AO3022062.
Charles E. McGovern, AO2230050.
John R. McKenzie, AO3018667.
Ivan L. McKinney, AO3008255.
Ray D. McLaughlin, AO3024124.
Royce H. McNeill, AO3006506.
Carl W. Miller, AO3007537.
Charles L. Miller, AO3007038.
Billie B. Mills, AO3007540.
Chris Millson, Jr., AO3012096.
Leighton N. Mishou, AO3008257.
Marvin L. Montgomery, AO3009730.
Stanley A. Moody, AO3003297.
John K. Mooney, AO3024752.
Arthur M. Moore, Jr., AO3012381.
Richard A. Moore, AO3023726.
Frederick J. Morgan, AO3007052.
David C. Morrill, AO3034030.
Jack A. Morris, AO3010539.
William F. Morris, AO3021001.
Charles F. Morton, Jr., AO3020001.
George E. Nancarrow, AO3012198.
Richard F. Nelson, AO3010464.
Russell T. Newman, AO3017119.
Stanley C. Newman, AO3034171.
George A. Nial, AO3013010.
Richard H. Nichols, AO1904615.
Charles E. Norby, AO2235343.
Thomas M. Oakes, AO3008050.
Richard E. Olin, AO3008516.
Joe R. O'Neal, AO3014925.
Howard D. Ortel, AO3012876.
Thomas M. O'Shaughnessy, AO3018139.
John V. Ott, AO3025534.
Eugene Owens, AO3007076.
William C. Palumbo, AO3007588.
Herbert W. Pangle, AO3008388.
David V. Pearson, AO3015931.
Russell L. Peate, AO3004371.
Samuel C. Pennington III, AO3024126.
Leonard A. Perlich, AO3003939.
Donald J. Pfannenstiel, AO3024738.
Harold L. Phelps, AO3006208.
Peter J. Phillips, AO3026226.
Charles R. Pinson, AO3017045.
James L. Pitts, Jr., AO3026031.
Harold C. Pluenneke, AO3021926.
Lewis W. Poe, AO2207613.
William Poehlman, Jr., AO3035084.
John Polonchek, AO2261869.
Clarence E. Poole, AO3008072.
Michael T. Popovich, AO3009094.
Richard Powell, AO3013039.
Robert J. Powers, AO3008078.
Lowell T. L. Proctor, AO3018729.
Charles E. Pugh, AO3012912.
Joe B. Purkhiser, AO3035508.
Stanley J. Pytel, AO3021917.
William D. Ralph, Jr., AO2246570.
Bruce R. Rauhe, AO3014408.
Robert H. Reed, AO3006536.
Ben A. Roberts, AO2245727.
Charles E. Rogers, AO2207719.
Philip A. Rowe, Jr., AO3034708.
Wheeler D. Samples, Jr., AO3005950.
Robert M. Sather, AO3008279.
Charles L. Saxe, Jr., AO2220322.
Ernest T. Scambos, AO3034647.
Bobby R. Scarlett, AO3012759.
David F. Schafer, AO3019913.
Carl N. Schaffhauser, AO3022370.
Edward P. Schelonka, AO2208854.
Stanley J. Schill, AO2217771.
George J. Schmidt, AO3035649.
William J. Schoder, AO3019249.
James A. Scott, AO3023219.
Russell J. Scott, AO3020843.
Frank P. Scruggs, Jr., AO3008410.
James F. Seegers, AO2208744.
James L. Shanks, AO3008282.
Edward E. Shapleigh, AO3008413.
Bobby T. Shields, AO3018548.
Gerard C. Shinn, AO3008415.
Roy E. Shy, AO3015495.
Joseph C. Simmons, AO3025238.
Howard B. Sivils, Jr., AO3014614.
Frank E. Sizer, AO3017054.

Sheldon H. Slater, AO3012895.
Harold F. Smith, AO3008285.
James C. Smith, AO3024979.
William J. Sparkman, AO3017937.
Richard A. Spinner, AO3008288.
Maurice G. Stack, AO3024980.
Kenneth H. Stargardt, AO2216090.
Thomas J. Stefan, AO3026038.
Harold I. Steinberg, AO3046441.
William J. Stelpflug, AO3033958.
Gene J. Stergar, AO1861235.
Denver Stone, AO3006023.
Gordon E. Stone, AO3014616.
Lewis W. Stone, AO3006398.
John E. Streit, AO3026425.
James E. Strub, AO2246597.
Russell D. Stuckey, AO3017154.
Floyd B. Sweet, Jr., AO3019293.
Harris J. Taylor, AO3022354.
Kenneth W. Taylor, Jr., AO3036680.
Arnold L. Telford, AO3014067.
Russell E. Thoburn, AO3015632.
Cornelius A. Thomas, AO3012218.
James C. Thomas, AO3007184.
James H. Thomas, AO3015223.
James K. Thompson, AO3035492.
John H. Thulin, AO3006214.
Fred R. Tice, AO3013361.
John J. Tonz, AO3020203.
William H. Townsley, AO3007190.
Clarence W. Troutman, AO3006452.
Lester W. Tucker, AO3007701.
Edward H. Turek, AO3015144.
Alvin R. Turner, AO3034132.
Donald E. Ulrich, AO3006670.
Rodney D. Vanderhoof, AO3016940.
Frank T. Van Lierde, AO3012298.
David J. Vanyo, AO3015036.
James E. Vaughan, AO3007708.
David R. Vehling, AO3003853.
Edwin T. Veith, AO3012299.
George L. Von Tersch, AO3016841.
Henry D. Voss, Jr., AO3012408.
Donald F. Waitt, AO3034094.
Robert P. Wakefield, AO3024562.
Donald J. Waldron, AO3016321.
Robert E. Waller, AO3020087.
Neil I. Walters, AO3015594.
Gerald Waltman, AO3023957.
Everett B. Watson, AO3007210.
John F. Watson, Jr., AO3022913.
Saul Waxman, AO3023895.
Kenneth L. Weber, AO3011043.
George E. Wehling, AO3033691.
Charles H. Weidner, AO3017626.
James P. Wells, AO3006456.
Kenneth L. Westby, AO3020152.
Ruric H. Wester, Jr., AO3008188.
Karl L. Wiegand, AO3015457.
John White, AO3006671.
John A. Wilkes, Jr., AO3021548.
Ernest W. Williams, AO3020940.
Roger L. Williams, AO3010344.
Herbert G. Wilson, Jr., AO3025778.
Lewis R. Wilson, AO3025436.
James W. Wold, AO3022661.
Richard E. Wolfsberger, AO3019672.
Milton B. Wood, AO3022942.
Theodore E. Workman, AO3025614.
Daniel J. Zimmerman, AO3010002.
Ralph W. Zoerlein, AO3021836.
Donald G. Zumstein, AO3023472.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, 80th Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947); and section 301, Public Law 625, 80th Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

To be first lieutenants

Joyce E. Harris, AL2230459.
Dorotha N. Wunderlich, AL2220907.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Olie R. Snead, Altoona, Ala., in place of T. A. Phillips, transferred.

Loyd C. McMillan, Daphne, Ala., in place of C. G. Stimpson, retired.

Robert L. Cockrell, Double Springs, Ala., in place of B. L. Butler, retired.

Annie G. Chambers, Gainesville, Ala., in place of V. C. Roberts, retired.

Heamon F. Salter, Jr., McKenzie, Ala., in place of J. B. Parker, transferred.

James C. Weatherwax, Moulton, Ala., in place of L. F. Howell, retired.

Grover C. Kicker, Jr., Mountain Creek, Ala., in place of G. E. Culver, retired.

Robert H. Blacklidge, Spruce Pine, Ala., in place of William Britton, resigned.

Jeff D. Cleckler, Thorsby, Ala., in place of J. D. Merchant, deceased.

Roy Wesley Rhodes, Tuscaloosa, Ala., in place of H. M. McLeod, removed.

ALASKA

Neva M. Pichler, Platinum, Alaska, in place of A. A. Webster, resigned.

Louise F. Trafton, Tok Junction, Alaska, in place of C. H. Trafton, resigned.

ARIZONA

Eric E. Nelson, Bisbee, Ariz., in place of J. N. Caretto, deceased.

Lucille E. Baughman, Cavecreek, Ariz., in place of P. C. Bradley, retired.

Carl M. Isaacson, Hereford, Ariz., in place of N. I. Freihage, resigned.

Joe H. Cittadini, San Manuel, Ariz. Office established April 1, 1954.

Alvertia M. Boss, Silver Bell, Ariz. Office established June 1, 1953.

Margaret N. Parkhurst, Tacna, Ariz., in place of V. M. Kelland, resigned.

Miles T. Preston, Wickenburg, Ariz., in place of G. C. Wentworth, retired.

Dick Groves, Willcox, Ariz., in place of L. B. McAleb, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Leonard E. Woods, Cash, Ark., in place of W. M. Freeze, Jr., resigned.

William R. Nutt, Hamburg, Ark., in place of C. O. Sawyer, retired.

Lonnie G. Smith, Havana, Ark., in place of E. B. Mitchell, resigned.

Ferman R. Rogers, Luxora, Ark., in place of S. C. Ingram, resigned.

Dorothy G. Moses, McCaskill, Ark., in place of J. S. Moses, retired.

Hunt Singletary, Marion, Ark., in place of J. F. Rieves, retired.

Dillard H. Collins, Salem, Ark., in place of H. J. Humphries, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Beatrice A. Gleason, Calabasas, Calif., in place of A. S. Weber, resigned.

Henry Payne Thayer, Newport Beach, Calif., in place of J. T. Boyd, Jr., resigned.

Ethel R. Sherrill, Nubieber, Calif., in place of R. L. Moslander resigned.

Raymond T. Whitney, Pedro Valley, Calif., in place of Mary Blume, retired.

William R. Robinson, Point Arena, Calif., in place of W. H. Stuart, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Alice N. Allen, North Granby, Conn., in place of Sam Goldschmidt, retired.

FLORIDA

Warren J. McMillan, Jr., Alachua, Fla., in place of R. E. Phillips, resigned.

Howard L. Evans, Bradenton, Fla., in place of Sam Wooten, resigned.

Darence Junior Jones, Eau Gallie, Fla., in place of Hugh McCormick, resigned.

Rufus M. Miller, Flagler Beach, Fla., in place of Leona Knight, resigned.

Maury J. Blalock, Madison, Fla., in place of L. B. Crandall, retired.

Ross Rath, McIntosh, Fla., in place of W. W. Waters, removed.

Mary F. R. McGee, Melrose, Fla., in place of F. B. Stewart, retired.

Warren A. Ray, Opa-Locka, Fla., in place of W. S. Griffiths, resigned.

Samuel H. Wallace, Pompano Beach, Fla., in place of T. J. Nobles, retired.

Kenneth B. Sears, Tavares, Fla., in place of C. S. Daniel, retired.

Fred Wagner, Tice, Fla., in place of B. L. Ward, resigned.

Lucille B. Morris, Yankeetown, Fla., in place of N. M. Knotts, resigned.

GEORGIA

Carey H. Melton, Ashburn, Ga., in place of J. J. Story, retired.

Wendell C. Leggett, Baxley, Ga., in place of Ira Leggett, retired.

George A. Lowman, Bloomingdale, Ga., in place of F. E. Waller, deceased.

Homer Coy Anderson, Cusseta, Ga., in place of N. K. Rogers, deceased.

Robert L. Roland, De Soto, Ga., in place of W. C. Dalton, deceased.

Thurman O. Mobley, Glennville, Ga., in place of L'Bertie Rushing, removed.

Robert D. Murphy, Jr., Greenville, Ga., in place of J. T. Freeman, deceased.

Branson C. Minter, Jakin, Ga., in place of E. C. Roberts, retired.

Ione B. Todd, Lithia Springs, Ga., in place of T. L. Harbin, retired.

Jerry L. McCullough, Ludowici, Ga., in place of H. B. Chapman, transferred.

Annie T. Gilbert, Pendergrass, Ga., in place of N. N. Braselton, deceased.

William I. Cushing, Pine Lake, Ga., in place of C. W. Hogan, Sr., removed.

Clarence M. Brown, Riceboro, Ga., in place of L. B. Richardson, deceased.

David H. McDaniel, Rossville, Ga., in place of J. C. McDaniel, retired.

Herbert C. Ray, Talking Rock, Ga., in place of Jewell Morrison, retired.

Robert M. Ellis, Villa Rica, Ga., in place of U. W. Busby, removed.

James F. Woodall, Woodland, Ga., in place of A. L. Pound, retired.

HAWAII

John W. Ornellas, Hamakuapoko, Hawaii, in place of A. F. Baldwin, retired.

May L. Au, Hauula, Hawaii, in place of L. P. Pickard, removed.

Raymond Ornellas, Hoolehua, Hawaii, in place of Josephine Makaiwi, deceased.

Masamitsu Nakamura, Kahuku, Hawaii, in place of R. M. Haitsuka, resigned.

Rose M. Shimizu, Kualapuu, Hawaii. Office established February 16, 1952.

Zenmitsu R. Arakawa, Maunaloa, Hawaii, in place of M. E. Cowan, resigned.

Harold H. Yoshida, Pahala, Hawaii, in place of Lee Loon, deceased.

Elsie M. Enanoria, Paauhau, Hawaii, in place of H. T. Gyotoku, deceased.

Barbara B. Perry, Puunene, Hawaii, in place of M. F. Xavier, transferred.

IDAHO

George Paul Bragg, Ketchum, Idaho, in place of A. G. Barry, retired.

Eytholle M. Greer, Rupert, Idaho, in place of H. B. Colwell, retired.

Gaylord R. Colvin, Jr., White Bird, Idaho, in place of V. A. Shuck, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Josephine C. Hanfelder, South Roxanna, Ill., in place of D. M. Magee, resigned.

Frank G. Brown, Salem, Ill., in place of C. H. Roberts, transferred.

INDIANA

Richard W. Gavin, Battle Ground, Ind., in place of A. C. Whiteside, retired.

Edward Stucky, Berne, Ind., in place of Rena Zehr, deceased.

Mary Ann Massa, Blanford, Ind., in place of James Perona, retired.

Mark A. Galloway, Cromwell, Ind., in place of Mildred Robertson, deceased.

Robert A. Diddie, Crown Point, Ind., in place of O. J. Sauerman, retired.

Mary A. Stites, Deputy, Ind., in place of E. M. Reiff, removed.

Guy E. Edds, Dugger, Ind., in place of H. M. Collins, resigned.

Maurice F. Keilman, Dyer, Ind., in place of L. E. Hoffman, deceased.

Richard B. Lash, Farmersburg, Ind., in place of Ray Dills, deceased.
Perry W. Hitchcock, Farmland, Ind., in place of F. B. Hoppes, retired.
Roscoe G. Brown, Laconia, Ind., in place of Grace Pittman, retired.
James H. Nelson, Ladoga, Ind., in place of O. H. Scott, deceased.
George M. Smith, Medora, Ind., in place of H. H. Zollman, resigned.
Paul Burns, Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters, retired.
Henry Kenneth Dennis, Pekin, Ind., in place of J. R. Hall, retired.
Arthur R. Bietry, Richmond, Ind., in place of F. B. Pickett, deceased.
Stanley G. Oesch, Topeka, Ind., in place of R. J. Clark, deceased.
Clarence R. Howe, Troy, Ind., in place of O. R. Huff, deceased.
Charles David Keller, Valparaiso, Ind., in place of R. B. Wise, retired.
Evart Julian, Winslow, Ind., in place of J. D. Arnold, retired.

IOWA

Thomas J. Hamilton, Epworth, Iowa, in place of S. J. Callahan, retired.
Jerry J. Snoble, Hazleton, Iowa, in place of G. E. Sherrer, retired.
Charles E. Boyles, Woodward, Iowa, in place of H. C. Calonkey, retired.

KANSAS

Thomas M. Holmes, Altamont, Kans., in place of M. E. McRae, transferred.
Raymond R. Miller, Hanston, Kans., in place of H. J. Hunter, retired.
Jack R. Houston, Seneca, Kans., in place of Gordon Alvis, removed.
Leroy E. Blocker, Wetmore, Kans., in place of J. A. Hanks, retired.

KENTUCKY

Joseph S. Rhodes, Jr., Frenchburg, Ky., in place of C. M. Swim, retired.
John T. Durham, Greensburg, Ky., in place of R. E. Vaughn, retired.
Rees H. Dickson, Jeffersontown, Ky., in place of B. H. Dean, removed.
Barber L. Shelton, Nortonville, Ky., in place of J. B. Ellington, retired.
Thomas C. Thomson, Providence, Ky., in place of C. E. Withers, deceased.
Walter W. Buckman, Simpsonville, Ky., in place of R. A. McDowell, retired.

LOUISIANA

Marlin M. Ryder, Deville, La., in place of J. M. Wilbanks, retired.
Edith C. Lafargue, Keithville, La., in place of A. J. Lafargue, resigned.
Louise E. Osborn, Roseland, La., in place of A. E. Morse, resigned.

MAINE

Raoul D. Cyr, Madawaska, Maine, in place of Paul Archambault, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edgar H. Peterson, Acton, Mass., in place of B. E. Hurley, retired.
Robert R. DeRosier, Billerica, Mass., in place of F. A. Rogers, retired.
William H. Folkins, Groton, Mass., in place of T. F. Donahue, retired.
John H. Knox, Littleton, Mass., in place of P. J. Smith, deceased.
Nathaniel A. Nash, Oakdale, Mass., in place of Laura Boulais, retired.

MICHIGAN

Joseph B. Woodrow, Jr., Augusta, Mich., in place of C. E. Richardson, removed.
Viberta M. Martin, Bancroft, Mich., in place of J. N. Carruthers, resigned.
Frank R. Sweeney, Bay City, Mich., in place of W. J. Schindehette, retired.
Carl R. Sterner, Dryden, Mich., in place of Floyd Slate, retired.
Theodore H. Lyon, Eaton Rapids, Mich., in place of W. V. Clegg, retired.
Robert W. Dullinger, Hubbard Lake, Mich., in place of A. H. Thompson, retired.
Alfred J. Pini, Hubbell, Mich., in place of T. J. Kaufman, retired.
Justin A. Mitchell, Leonidas, Mich., in place of Diana Wardwell, removed.
John Burdette Shaft, Leslie, Mich., in place of V. E. McIntee, transferred.
Richard F. Minzey, McBain, Mich., in place of R. W. Gilliom, resigned.
George T. Anderson, Mayville, Mich., in place of E. M. Lynch, retired.
John P. Danielson, Michigamme, Mich., in place of M. E. Devins, retired.
Raymond W. Hooker, Mount Pleasant, Mich., in place of L. R. Haight, transferred.
Rolla B. Crandell, Northstar, Mich., in place of V. C. Eyer, retired.
David L. Bellinger, Rosebush, Mich., in place of R. P. McConnell, retired.
William F. Kunst, St. Claire Shores, Mich., in place of D. E. Visnaw, removed.
John E. Luttmann, Sturgis, Mich., in place of H. E. Augspurger, resigned.
Burr D. Eveleth, Jr., Ubly, Mich., in place of G. I. Holdship, retired.
Albert A. Hebda, Wyandottee, Mich., in place of Adam Przybylski, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Preston H. Anderson, Blackduck, Minn., in place of G. M. Squires, deceased.
Carl O. Palmer, Buffalo, Minn., in place of L. E. Torrison, transferred.
Emmet H. Beckman, Bird Island, Minn., in place of J. D. Fehlhaber, resigned.
Edmonde K. Evanson, Canby, Minn., in place of H. A. Nelson, deceased.
Ralph W. Breitenbach, Darwin, Minn., in place of C. V. Miller, Jr., resigned.
Neil S. Rasmusson, Emmons, Minn., in place of C. L. Guthier, deceased.
Erwin D. Beutel, Lake Elmo, Minn., in place of R. A. Collopy, retired.
Adelbert O. Ames, Springfield, Minn., in place of W. J. Mueller, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Murray H. Martin, Bentonia, Miss., in place of B. F. Gerrard, retired.
James T. Caviness, Blue Mountain, Miss., in place of W. N. Guyton, retired.
Hilliard E. Griffin, Coffeeville, Miss., in place of F. H. Cooke, retired.
James Marion Parks, Doddsville, Miss., in place of V. E. Pentecost, retired.
Taylor V. Beasley, Harperville, Miss., in place of N. B. Eley, retired.
Hade W. Sessums, Lena, Miss., in place of W. M. Windham, deceased.
Donald D. Hale, Lumberton, Miss., in place of L. D. Fulmer, retired.
Willie D. Brantley, Sebastopol, Miss., in place of L. R. Anthony, retired.
James B. Johnston, Shubuta, Miss., in place of L. N. Mixon, deceased.
Robert T. Freeman, Union, Miss., in place of S. O. Taylor, deceased.
Herbert L. Hogue, Walnut Grove, Miss., in place of M. C. Ferguson, retired.

MISSOURI

Lawrence L. Voelker, Bertrand, Mo., in place of M. T. Russell, deceased.
Gordon A. Rollins, Carthage, Mo., in place of C. O. Smith, removed.
Herschel E. Morris, Clifton Hill, Mo., in place of W. E. Malone, transferred.
Roy Scantlin, Crocker, Mo., in place of F. L. Decker, resigned.
Ernest A. Homan, Jr., Marquand, Mo., in place of M. R. Ellis, resigned.
Edward D. Hogan, Martin City, Mo., in place of J. F. Roberts, resigned.
Floyd S. Drew, Qulin, Mo., in place of M. E. Christie, deceased.
Sylvia Cooper, Sheldon, Mo., in place of Evelyn Steward, resigned.

MONTANA

Charles E. Rice, Bozeman, Mont., in place of Jack Cruickshank, resigned.
Irma M. Hughes, East Glacier Park, Mont., in place of Cleola Ralston, retired.
Mabel W. Boman, Frenchtown, Mont., in place of L. L. Bowman, resigned.
Ellis Crosby Willis, Fromberg, Mont., in place of Jeanette Ross, retired.
Catherine Ann Triplett, Geyser, Mont., in place of R. J. Armont, resigned.
E. LaVerne Kaufmann, Grassrange, Mont., in place of J. J. Grogan, resigned.
Stephen Sams, Joliet, Mont., in place of H. C. Wilcox, deceased.
Alice H. Klempel, Lambert, Mont., in place of M. P. Browne, retired.
Lillian A. Hylland, Richland, Mont., in place of M. B. Squires, resigned.
Raymond A. Merritt, Roundup, Mont., in place of Margaret Huppe, retired.
Robert Julian, Sheridan, Mont., in place of F. A. Marsh, retired.

NEBRASKA

Bernard A. Boots, Ashby, Nebr., in place of Joyce Hubbard, retired.
John H. Rethwisch, Carroll, Nebr., in place of M. W. Ahern, retired.
Beulah M. Kitchens, Greenwood, Nebr., in place of Elsie Kelly, retired.
Robert Eugene Maw, Hershey, Nebr., in place of I. D. Brownfield, retired.

NEVADA

Mortimer W. Wagner, Boulder City, Nev., in place of O. E. Rhoades, transferred.
Efton E. Swindler, Hawthorne, Nev., in place of M. L. Andrews, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Lillian M. Tashjian, Beebe River, N. H., in place of J. H. Hopkins, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Francis E. Coffey, Blackwood Terrace, N. J., in place of V. E. Wise, removed.
Allegra M. Sweet, Closter, N. J., in place of Warren Eckerson, retired.
Anthony J. Pellecchia, Hanover, N. J., in place of O. C. Whaites, retired.
Frances L. Pitcher, Holmdel, N. J., in place of T. W. Hance, retired.
Charles A. Hicks, New Market, N. J., in place of R. F. Murray, deceased.
Harry E. Apgar, North Branch Depot, N. J., in place of W. W. Bunn, retired.
Harvey W. Dawson, Pedricktown, N. J., in place of K. A. Cooney, retired.
Clyde A. E. Snyder, Sr., Point Pleasant, N. J., in place of W. T. Johnson, deceased.
Michael Yurcisin, Roebling, N. J., in place of George Majoros, Jr., removed.
Grace V. Ellis, Rosemont, N. J., in place of E. T. Sherwood, retired.

NEW MEXICO-TEXAS

Asa N. Ealy, Anthony, N. Mex.-Tex., in place of P. E. Darybshire, resigned.
Matthew J. Price, Fort Stanton, N. Mex., in place of C. A. Terrell, deceased.
Irene G. Fullerton, Prewitt, N. Mex., in place of J. D. LaFont, resigned.
Jose M. Maestas, Jr., Santa Rosa, N. Mex., in place of J. Z. Sanchez, retired.

NEW YORK

Margurette E. Stark, Altona, N. Y., in place of B. I. Coultry, retired.
Bernice M. Murphy, Cattaraugus, N. Y.,, in place of J. B. Kilburn, retired.
Marta E. Hoffmann, Commack, N. Y., in place of M. S. Otten, retired.
Wendell C. Wilber, Delanson, N. Y., in place of L. A. Rockwell, resigned.
Raymond V. Seaman, Gilbertsville, N. Y., in place of H. B. Brown, retired.
Harry C. Cotier, Hicksville, N. Y., in place of W. G. Mollitor, retired.
Burdette W. Playfoot, Horseheads, N. Y., in place of W. A. Danaher, retired.
Noel R. Pearson, Little Valley, N. Y., in place of James Case, retired.
Fred H. Woolschlager, Lowville, N. Y., in place of S. J. Day, deceased.
David O. Rourke, Madrid, N. Y., in place of W. J. Finnegan, resigned.

Willis Clayton Farnham, Manlius, N. Y., in place of E. B. Koons, retired.
James E. Reilly, Massapequa Park, N. Y., in place of J. M. Southard, removed.
Percy Pembleton, Monroe, N. Y., in place of J. T. Crotty, retired.
Howard A. Searle, Newfane, N. Y., in place of S. E. Dodge, retired.
Archie C. Davidson, New City, N. Y., in place of J. A. Lynch, removed.
Joseph F. Ambrose, Thornwood, N. Y., in place of M. C. Eichhorn, resigned.
Ruth H. Dexter, Wampsville, N. Y., in place of M. E. Perry, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Judson G. Burrell, Barnardsville, N. C., in place of S. M. Brigmon, retired.
Ruth A. Farrior, Calypso, N. C., in place of Russell Best, retired.
Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N. C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.
Charles L. Alexander, Kings Mountain, N. C., in place of W. E. Blakely, resigned.
Dexter G. Oakley, Lawsonville, N. C., in place of J. T. Tucker, transferred.
Robert A. Liles, Lilesville, N. C., in place of W. B. Flake, retired.
John B. McLaughlin, Newell, N. C., in place of S. B. Wilson, retired.
Alice H. Graves, Seagrove, N. C., in place of J. L. Kearns, deceased.
Martin T. Southard, Stokesdale, N. C., in place of H. G. Cook, retired.
Ruth E. Parrish, Summerfield, N. C., in place of M. M. Ellington, retired.
Ida R. Irvine, Tarheel, N. C., in place of W. J. Monroe, retired.
Jasper M. Brown, Troy, N. C., in place of G. A. Holt, transferred.

NORTH DAKOTA

Otto W. Chapek, Anamoose, N. Dak., in place of H. R. Wold, transferred.
Dennis F. Evert, Edgeley, N. Dak., in place of W. A. Gamble, deceased.
Charles S. Moores, Finley, N. Dak., in place of N. A. Anderson, retired.
Edward Barth, Fort Yates, N. Dak., in place of L. J. Hokanson, retired.
Edith M. Lyle, Havana, N. Dak., in place of E. E. Parrow, transferred.
Ira V. Martin, Hettinger, N. Dak., in place of E. E. Jacobsen, retired.
Lawrence D. Larsen, Kindred, N. Dak., in place of A. A. Ringen, retired.
Clyde E. Ellison, Leonard, N. Dak., in place of F. C. Schroeder, retired.
Lillian R. Van Doren, Medora, N. Dak., in place of J. J. Eaton, retired.
Leo E. Tibbs, Minot, N. Dak., in place of Nellie Dougherty, retired.
Mons K. Ohnstad, Jr., Sharon, N. Dak., in place of M. K. Ohnstad, retired.
Brownell H. Cole, Valley City, N. Dak., in place of C. K. Otto, retired.
Ardell C. Bakko, Walcott, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Hanson, resigned.

OHIO

Jasper Kirt Everett, Cairo, Ohio, in place of O. B. Morris, deceased.
Beulah M. Lowe, Clayton, Ohio, in place of Vane Wagner, retired.
William R. Davis, Creston, Ohio, in place of W. F. Hookway, retired.
Ruthella D. Termeer, Dublin, Ohio, in place of W. W. Hill, removed.
Samuel W. Brown, East Liverpool, Ohio, in place of R. C. Benedum, deceased.
William A. Gail, Jr., Fowler, Ohio. Office established May 16, 1954.
Donald G. Woodward, Geneva-on-the-Lake, Ohio, in place of Eusebio Pera, retired.
Samuel R. Kerns, Leesburg, Ohio, in place of Clare Trent, retired.
Robert F. Burton, Middle Point, Ohio, in place of L. E. Clawson, deceased.
Galen A. Seeger, New Springfield, Ohio, in place of C. F. Stewart, retired.
Walter H. Cowles, Walbridge, Ohio, in place of E. I. Ducket, removed.
Clarence R. Trumbull, Jr., Weston, Ohio, in place of J. P. Businger, resigned.
Lell A. Smith, Wheelersburg, Ohio, in place of H. W. Staker, retired.
Elvin B. McKay, Wilmington, Ohio, in place of J. F. Smith, removed.

OKLAHOMA

Donald E. Jones, Byars, Okla., in place of J. D. Corbett, resigned.
Paul O. Wright, Hobart, Okla., in place of F. E. Gillespie, retired.
Guy W. Willibey, Sapulpa, Okla, in place of G. B. Grigsby, resigned.
Winslow W. Campbell, Stonewall, Okla., in place of R. H. Greenlee, resigned.
James B. Cox, Tahlequah, Okla., in place of W. H. Balentine, retired.
Gene L. Taylor, Wann, Okla., in place of D. M. Bailey, resigned.

OREGON

Willard A. Hughitt, Redmond, Oreg., in place of A. H. Tifft, retired.
Robert C. Wright, Taft, Oreg., in place of J. R. DeJardin, deceased.
Roger C. Smoot, Talent, Oreg., in place of P. S. Terrill, deceased.
Russell C. Neitzel, Westport, Oreg., in place of Mayrue Gregory, retired.
Catherine E. Weckerle, Winchester, Oreg., in place of M. L. Nance, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Alvin J. Oldham, California, Pa., in place of E. W. Sulek, resigned.
Joseph T. Hauser, Delaware Water Gap, Pa., in place of E. T. Brodhead, retired.
Florence L. Willard, Derrick City, Pa., in place of H. J. Robbins, declined.
George N. Sterner, Dewart, Pa., in place of H. B. Sterner, deceased.
Edwin B. Kimmel, Elderton, Pa., in place of J. F. Mulberger, retired.
Louis J. Prime, Emporium, Pa., in place of J. E. Burnside, retired.
Edward J. Flood, Flourtown, Pa., in place of H. W. Billingsley, resigned.
Wilmer E. King, Harrisburg, Pa., in place of L. A. Werner, retired.
James F. Timony, Hazleton, Pa., in place of C. A. Hanlon, retired.
Mary C. Pratt, Hopwood, Pa., in place of F. W. Coughanour, Jr., resigned.
John H. Hayes, Kersey, Pa., in place of C. E. Boyer, retired.
John R. Dietcher, Jr., Line Lexington, Pa., in place of J. P. Rice, retired.
William Robert Miller, Linglestown, Pa., in place of A. M. Schaner, retired.
George E. Palko, Loyalhanna, Pa., in place of T. S. Walter, resigned.
Millie Morelli, Ludlow, Pa., in place of M. E. Logan, retired.
William Lisle Stephenson, Mahaffey, Pa., in place of E. C. Mahaffey, transferred.
Fred D. Cleavenger, Mapletown, Pa., in place of Fred Cleavenger, retired.
Henry Douglas Carpenter, Middletown, Pa., in place of R. M. Tritch, resigned.
Robert P. Icelow, New Hope, Pa., in place of G. L. Corrigan, retired.
Charles M. Manwiller, Palmyra, Pa., in place of I. B. Earley, resigned.
Alfred A. Yarnell, Petersburg, Pa., in place of H. C. Cresswell, deceased.
Donald C. Shaffer, Portage, Pa., in place of J. W. Nash, removed.
George Spishock, Pricedale, Pa., in place of M. A. Turner, retired.
Malcolm Decker, Ramey, Pa., in place of Leonard Buranovsky, resigned.
Howard A. Miller, Richfield, Pa., in place of J. H. Snyder, resigned.
Lester I. Heist, Robesonia, Pa., in place of B. M. Kintzer, retired.
Elvin Charles Kaufman, Rockwood, Pa., in place of E. L. Leaphart, retired.
Robert A. Hunt, Sandy Lake, Pa., in place of George McConnell, deceased.
Donald J. Locke, Shade Gap, Pa., in place of W. M. Locke, retired.
Irvin K. Davis, Slatington, Pa., in place of G. S. Behler, resigned.
Glenn Crise, Smithton, Pa., in place of H. C. Johnston, removed.
John R. Hench, Spring Grove, Pa., in place of J. S. Stambaugh, retired.
Mary I. Hoy, Villa Maria, Pa., in place of R. C. Pierson, retired.
Robert H. Jenkins, Wapwallopen, Pa., in place of G. M. Barrall, transferred.
Ernest O. Clayton, Waynesburg, Pa., in place of W. R. Cumpston, removed.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John W. Stevenson, Carlisle, S. C., in place of M. B. Ratchford, deceased.
Sara M. Campbell, Clio, S. C., in place of K. L. McIntyre, retired.
John M. Harrelson, Drayton, S. C., in place of G. S. Orpin, resigned.
Myrtle E. Case, Ocean Drive Beach, S. C., in place of C. O. Hester, declined.
Joseph W. Milling, Jr., Ridgeway, S. C., in place of J. D. Boyd, transferred.
Samuel A. Elliott, Windy Hill Beach, S. C., in place of B. E. Reynolds, Sr., resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Howard B. Jones, Armour, S. Dak., in place of G. E. Hagen, retired.
Ethel M. Flood, Brandon, S. Dak., in place of R. E. Peterson, retired.
Dale R. Dunn, Dell Rapids, S. Dak., in place of J. A. Nesby, retired.
Ofa M. Simpson, Fort Pierre, S. Dak., in place of M. E. Fackelman, resigned.
Raymond C. Drayer, Frankfort, S. Dak., in place of N. F. King, retired.
Marvin R. Smith, Gettysburg, S. Dak., in place of Fred Shroyer, retired.
Raymond A. Andersen, Irene, N. Dak., in place of J. R. Andersen, removed.
Kenneth W. Anderson, Midland, S. Dak., in place of J. E. Elrod, removed.
Morris F. Broe, Mobridge, S. Dak., in place of J. E. Meyer, removed.
Russell C. Bernhard, Parkston, S. Dak., in place of W. H. Fergen, retired.
Maurice L. Wilhelm, Redfield, S. Dak., in place of E. R. Humeston, retired.
LaVerne R. Hughes, Stickney, S. Dak., in place of N. E. Gruenzner, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Morris F. Dozier, Ashland City, Tenn., in place of J. W. Nicholson, retired.
Doris M. Huffman, Bartlett, Tenn., in place of A. J. Jones, retired.
Willie L. Newberry, Gleason, Tenn., in place of G. P. Brummitt, retired.
Kathleen West Keeton, Helenwood, Tenn., in place of L. E. Ryan, removed.
Ulysses B. Coker, Jacksboro, Tenn., in place of B. T. Queener, retired.
George L. Bowman, Lenoir City, Tenn., in place of H. M. Calloway, retired.
William B. Tatum, Lyles, Tenn., in place of D. P. Lyell, removed.
Frank L. Oakes, Milligan College, Tenn., in place of N. H. Taylor, resigned.
Albert M. Daniel, New Market, Tenn., in place of B. L. Loy, retired.
Larry E. Hagood, Persia, Tenn., in place of R. M. Morelock, retired.
John W. Jennings, Rives, Tenn., in place of H. H. Hunt, retired.
Joe A. Lavender, Rock Island, Tenn., in place of W. E. Moore, retired.
Harold D. Huff, Thompsons Station, Tenn., in place of M. L. Cannon, retired.
William Raymon Kea, Waynesboro, Tenn., in place of C. A. Galloway, retired.

TEXAS

Williams S. Clements, Atlanta, Tex., in place of H. H. McWilliams, deceased.

Elmer E. Cryer, Bartlett, Tex., in place of H. O. Lindeman, deceased.
Marion Lee Neal, Baytown, Tex., in place of N. B. Ballard, transferred.
James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.
Homer B. Adams, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
Joseph A. Campbell, Covington, Tex., in place of B. O. Sanford, retired.
Edward H. Webster, Floydada, Tex., in place of B. H. Smith, retired.
Richard Thomas Cowan, Fort Worth, Tex., in place of D. C. Jernigin, deceased.
James P. Fortenberry, Friona, Tex., in place of S. H. Osborn, resigned.
Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park, Tex., in place of E. P. Minnock, removed.
Anita D. Wilkison, Hidalgo, Tex., in place of Rafaela Guerra, removed.
Henry T. Davis, Justin, Tex., in place of R. C. Dooley, transferred.
Ronald A. Helfenstine, Kennedale, Tex., in place of Sallie Helm, resigned.
Samuel J. Morse, Jr., Linden, Tex., in place of N. L. Stanley, transferred.
Robert D. Bohning, Lometa, Tex., in place of W. E. Everett, deceased.
Jeffie M. Griffith, Lockney, Tex., in place of H. B. Machen, resigned.
Annie E. Kain, Matagorda, Tex., in place of M. E. Pennington, retired.
William M. Turnbough, Meadow, Tex., in place of H. M. Welch, resigned.
Joyce M. Kee, Melissa, Tex., in place of M. E. Nichols, retired.
Mable D. Tompkins, Montague, Tex., in place of Fowler Magee, retired.
Ruby L. Ferrell, North Zulch, Tex., in place of A. C. Black, removed.
Hal Singleton, III, O'Donnell, Tex., in place of J. M. Noble, Jr., transferred.
Herbert W. Havemann, Orange Grove, Tex., in place of D. P. Seidel, declined.
Kyle C. Elam, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of F. C. Toups, deceased.
Ocie K. Milner, Jr., Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.
Doris F. Wiess, Sabine Pass, Tex., in place of Lura Moss, removed.
James D. Tidwell, Simms, Tex., in place of N. E. Webb, retired.
Alda R. McDougal, Smyer, Tex., in place of S. W. Arnett, deceased.
Hal M. Knight, Sterling City, Tex., in place of A. L. Johnson, removed.
Thomas J. Pippin, Van, Tex., in place of E. R. Cunningham, deceased.
Charles S. Engle, Jr., Wolfe City, Tex., in place of B. W. Clayton, resigned.
Henry M. Durham, Woodville, Tex., in place of A. H. Hughes, retired.

UTAH

Henry D. Malmgren, Centerfield, Utah, in place of Affalone Jensen, retired.
June I. Hunsaker, Honeyville, Utah, in place of P. T. Boothe, retired.

VIRGINIA

Hershel E. Boyd, Raven, Va., in place of A. W. Horton, retired.
Ervin C. Brown, Sweet Briar, Va., in place of C. M. Hunt, transferred.
William W. Edwards, Union Level, Va., in place of A. P. Gordon, retired.

WASHINGTON

Glenn R. Fredericksen, Cashmere, Wash., in place of S. J. Hughes, removed.
John E. Harrison, Eastsound, Wash., in place of E. B. Gibson, deceased.
Dwight L. Cruea, Everson, Wash., in place of H. L. Thompson, resigned.
Henry Grosso, Harper, Wash., in place of R. C. Henery, resigned.
Clifford E. Swenson, Harrington, Wash, in place of C. A. Scott, failed to return from military duty.
Viola B. Boyd, Marlin, Wash., in place of Hans Christoffersen, deceased.
Kenneth E. Roberts, Nooksack, Wash., in place of L. G. Pike, retired.
Robert F. Whitten, Ocean Park, Wash., in place of W. C. Pearson, retired.
Marion E. Keeney, Pacific Beach, Wash., in place of Sydney Moon, resigned.
Paul E. McMahan, Randle, Wash., in place of F. L. Magill, deceased.
Josiah F. Lester, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of R. H. Maus, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Shirley E. Conway, Albany, Wis., in place of A. H. Meinert, retired.
Ruth E. Hogan, Ashland, Wis., in place of C. J. McGeehan, retired.
Arnold C. Works, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehrer, retired.
Roy Bump, Baraboo, Wis., in place of R. J. Osborne, retired.
Elsbeth P. Jacob, Caledonia, Wis., in place of W. F. Ehrhardt, resigned.
Wallace Gordon Yadon, Delavan, Wis., in place of J. T. Murphy, retired.
Edward L. Williams, El Dorado, Wis., in place of C. F. Abbs, resigned.
Joseph L. List, Pound, Wis., in place of L. H. Culver, retired.
Orlan L. Prestegard, Readstown, Wis., in place of N. M. Johnson, resigned.
Harold A. Meyer, Shawano, Wis., in place of W. J. Milsap, resigned.
Henry L. Yulga, Stevens Point, Wis., in place of H. J. Glinski, resigned.
Neal E. Jones, Wausau, Wis., in place of G. R. Schoenfeld, retired.
Hartvig J. Elstad, Whitehall, Wis., in place of W. A. Johnson, transferred.
Raymond J. Chamberlain, Whitewater, Wis., in place of R. J. Kiernan, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1956:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Sigurd Anderson, of South Dakota, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1952.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years.

The following-named persons for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to qualifications provided by law:

John H. Brittain	Wilbur R. Porter
Emil H. Kirsch	Percy L. Bernstein
George R. Shelton	Charles A. Schanck
George A. Nelson	

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

APPOINTMENTS

The following-named persons to be lieutenants:

Warren R. Cushman	Alfred R. Hackbarth
James L. Brewer	John W. Leadbetter, Jr.

The following-named persons to be lieutenants (junior grade):

John D. Franks	Gilbert P. Sherburne
Bertrand J. Ronneberg	John D. Costello
	James R. Kelly
Herbert S. Hammaren	Clarence R. Gillett
Raymond H. Baetsen, Jr.	Charles E. Jurgens
	John H. Byrd, Jr.
David J. Linde	Glenn N. Parsons
William J. Glass	Robert G. Moore
Richard B. Brooks	Leon D. Santman
Edward G. Taylor	Patrick M. Jacobsen
David C. McClary	Harry J. Gardner
Robert T. Platt, Jr.	Henry N. Helgesen
Kenneth G. Wiman	Peter J. DeLaat, Jr.
Robert V. Hackney	Robert A. Carlston
Melvin W. Hallock	Robert B. Sims
James M. Barrett, Jr.	Sieguard E. Waldheim
John R. L. Hihn	Eugene G. Verrett
Sidney O. Tharrington, Jr.	Peter A. Morrill
	Ralph S. Kelley, Jr.
Robert C. Branham	James E. Thompson
John R. Lobkovich	David F. McIntosh
Gerald O. Lesperance	Donald C. Thompson
Carlton E. Russell	William S. Black
Willie W. Thurmond, Jr.	George E. Stickle, Jr.
	Joseph Stech
Robert D. Peters	John D. Steinbacher
Edmond Janczyk	Vincent E. Keyes
Robert S. Lucas	William H. Clark, Jr.
Bruce W. Dewing	Herbert G. Lyons
Herbert W. Eley	John F. Ellis

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–4:

John L. Price	Ross J. Hensley
Kurt F. Czybora	August Dannenberg
James E. Barr	Gabriel V. Denisov
Harvey E. Willis	Preddie G. Bookout
Thurman Salter	Milton H. Bradley
Harold G. Weber	Frank Fitch
Russell D. Erickson	Ronald S. Jacobs
William Miller	John E. Midgett
Walter F. Booth	Richard E. Walker
Jesse M. Jenkins, Jr.	Edward L. Masters
"A" "J" Beard	Edward C. Brichta
Frederick H. Raumer	James G. Leadbeater
Nulland E. Mahar	George W. Rickles
James E. Bill	Darcy W. Reid
Hubert R. Lindsey	Lester R. Chenoweth
Harlan E. Sterling	Henry McAllister
Alexander J. Cseh III	Milo Taber
George W. Madsen	

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–3:

Ludwig K. Rubinsky	Hudson M. Cooper
Michael Travers	Harold M. Schiffbauer
Seward S. Smith	John T. Borys
Lloyd M. Probst	Louis Breitenbach
Frank J. Macedonia	Roscoe Smith
Eugene Linneman	Ray E. Newton
George M. Seaman	Edward F. Birmingham
Raymond C. DeSelms	
Joseph E. Acker	Robert A. Johnson
John T. Hendrix	Joseph F. Van Cleave
Myles P. Lattin	Robert F. Anderson
Melvin H. Eaton	John H. Elliott
Michael J. O'Leary	

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W–2:

Wendell C. Leatherman	Carl A. Simon
	George S. Drew
Carl F. Michael	Rudolph E. Anderson
Donald H. R. Fraser	William K. Cooper
Christian A. Weitzel	Donald Cobaugh
Walter R. Goldhammer	Gerald M. Davis
	Luther C. Knight
Fred M. Guild, Jr.	Ellis P. Ward
Harold W. Wooley	Charles C. Colmer
John A. McCullough, Jr.	Edward E. Walker
	Donald A. Nystrom
Benjamin F. Weems	Herbert L. Johnson
Norman J. Wirsching	John A. Dearden
LeRoy F. Lander	Louie W. Stanley
William I. Janicke	Martin J. Trieschmann
Charles H. Sanders	
Jack D. Rodgers	James A. Lovewell
Marshall K. Phillips	Artell B. Crowley, Jr.
William R. Wessel	Martin F. Groff
Gordon R. Campbell	Lloyd T. Twiford
Ronald McClellan	Robert E. Lee
Millard W. Johnson	George A. Davisworth, Jr.
Daniel W. Cluff	
Robert C. Ashdon	George W. Hupper
William E. Hughes	Joseph L. Richardson
Stanley Thoroughman	Joseph D. Edwards
Victor A. Adams	Charles I. Carpenter
Jack S. Breschini	Roy Merrill
Leo V. Walsh, Jr.	Adrian Fulcher
Shelbert P. Creech	George J. McKinlock
Glenn N. Nelson	Dwight F. Conyne
David A. Smith	Walter S. Yeargain
William H. Thorrington	Robert J. Krueger
	George C. Werth
Warren E. Riley	Alva W. Henderson
Raymond I. Trenck	Herbert H. Oakes
Floyd V. McCombs	Christopher D. Elling
Daniel C. Giller	John C. Carney
Leslie A. Mears	Philip L. Regan
Robert J. Klestinec	Karl V. Macklin
Millard W. Foster	

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, Thou art of all friends the nearest, of all counselors the wisest, and of all helpers the ablest and most willing to minister unto our needs in times of crises and confusion.

We pray that Thy spirit may inspire us with an earnest and eager longing to contribute more generously and wholeheartedly to the welfare and peace of all mankind.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servant, our colleague, who now dwells in eternal blessedness, forever with the Lord.

Thou hast opened unto him the gateway to the larger life and received him into Thy nearer presence.

Grant unto the sorrowing and lonely the consolations of Thy grace and may they yield themselves without murmur or complaint to that divine providence which is too wise to err and too kind to injure.

In Christ's name we offer our petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On January 20, 1956:

H. R. 5614. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in regard to protests of grants of instruments of authorization without hearing.

On January 25, 1956:

H. R. 1022. An act for the relief of Antonio Andrea Chitato;

H. R. 1145. An act for the relief of Ora L. Powers;

H. R. 1146. An act for the relief of the Pacific Music Supply Co.;

H. R. 1183. An act for the relief of Baldomero R. Garcia, Teresa Garcia y Braganza, Francisco Garcia, Teresita Garcia, and Eduardo Garcia;

H. R. 1752. An act for the relief of Johanna Juresic Grgurich;

H. R. 1768. An act for the relief of the Jefferson and Plaquemines Drainage District and certain persons whose properties abut on the Federal Government's right-of-way for Harvey Canal in Louisiana;

H. R. 1910. An act for the relief of Blanka Goldstein;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of Der Chuck Yee and Wu Mei On;

H. R. 2296. An act for the relief of Simone Gilliland; and

H. R. 3027. An act for the relief of Leo E. Verhaeghe.

On January 28, 1956:

H. R. 938. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc;

H. R. 1219. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margaret A. Swift;

H. R. 1447. An act for the relief of Aleksandra Borkowski;

H. R. 2278. An act for the relief of Consuelo Calderon de Villarreal;

H. R. 2466. An act for the relief of Marino and Giselda Proni;

H. R. 2467. An act for the relief of Ivo and Elia Monari;

H. R. 4582. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to deductions from gross income of amounts contributed to employees' trusts;

H. R. 5428. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to the period of limitation for filing claims by certain transferees and fiduciaries for credit or refund of income taxes;

H. R. 7036. An act to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the earned income limitation on retirement income;

H. R. 7282. An act relating to the allowance of the credits for dividends received, for dividends paid, and for a Western Hemisphere trade corporation in computing the alternative tax of a corporation with respect to its capital gains; and

H. R. 7364. An act relating to the application of the documentary stamp tax to transfers of certain obligations paid for in installments.

On January 31, 1956:

H. R. 1015. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Derfery William Wright.

On February 2, 1956:

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Leong Ding Foon Quon; and

H. R. 7871. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953.

On February 10, 1956:

H. R. 5844. An act to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport;

H. R. 7930. An act authorizing the completion of the initial stage of development for flood control and other purposes in the Russian River Basin, Calif.; and

H. J. Res. 471. Joint resolution to permit FHA title I repair assistance to new homes damaged by major disasters.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

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

There was no objection.

THE NEW ORLEANS MARDI GRAS

(Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, each year when the Mardi Gras is being celebrated in the city of New Orleans as it has been for many generations, the Louisiana State Society here in the Nation's Capital has an annual Mardi Gras ball. The president of our State society is Mr. Felix Broussard. Each year this Mardi Gras ball is given about the same time that the Mardi Gras is being celebrated in the city of New Orleans.

We give this ball in Washington and dedicate it to a Louisiana industry. Last year the ball was dedicated to the rice industry and the year before to the sugar industry. This year our ball will be held tomorrow night and will be dedicated to the great oil industry of Louisiana.

I would also like to point out that each year we have many, many beautiful young ladies who come to Washington from all parts of Louisiana as queens of the various festivals throughout the State. There are 25 queens in all and I think everyone will agree with me when you look up into the gallery and see those 25 beautiful queens along with the queen of all queens, Miss Lee Anna Martino, of New Orleans, who will reign over this Mardi Gras ball tomorrow night. She also ruled as queen last fall at the Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition at Lafayette, La. Miss Martino is a graduate of Sacred Heart High School and Ursuline College, of New Orleans. She is one of the most beautiful ladies in all the South and I am sure she will make the Washington Mardi Gras a most gorgeous queen.

Her king will be Mr. William L. "Buddy" Billups, president of one of the South's largest independent oil companies with headquarters in Hammond, La. Mr. Billups has been an outstanding businessman in the oil field for many years and is known and respected throughout the entire oil industry. Not only have these beautiful queens come for the Mardi Gras party, but also have distinguished citizens from both Louisiana and Texas and at this time I would like to mention a few: Mr. and Mrs. Willard Johnson from Texas; Mr. and Mrs. Harry Brown from Houston, Tex.; Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Boudreau of Lake Charles, La.; Mr. and Mrs. I. W. Hoskins from Lake Charles, La.; Gov. Jimmy Davis from Louisiana; State Senator and Mrs. C. H. Downs from Louisiana; Mr. and Mrs. J. Moody Ellington from Louisiana; Mr. and Mrs. Stanley H. Freeman, Mr. J. R. Tully, Mr. Garnett, Jr., and Mr. and Mrs. L. C. Latham, Mr. and Mrs. Charles D. Saunders, Mr. and Mrs. Ford Graham, and Louisiana Democratic Committeeman Mr. Camile Gravel and wife, all from Louisiana.

The tableau of the ball will be Louisiana under 11 flags and perhaps be the most spectacular and dazzling ball ever given in Washington. Many of Washington's top officials will be there including Adm. Arthur W. Radford, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other notables, about 1,500 in all. The ball will be held at the Sheraton Park Ballroom, one of the most beautiful and largest in the world.

Below is a list of the queens and the festivals that they represent where they reigned as queen of each festival in Louisiana.

Names and addresses of Louisiana queens:

Miss Dixie Breithaupt, sugarcane festival, New Iberia, La.

Miss Sandra Briese, paper festival, Bogalusa, La.,

Miss Lois Boudreaux, dairy festival, Abbeville, La.

Miss Vita Brown, Louisiana fur festival,, Hackberry, La.

Miss Rosalyn Gates, sweetheart of the American Legion, Bogalusa, La.

Miss Donna Loyce Hamic, camellia festival, Lafayette, La.

Miss Glen Hope, spirit of Mardi Gras, New Orleans, La.

Miss Sharon Horne, peach festival, Ruston, La.

Miss Marie Lise Labbé, Southwest Louisiana Madri Gras, Lafayette, La.

Miss Lorette LeMarie, Delcambre fishing industry, Delcambre, La.

Miss Carolyn Leonards, international rice festival, Crowley, La.

Miss Ann McCaleb, north Louisiana delta festival, Bastrop, La.

Miss Bobbie Ann Mistich, orange festival, Buras, La.

Miss Sherry Posey, holiday in Dixie, Shreveport, La.

Miss Martha Richard, domino festival, Cheneyville, La.

Miss Pauline Sanders, future farmer of America, Baton Rouge, La.

Miss Kay Sellers, yambilee festival, Opelousas, La.

Miss Myrna Bea Soileau, cotton festival, Ville Platte, La.

Miss Judy Taylor, Louisiana livestock and pasture festival, Marksville, La.

Miss Elsie Theriot, shrimp festival, Morgan City, La.

Miss Allison C. Townsend, Louisiana Farm Bureau, Baton Rouge, La.

Miss Nealyne Tullas, rose festival, Bogalusa, La.

Miss Patricia Welsh, Miss Independent Oil, Lake Charles, La.

Miss Sherry Yarbrough, Florida Parishes dairy and agriculture, Kentwood, La.

Miss Pat Zimmer, forest festival, Winnfield, La.

Ladies in waiting to her majesty: Miss Patricia Bean, Miss Barbara Boggs, Miss Katherine Bourg, Miss Lucille Breaux, Miss Vaughn Burdin, Miss Elizabeth Coulon, Miss Deidre Rose Dwen, Miss Sarah Foret, Miss Ann Gravel, Miss Carrie Sue Hooks, Miss Marguerite Willis.

Mr. John McHugh, official chaperon.

Officers of the Louisiana State Society are: Felix W. Broussard, president; T. A. Thompson, vice president; J. W. Hanley, sergeant at arms.

I feel greatly honored that I have the privilege of being the chairman for this 1956 Washington Mardi Gras ball dedicated to the oil industry of Louisiana.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that he intends to submit a message from the President of the United States when this is over, then recognize the gentleman from Illinois. That is all the business we will have today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, do I understand then that is the end of the program for today?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if that is all there is to it, I withdraw my point of order that a quorum is not present.

[Mr. MORRISON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 336)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems submitted to me through its Chairman, covering its operations from January 1 to June 30, 1955, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 10, 1956.*

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2667. An act to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7054. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered was granted to Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 15 minutes, on Tuesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, inasmuch as I had a special order, that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

THE LATE CHAUNCEY W. REED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret and a heavy burden on my heart that I announce to the Members of the House the passing of our beloved friend, CHAUNCEY W. REED.

CHAUNCEY REED was vitally interested in his work. He was conscientious. He had but one real objective in mind, and that was to serve his country and his people to the best of his great ability. He worked untiringly to serve his constituents. He loved this great House of Representatives and its membership. He has left his mark on the history of his country through his devoted service on the important Committee on the Judiciary, of which he served as chairman the last Congress.

CHAUNCEY REED was a kindly man, always anxious to assist his colleagues and to offer advice from his great well of wisdom. He never failed to put his associates and his friends ahead of himself. While all of us knew and understood his great contribution to the work of the Congress, I think that those of us who have served with him down through the years will always remember with affection those times when he would retire to the cloakroom, light a cigar, and hold court by spinning yarns and tales of his experiences in the legal profession.

He was definitely honest in all things—mentally honest, as well as otherwise. I would say he was ruggedly honest. In addition to that, he was courageous; he had moral courage at a time when we need that virtue perhaps more than all other virtues.

CHAUNCEY W. REED, Republican, of West Chicago, Ill., was born at West Chicago, Ill., June 2, 1890; educated in West Chicago public and high schools, Northwestern University, and Webster College of Law; city treasurer of city of West Chicago, 1913–14; during the World War served in the 86th Division of the United States Army; was first commander of Naperville Post, No. 43, American Legion, and served as national garde de la forte and national conducteur of La Société des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux; elected State's attorney of Du Page County, Ill., in 1920, 1924, 1928, and 1932; served 4 terms as secretary of the Du Page County Bar Association and 2 terms as president of the Illinois State's

Attorney's Association; chairman of the Du Page County Republican central committee for 8 years; associated in the practice of law at Wheaton, Ill., with Judge Russell W. Keeney; member of the Du Page County, Illinois State, and American Bar Associations; married to Ella Stegen in 1929 and has three children—Barbara Ann, James William, and Thomas Henry, elected to the 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses; chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for the 83d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly happy to include in my remarks a telegram from Father Joe Lonergan, who was a close friend of our colleague. Father Joe Lonergan was national chaplain of the American Legion. His telegram is as follows:

AURORA, ILL., *February 9, 1956.*

Congressman LEO ALLEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please give Mrs. Chauncey Reed, Barbara, James, and Thomas my heartfelt sympathy and my prayers in the departure of her husband and their father and my comrade and friend. It would be a great privilege to stand over his grave at burial to assist in the final salute to a great American.

Father JOE LONERGAN.

Mr. Speaker, the body will lie in state at Lee's Funeral Home, Fourth and Massachusetts Avenue NE., Friday, February 10, 3 p. m. to 3 p. m. Saturday, February 11.

The body will then be moved to C. E. Norris & Son, undertakers, 112 Main Street, West Chicago, Ill., and lie in state Sunday afternoon, February 12, and Monday, February 13. The funeral will be Tuesday, February 14, 2 p. m., American Legion Hall, West Washington Street, West Chicago, Ill.

Funeral services will be conducted by Euclid Lodge, No. 65, A. F. and A. M., of Naperville, with honorary Knight Templar escort, Aurora Commandery, No. 22, Aurora, Ill.

Burial will be at Glen Oak Cemetery, West Chicago.

It is the wish of the family that any tokens of sympathy be sent to American Cancer Society, Inc., 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was with sad heart that I heard of the demise of our beloved colleague, CHAUNCEY REED.

I served with him on the Committee on the Judiciary for over 20 years and developed for him a most affectionate regard. We all learned to know his integrity of purpose, his kindliness, his courtesy, as well as his keenness of perception in understanding the problems that confronted him, not only as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary but also as its chairman.

He respected the high tradition and history of this committee. His chairmanship of the committee greatly enhanced its prestige, and when I followed him I tried to do all in my power to follow his path.

He leaves behind him a good name, the best of all bequeaths.

Our condolences go forth to his wife, his children, and his dear ones. All of us shall sorely miss him.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, so deeply I feel the loss with the passing of my personal friend and colleague that I do not know how to express what is in my heart.

He and I first came to Congress in the same year—a little over 20 years ago. From the day I first met him he won my affection and respect. As I worked with him on mutual problems, on matters of special interest to our State of Illinois, and on various national questions, my admiration of him constantly grew. To know him was to love him. To work with him was to admire him. Today my heart is filled with sorrow beyond measure.

CHAUNCEY REED was a man of great intellectual ability and absolute intellectual honesty. He was indeed an accomplished lawyer. For four successive terms, prior to coming to Congress, he served as State's attorney of Du Page County, Ill. He also served two terms as president of the Illinois State's Attorney Association. This was a statewide recognition of his unusual legal knowledge and ability and his honesty and integrity in the performance of his duties.

Notwithstanding his many attainments and many accomplishments, both in Illinois and here in Congress, notwithstanding the honors that came to him, CHAUNCEY REED remained just a quiet, entirely unassuming man. He approached everything and dealt with everyone with patience and with understanding. He would have made a great judge, just as he made a great chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee and at one time its distinguished chairman, he was directly responsible for many important measures now the law of the land. They are monuments to his work in Congress. I was proud to call CHAUNCEY my friend.

To his lovely wife and fine family I extend my deepest sympathy. I hope they might find some consolation in the knowledge that their loss is shared by countless people.

Weep not that their toils are over,
Weep not that their race is run;
God grant we may rest as calmly
When our work, like theirs, is done.
Till then we yield with gladness
Our treasures to Him to keep,
And rejoice in the glad assurance
He giveth His loved ones sleep.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, CHAUNCEY REED was a great legislator who not only did his work constructively and effectively but in a quiet manner that produced results. He served his district with loyalty and distinction. He served his State and his country with the same loyalty and distinction.

CHAUNCEY REED was not only a great man but over and above that he was a good man. There are some who are great who are not good, and as between greatness and goodness I would rather see goodness than greatness. But in the case of CHAUNCEY REED he was not only great but he was good.

To Mrs. Reed and her loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned that death had taken another friend from our midst.

CHAUNCEY REED came to the Congress at the same time I did, and there were not many of us on this side of the aisle in those days.

But the very limit of our numbers, I think, strengthened the bonds of comradeship among those of us who were here then. My friendship with CHAUNCEY REED continued on down through the years and it was a matter of great satisfaction for me when he became chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Republican 83d Congress.

Affable and able, conscientious and hard working, CHAUNCEY REED demonstrated his ability, his thoughtfulness, and his diplomacy as chariman of his committee.

It was under his fine leadership that the committee brought forth a series of legislative proposals to which reference has already been made designed to give the Federal Government new legal weapons in this Nation's long and hard battle to uncover and prosecute Communist conspirators within our borders.

Most of these measures were enacted with substantial majorities, a testimonial to their rightness and to the feelings of this body with respect to those who would betray America.

These measures are now law, and will stand as major contributions in the career of CHAUNCEY REED to the preservation of liberty in our land.

To his bereaved widow and her fine children I offer my deepest sympathies.

May they take some measure of comfort, at least, in the knowledge that their husband and father lived a useful life, dedicated to the service of his beloved country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinios. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of our distinguished colleague, Mr. CHAUNCEY REED. I had the privilege of serving with him on the Committee on the Judiciary since I became a Member of the House of Representatives. It was on that committee that I learned to know the great qualities of this man, as has been demonstrated by those who have paid tribute to him

here today. It was while serving with this committee that I learned that CHAUNCEY REED was always fair, honest and sincere in all decisions that he made regardless of political affiliation. Now that he has passed on, we will miss him not only in the House of Representatives but on our Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay my deep respect to his widow and to his fine children.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dear colleague CHAUNCEY REED, has affected us all with a deep sorrow that it is difficult to express. We have lost a great leader, patriot, astute legislator, and friend. While he was in our midst, he set us an example of faithfulness, sincerity, honesty, and untiring devotion to our responsibility which we will find a challenge to emulate. Now that he is gone, his memory will remain with us, for it is not possible to forget such a man.

I best knew CHAUNCEY REED through our work together on the Judiciary Committee. When I first came to Congress he was kindly and helpful to me—a stranger to him. He welcomed me to the committee. During our friendship, we talked much together, and his wisdom, derived from experience, made a deep impression upon me.

His services on the Judiciary Committee are well known to all of the Members. As chairman of the committee in the 83d Congress he guided, with consummate skill, the workings of a busy and diversified program. In his dealings with his work and his fellow men he was a competent, thorough, and enlightened person. He believed, as Samuel Johnson put it, that—

> The law is the last result of human wisdom acting upon human experience for the benefit of the public.

In all his actions in public life, CHAUNCEY was guided by the principles of a man whom all of us revere, Abraham Lincoln. Like that earlier son of Illinois, CHAUNCEY was a staunch believer in the right of man to be free and that government should not have the power of economic life over the people. His work among us reflected his belief in the words of Lincoln.

I think CHAUNCEY would agree with me that the highest compliment I could pay him would be to compare him with the Great Emancipator. As Lincoln said of his own principles, so by his actions among us, could CHAUNCEY REED have said: "I am not bound to win, but I am bound to be true. I am not bound to succeed, but I am bound to live up to what light I have. I must stand with anybody that stands right; stand with him when he is right and part with him when he is wrong." Lincoln said it, but CHAUNCEY proved to us that he, too, could have uttered those words.

Worthily he lived, worthily he served. We honor him for what he was and for what he did. We remember him for his triumphant hope and unfailing faith and hard work.

In the years to come I shall remember his ability, his accomplishments, his constructiveness, his noble character, and and all that he stood for. In my memory I shall always cherish his friendship.

My prayer is that his family will be consoled by the fact that his life was well and valuably spent. I extend to them my deep and sincere sympathy upon their loss.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the death of the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, the Members of Congress will share with the people of Illinois a great loss.

Elected to the 74th Congress and each succeeding Congress, CHAUNCEY REED was ever on the alert to be helpful to his constituents, his colleagues, and his country. His untiring efforts and accomplishments as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary are well known.

It is with great sorrow that I join with my fellow Members of Congress to pay my deepest respect to CHAUNCEY REED's memory, and extend to his family my sincere sympathy on their irreparable loss.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as broken as are the hearts on the Republican side of this House, so are broken the hearts of his Democratic colleagues. On both sides of the aisle the love for CHAUNCEY REED was universal and his passing has united us in a common grief. With broken hearts we come to give tribute to his memory.

To me has come a very personal grief. Perhaps longer than any Member of this body I have known CHAUNCEY REED. In the yesterdays, when I was a young man, I was invited to his community to give an address on Memorial Day and then taken for dinner into the warm glow of the parental home of CHAUNCEY REED, then a lad in high school. That was the beginning of my friendship with him, my understanding of and my love for CHAUNCEY REED.

I shall always remember him as the highest expression in his thoughts, his actions, and his words of the vibrant spirit of an old-fashioned but imperishable American patriotism. He loved this country of ours. He loved all of its traditions, and he loved and respected and revered the memory of all the noble men and brave women who in their respective generations had made the fabric of our great Republic.

When I came to this body, many years after my first meeting with CHAUNCEY REED in the home of his parents, he had preceded me by many terms and had the standing and the prestige earned by years of distinguished service. He helped me in every way. I know of no occasion when CHAUNCEY REED was not smiling and helpful. Never in his entire life was he guilty of a petty act. Never did a word come from his lips that brought injury to another's feelings. He represented the very best of Illinois. Oh, to me he was so much a personification of the spirit of Illinois. Yes, as has been said, he was like Lincoln in many ways; brilliant but always humble, helpful, always optimistic, always finding in people the best because that was the measure of his expectation. He never permitted high station and the advantage he had attained by worth to unbalance him. He just belonged to the people of which he was a part.

We are going to miss CHAUNCEY REED, but we who remain are going to be stronger servitors of this country of ours and our democracy because of the pattern that CHAUNCEY REED has left for us.

To the wife, the daughter, and the sons, for whom we feel so deeply, we can join in the strengthening assurance that the spirit of CHAUNCEY REED is eternal and will abide with them forever.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCVEY]

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with deepest regret that I learned yesterday of the passing of our good friend and colleague, CHAUNCEY W. REED. Congressman REED was one of the first Members of this body with whom I consulted when I came to the Congress.

By reason of his long tenure in office, his able leadership, and his wise judgment I found his advice most helpful in all the years that followed. I believe CHAUNCEY REED felt it a high privilege to be a Member of this distinguished body. We are going to miss him sorely, but we cannot always understand the pattern of life.

The Committee on the Judiciary, of which he was a minority member has lost an able representative. I wish to join with you in extending my sympathy to the members of his family in this hour of great sorrow. I know that nothing we can say here will mitigate to any great extent the sorry his family must feel, but I hope it is comforting for them to know that we grieve with them in this hour of bereavement.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I think that on occasions such as this all of us are aware that words are woefully weak and that only deeds and acts are great.

I would not want this opportunity to pass without saying a word about the passing away of a very, very dear personal friend. I appreciated very much what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] said when he stated that he never knew of CHAUNCEY REED doing a petty thing. To me it was that characteristic of the man that made him so great. I never heard him say an unkind word about any other colleague or any other person. I talked with him many times because I was interested in some constitutional amendments from time to time. I discussed them with him because I held high regard for his wisdom and his knowledge on subjects pertaining to the Constitution of the United States.

To me he was one of the kindest persons I have even known. We shall miss his presence here, but no mound of earth can still the voice of CHAUNCEY REED in the Halls of this House of Representatives. We shall continue through the years to give heed to that voice.

We sit here in days when we must be very careful that we do not allow

prejudices or preconceived notions, to dominate the positions we take. I do not know that I ever knew a person who was as free from petty prejudices and who brought an objective viewpoint to any piece of legislation that he considered than CHAUNCEY REED.

I extend to his wife and all members of his family my very deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, during times of such grief the heart is so full that the tongue becomes limping; and yet I would fail in something that I owe myself as much as I owe it to CHAUNCEY REED, if I did not try to express my tribute to him.

I happened to be on the corner opposite the New House Office Building yesterday when the American flag was lowered to half-mast to show the respect that a grateful Nation gives to those who have served her well. I wished that his family might have seen that outward token of the grief and of the honor that we all pay CHAUNCEY REED.

I could not help thinking of the long 21 years of his service in this Congress. It was a poignant memory to me, because the Chauncey Reeds, the Churches and the Hallecks, and Leslie Arends came to the House of Representatives in the 74th Congress, quite young then, but full of hope and very full of purpose. These belonged to that small Republican band, in one Congress reduced to 89, who stood by their principles with great moral courage. It was, you remember, the second Congress of the first term of President Roosevelt, and CHAUNCEY REED has served his country and his district ever since—a momentous 21 years in the history of this country, in the history of this world covering historic events and programs at home and two wars abroad: a great war fought and won; an action in Korea fought and ended—problems, questions, tensions.

CHAUNCEY REED met every test, every problem foreign and domestic with equanimity, with strength, with Christian faith. He saw much time pass into history, and he helped mold and build that history. He was never frightened, nor dismayed; he always knew that if you had high principle and held to it, all would still be well.

I think also, however, of the 21 years of his service to a district. It happens that Mr. REED's district adjoins mine. Our districts run side by side for miles in Illinois. I know how today hearts are grieving there, the hearts of those he has helped in these 21 years, the hearts of those who respected him most because he stood for that kind of integrity in Government which is after all the best test of any man's service.

I think of Mrs. Reed and of the children with very deep sympathy. The days ahead are not going to be easy, but I can assure her that those days will be made lighter and the future brighter than it looks today, by the knowledge of what CHAUNCEY REED has been to them; and to this very great country which he loved; and to the world which he helped shape in the last 21 years. I trust that their grief will be more bearable in the knowledge that it is shared by all who knew him.

We of the Illinois delegation have lost more than we can express. There was strength in CHAUNCEY REED. There was a poise in him, every time that he entered a discussion, that helped us all. There was a gentleness which calmed even the most troubled spirit. None of us yet have had time to realize quite what we have lost, but we do know, Mr. Speaker, that the Illinois delegation throughout future history will be stronger because of CHAUNCEY REED; and that those who served with him will, because of his example and his spirit, find their own courage and purpose strengthened, and their faith enriched and immortalized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, many beautiful tributes are being paid to our colleague, the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, from our great State of Illinois, and it is impossible for me to do his memory justice in this simple presentation.

He was a great American. His judicial temperament was well known to us; he was fair in his dealings, and untiring in his efforts to do what he thought best for all concerned. His eternal rest is the reward of one who gave unsparingly, unselfishly of himself in time of tensions and of threats.

I got to know CHAUNCY quite intimately, as we were neighbors, owning little summer homes on one of the lakes in Wisconsin. We would meet on occasions and do a little fishing, relaxing and talking.

I like to think of him as a friend, and he was a good and sincere friend of mine. He was also a friend of those who wanted to enjoy and be inspired by his qualities of character and personality.

On behalf of Mrs. Gordon and myself and our family, I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Reed and CHAUNCEY'S family.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with the many splendid tributes which have been paid to my distinguished friend and colleague, CHAUNCEY REED. It so happened that my first committee assignment when I came to Congress was to the Committee on the Judiciary, where I first became acquainted with CHAUNCEY. It was obvious to a new member of that committee that he was an excellent lawyer. Not only was he an excellent lawyer, but the approached all problems with a completely fair and judicious mind. He had what many judges lack, in my opinion; he was born with a judicial temperament. In other words, he approached a problem with an open mind and dealt with it on the basis of the logic of the facts. In so happened, also, that something over 2 years ago, CHAUNCEY and I were in the hospital at the same time. My room was opposite his, and there for the first time I had the opportunity of meeting and visiting with his family. CHAUNCEY was an exceedingly patient man. I never heard him complain about the action of any colleague. It has been said here that he was never intemperate in his remarks, and that is certainly true. He was a kindly disposed human being to all, and to everyone he extended the innate fairness that was his. Certainly in this very dark hour it must be a great matter of comfort to his wife and to his family to know that in the Congress of the United States it could be verily said that CHAUNCEY REED had no enemies. The Members were all his friends, and it could in fairness be said of him that he was a friend to every Member of Congress. Certainly the world will be something of a better place to live, and to me it has been a better place to live, in being associated with men like CHAUNCEY REED, who had the deeper seriousness of the responsibility of his office and at the same time the innate fairness of granting to everyone the right to differ in viewpoint as to the problems of the day.

To his family—Mrs. Reed and the children—Mrs. O'Hara and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, within my limited capacity, I, too, want to pay my humble respects to the memory of this great American and to say something by way of consolation to his grieved loved ones that may in some measure let them know the wide affection all of us from each corner of America felt for this great man. When I first came to the Congress 15 years ago I had an office assigned next to that of his, and I got to know this great American. Immediately I recognized him for the greatness that he possessed. He was exercised about great things, but he was never too busy to take time out for small things. He was never impatient with those of us of lesser learning or contemptuous of us of different political philosophies. He was truly a great American, and we shall miss him indeed. He believed fervently in the Constitution and he had a great knowledge of it. Few, indeed, have ever been in this body who had a greater knowledge of that great document. He believed in a government of laws and not of men, and he practiced it. He never willfully hurt anybody. His having been here will make this a better place for that reason, and his having left us will leave a void which will be difficult, Mr. Speaker, to fill. I just want to say that I personally shall miss him, like the great State which he represented, and the fine family which now grieves for him.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Illinois and other Members of this great body in mourning the passing of CHAUNCEY REED, of Illinois. This body has lost a great Member. Illinois has lost a great son.

I think of those words:

Greater love hath no man than this, than he who is willing to lay down his life for his friends.

CHAUNCEY REED was that type of man. I come from the southern part of Illinois and I have not enjoyed as close a relationship with Mr. REED as have some of the Members of the Chicago area. But my constituents and I know of the great work Mr. REED has done in this body. They have always respected him, knowing him to be a man of high caliber and a great statesman.

May I say to his wife and family that although the words that are uttered on this floor today may not ease their grief, or really comfort them, I would like them to know that each one extends his sympathy with the deepest of sincerity, and the great friendship and work of CHAUNCEY REED will be indelible in the hearts and minds of friends, colleagues, and citizens for time to come.

(Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that the Members of the House heard the news of the passing of CHAUNCEY REED.

Those of us who knew and admired CHAUNCEY REED as a friend and colleague through the years of his service in the House of Representatives join in the expression of deepest sympathy to the members of his family in their bereavement.

He served his home district, the 14th of Illinois, faithfully and well. He brought his rich personal and legal experiences in West Chicago to bear on the intricate legislative problems which were his to consider. Both as a member and as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, he won the esteem and affection of all his associates. His achievement in bringing about improvement of the Federal bankruptcy laws was notable. His continuing interest and skill in the law made him a true lawyers lawyer.

CHAUNCEY REED'S devotion to principle and his untiring efforts were far beyond the common line of duty. He may be counted among those who served his country well. He will be sorely missed by those of us who were his friends.

(Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of our esteemed colleague, CHAUNCEY REED. Those of us who served under him during his chairmanship of the Committee on the Judiciary in the 83d Congress and as ranking minority member of the committee in other Congresses, will remember him in days to come.

His service to his State and country was most outstanding. CHAUNCEY REED began public life as a city treasurer, later was elected State's attorney, and subsequently became a national figure because of his work with the Committee on the Judiciary.

I join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to a great American and extending my sympathy to his family.

(Mr. MEADER (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. MEADER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the remarks of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois.)

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, very beautiful tributes have been paid today to CHAUNCEY REED. I would like to add a thought of interest and heart and the esteem in which he was held to what has already been said. I should like to mention one incident that typified CHAUNCEY REED'S greatness, to me, and showed so plainly the love of the people of Illinois and the workers all over the United States for Mr. REED.

I attended a meeting with him of a group of watch workers. CHAUNCEY REED had been trying to save the watch industry and to protect the workers. Their respect and their love for him was obviously very deep.

I can see CHAUNCEY REED, always strong in sickness and in health, always courageous when in pain, he had great physical as well as moral courage, always upright in stature and character like Abraham Lincoln, a true follower of God. Mr. Speaker, I mourn his passing with Illinois and his wonderful family and with my colleagues and with the Nation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the life and the accomplishments of CHAUNCEY REED, at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, with all Members of the House, I deeply regret the untimely passing of CHAUNCEY REED. He was a man of splendid ability, of high character. He was really a man among men.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of CHAUNCEY REED has brought grief to the many friends he had acquired in a lifetime which was marked by honorable public service.

In the State of Illinois, and particularly in the Chicagoland area, he occupied a position of prominence for many years. I am proud to say that my acquaintanceship with him has been one of long standing; through the years, my respect and affection for him have grown steadily.

When I came to Washington in 1949, as a Member of the 81st Congress, CHAUNCEY greeted me with the cordiality and kindness which were so much a part of him. I knew that at any time I could call upon him for advice and assistance, and that it would always be forthcoming. I shall miss him very much, as will the many who have had the privilege of being associated with him over the years.

I should like to convey my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Reed and to their children in their great loss.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of my beloved friend from the State of Illinois, CHAUNCEY W. REED. His passing is a singular loss to the House of Representatives, to the Judiciary Committee, to the Republican Party, and to me personally. As a fellow Congressman from Illinois and a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee, my association with him formed a friendship between us which I valued deeply.

On the day that I came to the Judiciary Committee, he said to me, "You will like this committee." And it was so. His service and his example helped make it so, for CHAUNCEY REED was highly respected and admired for his personal friendliness, lack of partisanship, and integrity. He was a tower of legal acumen, and represented a long and vast accumulation of empirical legal knowledge. CHAUNCEY REED was also a hard and conscientious worker. When I visited him at the Naval Hospital 2 weeks ago, his one and only concern was when he could get back; he kept talking about returning to do his part of the job.

For 21 years, the 14th Congressional District of Illinois was represented by an able and courageous legislator, who justified their selection through an unfailing devotion to duty.

It is very hard to accept the fact that CHAUNCEY REED is no longer with us in this Chamber. To his wife, his children, and his family, I extend my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of my dear friend, CHAUNCEY W. REED, was a tragic loss to all of us who knew and loved him.

He was a conscientious public servant, and his honesty and courage, his devotion to the principles for which he stood, endeared him to everyone. His character and kindly personality radiated warmth and affection wherever he went. I always shall cherish the memories of our fine associations and his true friendship.

The people of his district have not only lost a great statesman, they lost a genuine and a true friend.

To his widow and children, I wish to extend my sincere condolence and sympathy.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved when I learned of the passing of our friend and colleague CHAUNCEY W. REED. CHAUNCEY, as we who knew him well addressed him, has left behind many, many friends who will not soon forget the important role he played in shaping the destiny of this body and therefore the history of the United States. He was a true gentleman with a keen intellect, always tolerate of other peoples' views. His courage in standing up for what he believed and his devotion to these principles never faltered during his 21 years of service in the House of Representatives.

When I visited him last Sunday at the Naval Medical Hospital in Bethesda, Md., he greeted me in the same affable, cheerful, and genial manner which has characterized him over the years and which has endeared him to so many hearts. CHAUNCEY REED set a fine example by his faith in God and man that is an inspiration to all of us who knew him.

I extend my most heartfelt sympathy in this sad hour to Mrs. Reed and their three children.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Illinois in paying tribute to the memory of CHAUNCEY REED.

I have known CHAUNCEY REED since the first day of his service in the House of Representatives. Although I was not a Member at that time, it was my good fortune to form a close association with him through frequent visits to his office and almost daily conversations on matters of interest to constituents in Illinois.

Every member of the Illinois delegation held CHAUNCEY REED in the highest esteem. All his colleagues in this House recognized his great ability as a statesman and saw in him sterling traits which made him a congressional leader.

In his long years of service in Congress he brought honor to himself and to his native State of Illinois.

An outstanding lawyer before he began his career in Congress, he sought assignment on the Judiciary Committee of the House and his legal knowledge and his judicial wisdom has been of invaluable aid to the committee and the House through the years.

With all his great contributions in Congress, our colleague still found time to maintain an active and important interest in activities of the American Legion and many civic organizations. His was a worthwhile and useful life, which left a good influence wherever he walked.

His fine family has my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague and cherished friend has been called to his heavenly reward.

Yesterday his spirit left us.

And there is an emptiness in our hearts.

For CHAUNCEY REED was every inch a gentleman; kind, considerate, and with the humble dignity befitting a representative of the people.

The cold words of biography reveal that he was a veteran, a lawyer, and one of the senior Members of the United States House of Representatives in consecutive service.

These facts do not do him justice.

From West Chicago, Ill., he came to Congress 22 years ago. At the time of his death he was ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, and had previously served as chairman when his party controlled the House.

As chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Judiciary Committee, of which CHAUNCEY REED was a member, I valued his fine legal mind and his judicial temperament.

Fair play was inbred in his character. Training and experience mellowed it with the precious wisdom that we shall miss.

The world goes on, in the belief that every good man can be replaced, when his time comes.

This is true only in a material sense.

To family, friends, and associates, there can never be a substitute for a man like CHAUNCEY REED. The qualities that attracted us to him will never be duplicated. They cannot be. There was only one CHAUNCEY REED.

We join with his survivors in bereavement.

Praying that his memory will help us to live up to his fine example for the rest of our days.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing from our midst of our respected colleague, CHAUNCEY REED, brings sorrow to everyone who had the privilege to know him. Mr. REED lived a rich and useful life. Early in his distinguished career, he exhibited his interest in public service. His friends were legion. They were among his constituents, who repeatedly rewarded his efforts and showed their confidence and faith in his ability by consistently returning him to Congress as their able Representative since 1935. It has been my privilege for the past 13 years to serve as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary with Mr. REED, during two terms of which service my good friend, CHAUNCEY REED, was chairman. During those years, I had come to know CHAUNCEY very well. His concern was for the welfare and security of our country, and his every action was dedicated toward those ends.

The passing of our dear friend is also a personal loss to me. CHAUNCEY was a devoted husband and father. To Mrs. Reed and their children I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 399).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of 14 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois, Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois, Mr. VELDE, Mr. YATES, Mrs. CHURCH, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. SHEEHAN, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. POFF, Mr. BOYLE, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), under previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 14, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1512. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting the 15th Semiannual Report of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the period July 1 to December 31, 1955, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1513. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to include natural children of the spouse of a member in the definition of 'children' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1514. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting the second of the reports required by section 208 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 295, 84th Congress, pursuant to section 708 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1515. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the report to the President of the Interdepartmental Committee on Narcotics showing the result of a survey of narcotic conditions in the United States with respect to the distribution and use of narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 455. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7723. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1760). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 9239. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 9240. A bill to correct an inequity resulting from the setting of the effective date of Public Law 68 of the 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 9241. A bill to extend benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to persons injured while engaged in civil-defense activities during World War II; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9242. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, to regulate judicial review of deportation and exclusion orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9243. A bill to authorize the admission to the United States of certain aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 9244. A bill to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 9245. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 9246. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by authorizing payments to survivors of former members for unused leave credit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. J. Res. 530. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs; to the Committee on Rules.

Appendix

Some of the Great Sayings and Writings of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present certain selected statements made orally or in writing by Abraham Lincoln in his lifetime. They came to me from the Library of Congress in response to my request that said Library furnish to me the text of statements made by Abraham Lincoln which were generally considered, in their experience, the most significant. I have made a few selections of the great statements and writings which to me have always been significant and inspiring and which I was reasonably sure all patriotic American citizens would be pleased to have to their attention for review and refreshment as to some of the great words and writings made by this great American, Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln has always been my ideal of American statesmanship and of great indelible service rendered to the cause and the dignity and the freedom of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a fact that on the occasion of each or most of the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln, to wit, February 12, the 9 years I have already served in this great legislative body, it has been my privilege and pleasure to either speak or write something of my admiration of what Abraham Lincoln's life has meant to me in my boyhood years and then in my years as a practicing lawyer in California at the bar of the California courts and at the Supreme Court of the United States and now later as a Member of this great legislative body, to wit, the House of Representatives, of which great legislative body Abraham Lincoln was also a Member.

The statements follow:

SELECTED STATEMENTS ABOUT THOMAS JEFFERSON BY ABRAHAM LINCOLN

LETTER TO H. L. PIERCE AND OTHERS

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *April 6, 1859.*

But, soberly, it is now no child's play to save the principles of Jefferson from total overthrow in this Nation. One would state with great confidence that he could convince any sane child that the simpler propositions of Euclid are true; but nevertheless he would fail, utterly, with one who should deny the definitions and axioms. The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society. And yet they are denied and evaded, with no small show of success. One dashingly calls them "glittering generalities." Another bluntly calls them "self-evident lies." And others insidiously argue that they apply to "superior races." These expressions, differing in form, are identical in objects and effect—the supplanting the principles of free government, and restoring those of classification, caste, and legitimacy. They would delight a convocation of crowned heads plotting against the people. They are the vanguard, the miners, and sappers of returning despotism. We must repulse them, or they will subjugate us. This is a world of compensation; and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it. All honor to Jefferson—to the man, who in the concrete pressure of a struggle for national independence by a single people, had the coolness, forecast, and capacity to introduce into a merely revolutionary document an abstract truth, applicable to all men and all times, and so to embalm it there that today and in all coming days it shall be a rebuke and a stumbling-block to the very harbingers of reappearing tyranny and oppression.

Your obedient servant,

A. LINCOLN.

(Source: Nicolay and Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, vol. 5, pp. 126–127.)

SPEECH AT COLUMBUS, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 16, 1859

This is an idea, I suppose, which has arisen in Judge Douglas' mind from his peculiar structure. I suppose the institution of slavery really looks small to him. He is so put up by nature that a lash upon his back would hurt him, but a lash upon anybody else's back does not hurt him. That is the build of the man, and consequently he looks upon the matter of slavery in this unimportant light.

Judge Douglas ought to remember, when he is endeavoring to force this policy upon the American people, that while he is put up in that way, a good many are not. He ought to remember that there was once in this country a man by the name of Thomas Jefferson, supposed to be a Democrat—a man whose principles and policy are not very prevalent amongst Democrats today, it is sure; but that man did not take exactly this view of the insignificance of the element of slavery which our friend Judge Douglas does. In contemplation of this thing, we all know he was led to exclaim, "I tremble for my country when I remember that God is just." We know how he looked upon it when he thus expressed himself. There was danger to this country, danger of the avenging justice of God, in that little unimportant popular-sovereignty question of Judge Douglas. He supposed there was a question of God's eternal justice wrapped up in the enslaving of any race of men, or any man, and that those who did so braved the arm of Jehovah—that when a nation thus dared the Almighty, every friend of that nation had cause to dread His wrath. Choose ye between Jefferson and Douglas as to what is the true view of this element among us.

(Source: Nicolay and Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, vol. 5, pp. 158–160.)

LETTER TO J. H. REED

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., *October 1, 1860.*

MY DEAR SIR: Yours of September 21st was received some time ago, but I could not till now find time to answer it. I never was in McDonough County till 1858. I never said anything derogatory of Mr. Jefferson in McDonough County or elsewhere. About 3 weeks ago, for the first time in my life did I ever see or hear the language attributed to me as having been used toward Mr. Jefferson; and then it was sent to me, as you now send, in order that I might say whether it came from me. I never used any such language at any time. You may rely on the truth of this, although it is my wish that you do not publish it.

Yours truly,

A. LINCOLN.

(Source: Nicolay and Hay, Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, vol. 6, p. 60.)

There are 13 other instances according to the index to Lincoln's Works where he quoted Jefferson or named him incidentally in connection with other early American statesmen. They could be considered statements about Jefferson only by implication.

LETTER WRITTEN BY PRESIDENT LINCOLN TO MRS. BIXBY

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, November 21, 1864.

MRS. BIXBY,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the adjutant general of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Yours very sincerely and respectfully,

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

(Source: Abraham Lincoln: Complete Works. Edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay, vol. 2, p. 600, 1894 ed.)

SELECTED STATEMENTS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON CIVIL LIBERTIES AND RIGHTS

ADDRESS TO THE MAYOR AND CITIZENS OF CINCINNATI, OHIO, FEBRUARY 12, 1861

I am reminded by the address of your worthy mayor that this reception is given not by any one political party, and even if I had not been so reminded by his honor I could not have failed to know the fact by the extent of the multitude I see before me now. I could not look upon this vast assemblage without being made aware that all parties were united in this reception. * * * Allow me to say that I think what has occurred here today could not have occurred in any other country on the face of the globe, without the influence of the free institutions which we have unceasingly enjoyed for three quarters of a century.

There is no country where the people can turn out and enjoy this day precisely as they please, save under the benign influence of the free institutions of our land.

I hope that, although we have some threatening national difficulties now, I hope that while these free institutions shall continue to be in the enjoyment of millions of free people of the United States, we will see repeated every 4 years what we now witness.

(Nicolay, John G. and John Hay, editors. Abraham Lincoln: Complete Works. New York, the Century Co., 1894, 2 volumes, vol. I, p. 674–675. E457.9, 1894.)

RESPONSE TO EVANGELICAL LUTHERANS (MAY 6?), 1862

GENTLEMEN: I welcome here the representatives of the Evangelical Lutherans of the United States. I accept with gratitude their assurances of the sympathy and support of that enlightened, influential, and loyal class of my fellow citizens in an important crisis which involves, in my judgment, not only the civil and religious liberties of our own dear land, but in a large degree the civil and religious liberties of mankind in many countries and through many ages.

(Work cited, vol. II, p. 148.)

LETTER TO ERASTUS CORNING AND OTHERS, JUNE 12, 1863, IN ANSWER TO RESOLUTIONS CENSURING THE ADMINISTRATION FOR SUPPOSED UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION, SUCH AS THE MAKING OF MILITARY ARRESTS

Thoroughly imbued with a reverence for the guaranteed rights of individuals, I was slow to adopt the strong measures which by degrees I have been forced to regard as being within the exceptions of the Constitution, and as indispensable to the public safety. * * *

The provision of the Constitution that "the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it" is the provision which specially applies to our present case. This provision plainly attests the understanding of those who made the Constitution that ordinary courts of justice are inadequate to cases of rebellion—attests their purpose that, in such cases, men may be held in custody whom the courts, acting on ordinary rules, would discharge. Habeas corpus does not discharge men who are proved to be guilty of defined crime; and its suspension is allowed by the Constitution on purpose that men may be arrested and held who cannot be proved to be guilty of defined crime, "when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it."

(Work cited, vol. II, pp. 347–348.)

EXCERPTS FROM LINCOLN'S WORKS RELATING TO HARMONY, UNITY OF PURPOSE, ETC.

December 10, 1856—Fragment of speech at a Republican banquet in Chicago:

"All of us who did not vote for Mr. Buchanan, taken together, are a majority of 400,000. But in the late contest we were divided between Fremont and Fillmore. Can we not come together for the future? Let everyone who really believes, and is resolved, that free society is not and shall not be a failure, and who can conscientiously declare that in the past contest he has done only what he thought best—let every such one have charity to believe that everyone can say as much" (p. 226).

February 27, 1860—Address at Cooper Institute, New York:

"A few words now to Republicans. It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace, and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them" (p. 611).

March 5, 1860—Abstract of speech at Hartford, Conn.:

"All portions of this Confederacy should act in harmony and with careful deliberation" (p. 616).

March 6, 1860—Speech at New Haven, Conn.:

"It is exceedingly desirable that all parts of this great Confederacy shall be at peace and in harmony one with another. Let us Republicans do our part to have it so. Even though much provoked, let us do nothing through passion and ill temper. Even though the southern people will not so much as listen to us, let us calmly consider their demands, and yield to them if, in our deliberate view of our duty, we possibly can. Judging by all they say and do, and by the subject and nature of their controversy with us, let us determine, if we can, what will satisfy them" (p. 628).

(Abraham Lincoln, edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay, vol. I (E457.91).)

July 4, 1861—Special session message:

"As a private citizen the executive could not have consented that these institutions shall perish; much less could be in betrayal of so vast and so sacred a trust as these free people had confided to him. He felt that he had no moral right to shrink, nor even to count the chances of his own life, in what might follow. In full view of his great responsibility he has so far done what he has deemed his duty. You will now, according to your own judgment, perform yours. He sincerely hopes that your views and your action may so accord with his as to assure all faithful citizens who have been disturbed in their rights of a certain and speedy restoration to them under the Constitution and the laws.

"And having thus chosen our course, without guile and with pure purpose, let us renew our trust in God and go forward without fear and with manly hearts" (p. 3232).

A proclamation:

"And I do further recommend to my fellow citizens aforesaid that on that occasion they do reverently humble themselves in the dust and from thence offer up penitent and fervent prayers and supplications to the great disposer of events for a return of the inestimable blessings of peace, union, and harmony throughout the land which it has pleased Him to assign as a dwelling place for ourselves and for our posterity throughout all generations" (p. 3430).

(Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. VII (J81.B97).)

LINCOLN'S STATEMENTS CONCERNING SECESSION

(Volume and page numbers which appear at the end of the following quotations refer to the Gettysburg edition of Lincoln's Complete Works, published by Francis D. Tandy Co., New York, 1905.)

Speech, Cincinnati, September 17, 1859:

"I want to know what you [men of the South] are going to do with your half of it [the Union]? Are you going to split the Ohio down through, and push your half off a piece? Or are you going to keep it right along side of us outrageous fellows? Or are you going to build up a wall some way between your country and ours, by which that movable property of yours can't come over here any more, to the danger of your losing it? Do you think you can better yourselves on that subject [slavery] by having us [of the North] bear no obligation whatever to return those specimens of your movable property that come hither?" (vol. V, p. 219).

"Will you [after the Union is dissolved] make war upon us [Northerners] and kill us all? Why, gentlemen, I think you are as gallant and as brave men as live; that you can fight as bravely in a good cause, man for man, as any other people living; that you have shown yourselves capable of this upon various occasions; but man for man you are not better than we are, and there are not so many of you as there are of us. You will never make much of a hand at whipping us. If we were fewer in numbers than you, I think you could whip us; if we were equal it would likely be a drawn battle; but inferior in numbers, you will make nothing by attempting to master us" (vol. V, p. 219).

"You [will] have divided the Union because we would not do right with you, as you think, upon that subject [slavery]; when we cease to be under obligations to do anything for you, how much better off do you think you will be?" (vol. V, p. 221).

Speech to Ohio Legislature, February 13, 1861:

"There is nothing going wrong. It is a consoling circumstances that when we look about there is nothing that really hurts anybody. We entertain different views upon political questions, but nobody is suffering anything" (vol. VI, p. 122).

Speech, Cleveland, February 15, 1861:

"What is happening to hurt them (men who seek to destroy the Union)? Have they not all their rights now as they ever have had? Do not they have their fugitive slaves returned now as ever? Have they not the same Constitution that they have lived under for seventy-odd years? Have they not a position as citizens of this common country, and have we any citizens of this common country, and have we any power to change that position? What then is the matter with them? Why all this excitement? Why all these complaints?" (vol. VI, p. 130).

First inaugural, March 4, 1861:

"All the vital rights of minorities and of individuals are so plainly assured to them (men of the South) by affirmations and negations, guaranties and prohibitions, in the Constitution, that controversies never arise concerning them (vol. VI, p. 177).

"If a minority * * * will secede rather than acquiesce (in the rule of the majority) they make a precedent which in turn will divide and ruin them, for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy a year or two hense arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this. Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new union as to produce harmony only and prevent renewed secession?" (vol. VI, p. 178).

"Plainly the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left (vol. VI, p. 179).

"Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse (between the sections) more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends Suppose you go to war, you cannot fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides, and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old terms of intercourse are again upon you" (vol. VI, p. 181).

Message to Congress, July 4, 1861:

"It might seem at first thought to be of little difference whether the present movement at the South be called secession or rebellion. The movers, however, well understand the difference. At the beginning they knew they could never raise their treason to any respectable magnitude by any name which implies violation of law. * * * Accordingly, they commenced by an insidious debauching of the public mind. They invented an ingenius sophism, which, if conceded, was followed by perfectly logical steps through all the incidents to the complete

destruction of the Union. The sophism itself is that any State of the Union may, consistently with the national Constitution, and therefore lawfully and peacefully, withdraw from the Union without the consent of the Union or of any other State. The little disguise that the supposed right is to be exercised only for just cause, themselves to be the sole judge of its justice, is too thin to merit any notice. With rebellion thus sugar-coated they have been drugging the public mind of their section for more than 30 years, and until at length they have brought many good men to a willingness to take up arms against the Government the day after some assemblage of men have enacted the farcical pretense of taking their State out of the Union who could have been brought to no such thing the day before" (vol. VI, p. 312).

"The Nation purchased with money the countries out of which several of these [seceding] States were formed. Is it just that they shall go off without leave and without refunding? The Nation paid very large sums—in the aggregate, I believe, nearly a hundred millions—to relieve Florida of the aboriginal tribes. Is it just that she shall now be off without consent or without making any return? The Nation is now in debt for money applied to the benefit of these so-called seceding States in common with the rest. Is it just either that creditors shall go unpaid or the remaining States pay the whole? * * * If one State may secede, so may another; and when all shall have seceded none is left to pay the debts. Is this quite just to creditors? Did we notify them of this sage view of ours when we borrowed their money?" (vol. VI, p. 317).

"A part of the present national debt was contracted to pay the old debts of Texas. Is it just that she shall leave [the Union] and pay no part of this herself?" (vol. VI, p. 217).

"If all the States save one should assert the power to drive that one out of the Union, it is presumed the whole class of seceder politicians would at once deny the power and denounce the act as the greatest outrage upon State rights. But suppose that precisely the same act, instead of being called 'driving the one out,' should be called 'the seceding of the others from that one,' it would be exactly what the seceders claim to do, unless, indeed, they make the point that the one, because it is a minority, may rightfully do what the others, because they are a majority, may not rightfully do. These politicians are subtle and profound on the rights of minorities" (vol. VI, p. 318).

"The principle [of secession] itself is one of disintegration ,and upon which no government can possibly endure" (vol. VI, p. 318).

"Whoever in any section proposes to abandon such a government [as that of the United States] would do well to consider in deference to what principle it is that he does it—what better is he likely to get in its stead—whether the substitute will give, or be intended to give, so much of good to the people?" (vol. VI, p. 320).

"No compromise by public servants could, in this case, be a cure" (vol. VI, p. 324).

SOME OF THE SAYINGS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN

"If the good people, in their wisdom, shall see fit to keep me in the background, I have been too familiar with disappointments to be very much chagrined." (Address, New Salem, Ill., March 9, 1832.)

"I go for all sharing the privileges of the Government who assist in bearing its burdens." (Letter to editor of the Sangamon Journal, New Salem, Ill., June 13, 1836.)

"If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time, or die by suicide." (Address, Young Men's Lyceum, Springfield, Ill., January 27, 1838.)

"I am not a Know-Nothing; that is certain. How could I be? How can any one who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we begin by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read 'all men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure and without the base alloy of hypocrisy." (Letter to Joshua F. Speed, August 24, 1855.)

"A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction; or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South." (Speech, Republican State Convention, Springfield, Ill., June 16, 1858.)

"Nobody has ever expected me to be President. In my poor, lean, lank face nobody has ever seen that any cabbages were sprouting out." (Second campaign speech against Douglas, Springfield, Ill., July 17, 1858.)

"As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy." (Fragment (August 1, 1858?) in Roy P. Basler: The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln (1953).)

"This is a world of compensation; and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it." (Letter to H. L. Pierce and others, April 6, 1859.)

"Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." (Address, Cooper Union, New York, February 27, 1860.)

"It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination." (First inaugural address, March 4, 1861.)

"Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights." (First annual message to Congress, December 3, 1861.)

"It is difficult to make a man miserable while he feels he is worthy of himself and claims kindred to the great God who made him." (Address on colonization to a Negro deputation at Washington, August 14, 1862.)

"I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views so fast as they shall appear to be true views * * * and I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free." (Letter to Horace Greely, August 22, 1862.)

"Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

"Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final restingplace for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

"But, in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." (Address at Gettysburg, November 19, 1863.)

"It is no fault in others that the Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospital, and more prayers to Heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Church. Bless all the churches, and blessed be God, who, in this our great trial, giveth us the churches." (To a Methodist delegation, May 14, 1864.)

"It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not, that we be not judged." (Second inaugural address, March 4, 1865.)

Nomination of Hon. Walter F. George, of Georgia, for 1956 Nobel Peace Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article written by Col. Hubert Lee, sent to me from the Dixie Business Magazine, in regard to the nomination of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], by the organization of which Mr. Lee is the head and manager, to receive the Nobel peace prize. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

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

THIS WEEK

(By Col. Hubert Lee, editor, Dixie Business magazine)

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE is to be nominated for the 1956 Nobel peace prize.

Time for nominations for the 1955 award was February 1, 1955, or sooner.

Those nominated on or before February 1 are considered and the announcement made each December 10.

Through the courtesy of the Department of State, I have received the official announcement about how to go about entering a nomination. Here is the way:

"Det Norske Stortings Nobelkomite, Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament. Nobel peace prize."

All proposals of candidates for the Nobel peace prize, which is to be distributed December 10, 1955, must, in order to be taken into consideration, be laid before the Nobel

Committee of the Norwegian Parliament by a duly qualified person before the 1st of February of the same year.

Any one of the following persons is held to be duly qualified: (a) Members and late members of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, as well as the advisors appointed at the Norwegian Nobel Institute; (b) Members of Parliament and members of the government of the different states, as well as members of the Interparliamentary Union; (c) members of the International Arbitration Court at the Hague; (d) members of the Council of the International Peace Bureau; (e) members and associates of the Institute of International Law; (f) university professors of political science and of law, of history, and of philosophy; and (g) persons who have received the Nobel peace prize.

The Nobel peace prize may also be accorded to institutions or associations.

According to the Code of Statutes, paragraph 8, the grounds upon which any proposal is made must be stated and handed in along with such papers and other documents as may herein be referred to.

According to paragraph 3, every written work, to qualify for a prize, must have appeared in print.

For particulars, qualified persons are requested to apply to the Office of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Drammensvei 19, Oslo.

Enforcement of Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business.

I have observed with considerable interest, as many of my colleagues must also have noted, the splendid action of this small business organization over the years to protect small business and the free-enterprise system by making as their principal objective all-out, vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

The statement relates to a serious situation caused by the attempt of the big rubber manufacturers and the major oil companies to monopolize the distribution of tires, batteries, and accessories. It is an alarming situation, and arouses my interest in view of the fact that during my chairmanship of the Senate Small Business Committee, one of the first major actions of the committee in 1942 was to study the small business problems of the tire and rubber manufacturers and retailers. The complete report is embodied in Senate Committee Print No. 3, 77th Congress, 1st session, and I read from the report:

Despite the fact that the major petroleum marketers proclaim their stations are largely operated by independent businessmen it is not difficult to discover that so far as having the right to select a brand of tires is concerned, this independence is in reality nonexistent.

This was in 1942, Mr. President, and here some 14 years later the Federal Trade Commission issues a report which discloses, in substance, a $12 million override of $147 million in tire, battery, and accessory sales through 74,000 gasoline service stations, by Firestone with Shell, Texas, and Atlantic; by Goodyear with Shell and Atlantic; and by Goodrich with Texas. This all happened within a 2-year period, and I am just wondering what happened in the preceding years. In other words, it is self-evident that independence of free enterprise ceased to exist due to these combines.

There is pending before the Congres a bill I have repeatedly introduced, which would break once and for all time the hold by big rubber and oil interests established in an effort to monopolize that industry, and I am referring to my bill, S. 50. I shall urge the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to start hearings at the earliest possible moment.

I have also been advised that the National Federation of Independent Business has recently polled its nationwide membership, comprising approximately 100,000 independent business and professional men—all individual voting members—and the poll discloses: 56 percent for S. 50, 37 percent against, 75 percent no vote.

It is because of the conditions I have related that I believe it is important for my colleagues and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to note that my remarks are confirmed by the nationwide small business organization whose statement I have asked to have printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

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

The action of the Federal Trade Commission, now headed by the Honorable John W. Gwynne, in its findings as to alleged violations of the antitrust laws by three rubber and three oil companies—Goodrich-Texas, Goodyear-Atlantic Refining, and Shell-Firestone—to attempt to monopolize retail tire distribution was hailed today by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, as the "removal of a major roadblock from the path of small business after a 15-year-old exposé made by the Senate Small Business Committee in its report to the 77th Congress, 1st session, 1941."

The committee at that time came to its conclusions after a national survey was made of the small business problems of the tire and rubber manufacturers and retailers which discloses there was no real free enterprise due to the ties existing between major oil and major rubber companies.

"The big question in the minds of independent business," Burger added, "was what was the contributing cause for the delaying action these past 15 years in coming to definite findings?" And, he further states that the recent actions of the Small Business Committees of the Congress in exploring the operations of the Federal Trade Commission in its enforcement of the antitrust laws were long overdue, and it is apparent that the present leadership recognizes this and now is taking more aggressive action in the inforcement of the laws.

Burger concluded: "Small business in all lines of industry will now watch with considerable interest that this case receives top priority over any and all other actions of the Federal Trade Commission to follow through."

The Late Governor Patterson, of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Pendleton East Oregonian, an independent newspaper published in the great eastern expanse of my State, has printed a most thoughtful and touching editorial about Oregon's late distinguished Governor, the Honorable Paul L. Patterson, who died in Portland on January 31, 1956. This editorial, written by Mr. J. W. Forrester, editor and publisher of the East Oregonian, appeared in that newspaper on February 2, 1956.

I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a tribute to the late Governor of my State.

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

PAUL PATTERSON

The most appealing of Paul Patterson's many attributes was his humility. We shall never forget his modest version of how an accumulation of circumstances took him from the practice of law in Hillsboro to the Governor's office; the deep sense of humility that had come upon him when he, "a little country lawyer," was called upon to serve the citizens of Oregon in the State's highest office; his complete feeling of inadequacy when the wand of fate touched his shoulder.

Paul Patterson soon proved himself completely adequate in the Governor's office. Newspapermen of all shades of political thinking were almost unanimous in saying, after Mr. Patterson had had an opportunity to get a firm grip on the reins dropped by Douglas McKay, that he was one of the best governors in Oregon history. The people showed conclusively at the general election of 1954, when Mr. Patterson asked a 4-year term as Governor, that they agreed.

Because Paul Patterson had been years in a small community and because he had been very active in the affairs of that community—he had been president of the Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce—he had an understanding of and sympathy for community projects of all sizes and descriptions. When the proponents of those projects took them to the Governors office, Mr. Patterson listened will and counseled well. He fully understood the cases placed before him because he had lived and worked with many of an identical nature in his own community.

Governor Patterson had a sincere interest in the Pendleton Round-Up. Many will recall the memorable remarks he made to a roundup audience in 1953 about the meaning of the historic show to the State of Oregon. No finer words ever were spoken in behalf of the Pendleton Round-Up. When it became apparent the roundup and Happy Canyon would face a conflict of Saturday

night shows after the canyon moved into a new plant the Governor took time to write a lengthy letter to the boards of both organizations, suggesting ways to put the shows together on Saturday night.

Paul Patterson didn't avoid any of the problems that faced his State. He didn't, for political expediency, sweep them under the rug. His message to the 1955 legislature stated clearly the fiscal problems that had come upon the State and presented a definite approach to solution of those problems. He felt he had as much responsibility as the legislature to find a way out. He didn't consider for a moment crawling from under that responsibility, as his predecessor had.

Although he was a successful lawyer, Paul Patterson was not an eloquent speaker who could excite an audience. But he always got through to an audience and held its attention because of his obvious sincerity. What he had to say his listeners knew he sincerely believed.

No one could stampede Paul Patterson into making a decision. True to his training in the law, he demanded all the facts and then carefully weighed them. When he had done that he showed no fear of giving his decision and standing behind it.

Oregon was exceedingly fortunate that Paul Patterson stood at the head of the line of succession when Douglas McKay went off to Washington. He was far better than a substitute. Oregon will have few Governors who serve as well. The State has lost a valuable citizen, one who gave wisely, unselfishly, and always humbly in the best interests of all Oregonians, whose hopes and dreams a country lawyer understood.

No More Money for ILO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., in which he raises the question as to whether or not Congress should appropriate any more money to support the International Labor Organization. Here, indeed, is an opportunity for Congress to save more than $1½ million. The article by Mr. Lewis follows:

WHY SHELL OUT FOR ILO?

WASHINGTON.—If Congress is really sincere in trying to reduce Government expenditures, it could start by cutting off the American contribution to operating expenses of the welfare-statist International Labor Organization.

The savings in itself would be small—only $1,650,000 this year, although the administration has asked Congress to increase from $1,750,000 to $3 million, the maximum authorized annual payment.

But small as it is, many Members of Congress feel the United States would profit by cutting off its payments to the upkeep of what they regard as a Communist-dominated organization engaged only in propagandizing socialist theories.

In the post-World War II era, the ILO has adopted conventions which would outlaw all privately operated employment agencies and put them under government control; give government power to negotiate labor-management collective-bargaining agreements; compel governments to provide maternity benefits for working mothers, and many other out-and-out socialistic programs.

A convention, of course, is not effective in any country unless and until that country ratifies it. Fortunately, the United States has ratified only seven innocuous conventions, but the others are pending and conceivably could be adopted by the Senate.

In any event, there can be no logical justification for this country to shell out one-fourth of the cost of operating an international setup which is actively campaigning against all that the United States stands for.

The International Labor Organization originally was established in 1919 as an offshoot of the League of Nations, with the eminently laudable objective of improving the lot of working men and women throughout the world.

The United States did not join it until the advent of the New Deal; in 1934, at the request of the late President Roosevelt and over the objections of critics who even then claimed the ILO was merely a promoter of state socialism, Congress voted United States affiliation.

After World War II, the ILO was taken over by the U. N. as a specialized agency, and its actual operations went from bad to worse, like those of so many other U. N. subsidiaries, such as the notorious UNESCO—another very apt spot for Congress to do a job of appropriation paring.

The Soviet Union did not move into the ILO until 1954, when, with two of its constituent "republics"—the Ukraine and Byelorussia—it suddenly assumed a full membership role. The result has been that, with the slavish following of four Red satellite members and various so-called neutral countries, the Communist bloc has been able to overrule the United States on almost every issue brought up during the last 18 months.

The ILO is supposed to be organized on a tripartite basis, with each member nation sending delegates representing the government, labor, and management, to its annual meetings in its huge, ornate marble home in Geneva.

The United States employer delegate, W. L. McGrath, prominent Cincinnati industrialist, has been battling against acceptance of Soviet employer delegates on the very valid grounds that there can be no employer class under the Communist system, that any Red delegates in this category therefore are per se nothing more than agents of their government and of the Communist Party.

McGrath was named to his post at the recommendation of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers. Both organizations have been strangely loath to take up the cudgels in his behalf, but the chamber's board of directors now has finally adopted a resolution urging Congress to investigate the ILO's "activities and structure * * * (to) determine whether the United States should continue its support of and continuation in that organization."

A special NAM committee has made a similar recommendation, but neither organization is willing to support McGrath's proposal that the United States get out now.

Expensive Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, Congress is now being subjected to its annual program of plea and pressure from Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield for an increase in postal rates.

From now until sometime in the distant future we will be hearing of the great improvement in the postal service. The fact is that postal operation cost is more today than ever before and, in my opinion, the rate increases requested are not fair and avoid many basic important policy decisions. Much can be done to improve management of the Post Office Department. Much should be done to improve morale of the postal worker. This cannot be achieved through the programs of speed-up which have been inaugurated by the Postmaster General.

Mr. Summerfield is a man of very interesting and diverse facets. He seems to have an uncontrollable desire to experiment with gadgets of various types. Recently, the press carried an announcement that stamp-selling machines would thank each patron for the dimes, nickels, or pennies fed into it. My views as to the value of such a gadget are best contained in the following item from the Tulare Advance-Register in California:

EXPENSIVE THANKS

We can't say that we're much taken with the Postoffice Department's latest stunt to curry favor with its patrons.

Postmaster General Summerfield and his inventive aides have come up this time with a little gadget which says "thank you" when a customer pops coins into a stamp vending machine.

Well goodie, goodie for the Postoffice Department. Now even the machines around the postoffices of the United States are going to be real polite to us.

Courtesy is a nice thing, all right, but the catch to this latest postoffice gimmick is that the 7 machines built so far cost about $4,000 each. Others to be built will cost about $1,000 apiece, say the wizards of the Postoffice Department.

Well, fine and dandy, but for a Department that's constantly hollering to the high heavens about its deficit, the whole idea of talking stamp machines seems to us to be a pretty extravagant thing.

Sure, we suppose it will be real cute the first time we hear the stamp machine in the postoffice lobby tell us, "Thank you for buying stamps." It will be, that is, until we realize that this little bit of etiquette is costing us a big hunk of money that could be used to help get the Post Office Department into the black for a change.

Outstanding Bibliography on Estonian Publications of Dr. Salme Kuri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this distinguished body at times has the occasion to perform certain research that is essential to the duties of our office.

Depending on which committee we serve upon, our ability to legislate more intelligently—thus to fulfill the responsibility for which we were summoned by

the people of America—is largely dependent upon our accessibility to facts about many matters and categories with which we must be well acquainted.

In this terrifying age—when more than 900 million innocent human beings are held in cruel Soviet bondage—there is compelling need for factual and up-to-date information about the various satellite and Baltic States that are bound by the heavy chains of Communist slavery.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with my duties on the House Armed Services Committee, I recently took upon myself the task of acquiring certain late and current information about the unfortunate Baltic States, particularly about that northernmost country that borders the Baltic Sea—Estonia.

Searching vainly through the gigantic catalog of our Library of Congress, I was unable to find a single bibliography on publications concerning the Baltic States that would provide me with a shortcut to the information that I sought and needed.

It was only good fortune, Mr. Speaker, that finally led me to the library of our Catholic University in Washington where I found a complete and up-to-date bibliography on Estonian publications that had recently been submitted as a dissertation for a master's degree by Dr. Salme Kuri—herself a naturalized American citizen from Estonia who is an employee at the Library of Congress.

This bibliography of Dr. Kuri is unique in many respects. The hundreds of publications contained therein are broken down in various fields of interest, and it contains an extensive index. This work of Dr. Kuri is indeed a masterpiece and without doubt the most outstanding product of extensive research on the Baltic area.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Library of Congress now contemplates publishing this outstanding work of Dr. Kuri; and if so, it will certainly be a useful and noteworthy contribution to the legislative branch of our Government. If published, I wholeheartedly recommend this bibliography to any of my distinguished colleagues who are desirous of obtaining a shortcut to information on all aspects of Estonia. It would be an asset to the Nation if a similar publication existed that covered the entire Baltic area.

Mr. Speaker, this outstanding contribution of Dr. Kuri only bears out a contention that I have held for many years: That is that the United States is fortunate to have among its citizenry so many of the good, progressive and industrious peoples from East Europe and elsewhere. It is my good fortune to represent a district in which a number of Connecticut's finest and most progressive citizens are of Polish descent. Also, we have in the fifth congressional district many excellent citizens that are of Czechoslovakian, Hungarian, and Italian descent. These good people are constantly striving, in their respective ways, to make America a greater nation and to maintain the flame of liberty that they knew they would find when they reached the shore of the United States.

Censorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the November 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

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

CENSORSHIP IN WASHINGTON

Not long ago a reporter queried a Government agency to find out how much peanut butter our men in uniform consume in a year.

His request was turned down cold. "This information," snapped the Government press officer, "is classified top secret. A potential enemy might get valuable clues on our armed strength if we were to release these figures."

This, unfortunately, is a true story which Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat, California, tells to illustrate to what absurd lengths secrecy and coverup in Government have gone. (As just about everyone knows, the armed services regularly publish up-to-date reports on the number of men in service, so spies don't need to estimate the per capita consumption of peanut butter.)

"Secrecy in Washington," Dr. Gerald Johnson, noted historian and commentator, wrote recently, "is more than an administration policy. It has become a disease." This is a view shared, incidentally, by the American Society of Newspaper Editors and the Association of Newspaper Publishers, both of whom have called for a halt to the spreading contagion.

Although the various department heads deny it, the record shows a definite trend toward coverup Government involving far more than the press. At this writing, the administration seems bent on erecting a paper curtain of censorship not only between itself and the public, but against the Congress as well.

The administration philosophy on blacking out information was clearly enunciated this summer by Boston banker Robert Cutler, former secretary of the President's National Security Council, who still serves as a part-time White House consultant.

Speaking to the Associated Harvard Clubs, Cutler declared the right to decide what information shall be made public—not just military information but all the vast paraphernalia which lies behind any policy decision—belongs to the President alone. In this complex, atom-dominated age, free speech, not secrecy, must justify itself, and the people need learn of decisions only after they have been implemented. So runs the Cutler thesis.

According to David Lawrence's magazine, U. S. News & World Report, Mr. Cutler's views were especially commended to White House aids by Mr. Eisenhower himself.

The press generally took a dim view of the speech. "Secrecy a la mode" and "Creeping Aunty-Knows-Bestism" the Washington Post called the Cutler philosophy. As Cutler sees it, the Post commented, information is no more than "a commodity to be manipulated to Government's advantage."

Wrote the Alsop brothers in their June 21, 1955, column: "the Cutler system, which is also the Eisenhower administration system, is not merely antidemocratic. Worse still, it is plain silly, unless its real purpose is to prevent those political embarrassments which officials have always wished to avoid."

Some of the concealment, like Topsy, "just growed," as officials found it more and more expedient to cover up errors of omission and commission.

But some of the coverup has certainly been deliberate from the outset—designed to mask unpopular proposals from the public or to distort the facts in a potentially flammable situation for political effect. The first consideration undoubtedly was behind the interagency conspiracy of silence and evasion which surrounded the Dixon-Yates and Hells Canyon deals. And one has only to read the newspapers now to see that no censorship could have been more self-serving than the administration's persistent refusal to submit its loyalty-security program to public analysis.

The businessmen now running the Government see nothing unusual about the secrecy they impose. After all, in the business world from which they came they were not used to sharing their affairs with the press or public. No one, certainly not President Eisenhower, has pointed out to Cabinet officers that as appointed representatives in a democratic government they now have responsibilities to the public which have no parallel in the business world.

The Washington press conference, a Chicago Tribune writer mourned recently, is a vanishing institution. In June, no Cabinet officer met the press more than once; in July, only 3 and in August 5 of the Cabinet held conferences.

The Defense Department's paper curtain has become almost as impenetrable as armor. Although 70 cents out of every tax dollar goes for defense, Secretary Wilson will release only information he feels "makes a constructive contribution to the mission" of his Department. His new press deputy has gone a step further and favors releasing only useful information. As Gerald Johnson commented, conceivably the public might find incompetence on the part of a Defense official useful information but certainly the Defense agency would not.

All last spring, Secretary Wilson argued for a reduction in ground forces by reason of our alleged air superiority over the Soviets. He had to make a quick about-face when Moscow staged a public demonstration of its new jet bombers on May Day but even when he upgraded his budget estimates, he refused to release any information whatever on Soviet air strength. Not until the foreign press and technical journals here had published eye-witness accounts of what they had seen was the Secretary persuaded to make a belated and inadequate public announcement explaining his position.

Then, of course, the Congress moved swiftly to vote increased appropriations for the Nation's defense.

Several times, Mr. Wilson has shown he believes only information helpful to the administration is good for the country. When Gen. Matthew Ridgway retired in July, he wrote the Defense Secretary protesting cuts in our Armed Forces. Wilson promptly classified the letter. Then 2 weeks later, the New York Times happened on a copy, and finding nothing secret, published it. This forced Wilson to dig his copy out of the safe and release it. He explained sheepishly he had suppressed the information so as not to complicate the work of President Eisenhower at Geneva.

Agriculture Secretary Benson is another administration official who on not 1 but 2 occasions has stated publicly that sometimes "information should be withheld which might do harm to the Government"—Government being synonymous with the administration.

When did Mr. Benson withhold information, for instance, which might harm the Government Notably in refusing to discuss

any of his now discredited security charges against Wolf Ladejinsky.

His philosophy may also explain why, when he raised interest rates on Commodity Credit Corporation price-support loans, and again last January when he upped the interest rate farmers pay for disaster-relief loans, he conveniently forgot to make any public announcement.

Consider the pattern of evasion and concealment which marked the administration's handling of Dixon-Yates:

For almost 2 years—until a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee under Senator KEFAUVER blasted out the facts—the administration concealed the role of Adolphe Wenzell, an ambidextrous gentleman who attended 25 separate meetings at the Budget Bureau as a consultant to the Government on Dixon-Yates. At the same time, he worked as vice president of the First Boston Corp., which, by happy coincidence, had agreed to finance Messrs. Dixon and Yates.

In releasing detailed chronologies in August 1954, the administration assured the public they contained the whole story on Dixon-Yates. But it was later revealed that Mr. Wenzell's name was conspicuously missing.

When Senate investigators sought the working papers from the Budget Bureau Director, they were refused the information.

Although Mr. Wenzell testified he himself had some doubts about the propriety of his dual role, there was no criticism of him within the administration.

This past August, the press was told that the Dixon-Yates records could not be dragged out with justice to the public—although it is hard to see how their publication could have hurt anyone except the administration and Dixon-Yates.

Although he admittedly ordered the Securities and Exchange Commission to recess a hearing on Dixon-Yates until after Congress cast a crucial vote on the matter, Assistant President Sherman Adams took a quick dive under the cloak of presidential immunity when asked to testify.

Time and again the administration has followed a pattern for refusing to give Congress information—notably when it declined to give the joint congressional committee investigating the Army-McCarthy copies of high-level memoranda within the executive agencies.

In recent month, administration officials have clammed up more and more in the face of congressional investigations.

Commerce Secretary Weeks, acting on White House advice, has refused to cooperate with a House Judiciary Subcommittee's probe of the Department's business advisory commission and the role of businessmen serving without compensation (WOC's they are called) at Commerce. Representative EMANUEL CELLER's subcommittee sent eight separate requests for the WOC files. The only material they have received is published speeches and press releases. In 1951 Commerce Secretary Sawyer supplied the same committee with all WOC files.

Secretary Weeks has stiff-armed three requests to testify. He has, however, angrily labeled the investigation "a massive attack on free enterprise" and concluded irrelevantly, "I don't think the American people want anyone to play politics with defense or prosperity."

(Mr. Weeks' penchant for playing it close to the chest got him in hot water once before. To a reporter for the Detroit News he hotly denied an exchange of letter with Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, on the St. Lawrence seaway. The Detroit News printed his denial side by side with the verbatim letters.)

Federal Power Commission Chairman Jerome Kuykendall was less than frank with Congress in his testimony on Dixon-Yates. Again this summer he assured a House committee that FPC had taken no action to license the private Idaho Power Co. to build dams at Hells Canyon. The FPC order junking plans for a big Government dam at Hells Canyon, was dated the day before Kuykendall testified. The Administration, it seems, wanted no announcement made until Congress got out of town.

Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of a House Government Operations Subcommittee, has charged Interior Secretary McKay with deliberately withholding information on the Government's agreement with the Georgia Power Co. to ransmit Government power to rural electric co-ops in the State. CHUDOFF'S committee is investigating whether preference users like REA co-ops are getting their fair share of Government power.

Agriculture Secretary Benson several times has refused to testify on the circumstances within his Department which enabled private operators to make windfall killings in cheese and butter last year.

Mr. Stassen, when head of FOA, steadfastly refused to turn over documents to a Senate operations subcommittee. The group was inquiring into an FOA contract with a Los Angeles firm—the highest of five bidders—to build grain storage facilities in Pakistan. Mr. Stassen never let loose the documents, but admitted error, cancelled the contracts, and asked for new bids.

A House Operations Subcommittee, headed by Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat, of California, expects to open hearings in November on the spreading web of Government secrecy. With over 100 cases of withheld information now under study, he will probably spend sometime trying to pierce the silken curtain with which Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby surrounded the Salk vaccine controversy, and also look at the all-important question of why the full story on the effects of radioactive H-bomb fallout has been withheld by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Carroll Binder, editor of the Minneapolis Tribune editorial page, was especially concerned over this latter aspect of Government secrecy when he addressed the Harvard clubs this summer. He took issue on the subject, incidentally, with Presidential consultant, Cutler.

Said Mr. Binder: "Under the policy of secrecy pursued by the AEC, our civil-defense authorities know less about the effects of H-bomb damage than the Russians know. The AEC waited almost a year before it released information about the fallout of the H-bomb explosion at Bikini Island on March 1, 1954, and then it released less information than physicians need to know to treat H-bomb injuries or civil-defense officials need to know to make wise plans for coping with a possible attack."

The full extent of Government coverups can only be imagined. They generally start small and get bigger. The pattern begins with censorship of information, then hush-hush treatment of small mistakes and inefficiencies. From there, it is only a matter of time and degree for some grave blunder or failure to be hidden from sight in the ordinary course of business.

For example, the absurd classifying of peanut-butter statistics probably grew out of the embarrassment suffered by the Navy last spring when Hoover Commission investigators uncovered what they claimed was a 60-year supply of canned hamburger lying in Navy warehouses. Coverups on peanut butter and hamburger are not necessarily important in and of themselves. But the deliberate concealment of lagging defense or failing to tell the public about radioactive fallout can be as important as survival itself.

The Dayton Daily News warns just how serious the coverup has become: "Censorship at the well can choke off the flow of information to the public as surely as censorship at the spigot." And, the News continues, "It's past time * * * to take forceful measures to reverse it."

Scientific and Technical Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the success or failure of our effort to keep ahead of the world in scientific and technological development may to a considerable part depend on our ability to retain the very best in trained scientific and technical personnel in the service of our Government. This applies to no small extent to the fields of activity engaged in by the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

I have, therefore, asked the Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission for a report on the effect which Federal pay has upon the recruitment of scientific personnel. He has answered my inquiry with the letter which I submit herewith:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GUBSER: This has further reference to your letter of December 21, 1955, in which you inquire about our experience in hiring and retaining employees, particularly for scientific positions.

Although the number of employees we recruit for the lowest levels of scientific and technical positions is relatively small, those we need for such positions must be outstanding and possess unusual capacities for growth into more responsible positions. These, of course, are the very ones who are much sought after by private industry, with salary offers we frequently are unable to match. However, we are in a somewhat favorable position in that many high-caliber people are attracted to our agency because of the nature of the work and the opportunity to be associated with outstanding scientists and leaders in atomic energy.

With respect to your question about the retention of employees in the higher salary levels, our current cumulative separation rate (separations per 100 employees of the same grades) for employees at grade GS–14 and above (of which we have approximately 600) is 10 percent a year. Of this group, about three-fourths resign from the Federal service. These resignations are sometimes due to an offer of compensation much higher than we are able to pay. In the case of scientific and technical personnel, we have some measure of relief from this situation afforded by our authority to pay such personnel in excess of Classification Act rates. We have used this authority very sparingly, however, because we must try to keep salaries of such personnel properly alined with those of nonscientific and technical employees.

In competing with private industry for highly qualified personnel, we also find that Government is sometimes at a disadvantage with respect to special fringe benefits. One notable example, which is a continuing problem for us, is our inability to pay for travel and transportation of household effects for

newly hired key employees to their first duty station.

With rapidly increasing participation of private industry in civilian applications of atomic energy, its interest in AEC employees, particularly those with scarce specialized scientific and technical skills, is likely to increase in the future. In some cases, this will not be undesirable, since it will help in the promotion of increasing private participation contemplated in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, but is likely, also, to increase the turnover rate for our key employees.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and hope our comments are helpful.

Sincerely yours,

K. E. FIELDS,
General Manager.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is too serious to trifle with. I have introduced legislation which will correct this problem, and I urge the House to consider it or any other legislation which will make it possible to immediately recruit sufficient and adequate scientific personnel and retain it for a satisfactory period.

Demagoguery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 10, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under date of February 7, 1956, the Democratic State central committee, controlled by the UAW–CIO, sent out a letter stating that it intends to defeat the six Michigan Republican Congressmen—and I am one of them—who voted for the gas bill.

The letter charges that those who voted against the bill "sold out the people back home," undoubtedly meaning those who purchase gas. It asks whether the six accepted or intended to accept campaign contributions from the oil and gas interests.

Those who voted for the bill did not directly or indirectly sell out anyone nor will their action in any way contribute to an increase in the price of gas as used by the consumer.

The transportation of gas from the well to the consumer is now regulated by the Federal Government. The price paid by the consumer is regulated in Michigan by the State Public Service Commission.

There is no more reason why the Federal Government should control the production of gas at the well than there is that it should control the making, sale, and transportation of automobiles.

Always I have voted against an extension of the power of the Federal Government, against measures designed to limit the rights of the people or of the States.

In answer to the CIO's Democratic State central committee's inquiry as to whether I accepted or intended to accept contributions from the oil and gas interests, my answer—as the CIO well knows—is that I never have and I never expect to get any.

No part of the $1,035,958 spent in 1954 by labor organizations in political activities came to me. Nor was a dollar of the $272,714 political fund of the UAW–CIO–PAC spent in my behalf.

The sworn statement of the CIO on file with the Clerk of the House shows that over the years the CIO has, as it did last year, made political contributions to my political opponent. Undoubtedly, the reason was that they expected he would be their "rubber stamp," their "yes man," vote for their legislative program here in Washington.

The current press carries the statement that the political bigwigs of the AFL–CIO, meeting at Miami Beach, are contemplating spending some $2 million to defeat Congressmen who do not bow to their will. Looks as though the labor bosses, with their campaign millions, have congressional candidates who will not kiss the collective labor "foot," over a barrel.

Apparently, the CIO intends to continue to use funds paid in by its members—even though they are Republicans—to support its hand-picked candidates running under a Democratic label. This money, according to the union announcement, comes "from two sources, voluntary contributions from union members and from union treasuries."

Campaign Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed alarmed to read in this morning's paper an article by Drew Pearson wherein he enumerated the fabulous sums of money contributed by the Rockefeller, Pew, Mellon, du Pont, and other families toward the Republican 1952 campaign. He elaborated in this article how various members of the family circumvented the true intent of the Corrupt Practices Act by the parents and children, cousins, uncles, and aunts all contributing sums of money in order to break down the total amount to avoid the intent of the election law dealing with unreasonable contributions.

I think it is highly necessary for the House to establish a special committee in the 1956 campaign as a watch-dog committee to prevent evasion of the Corrupt Practices Act and avoid the repetition of the millions that were spent by the Republican Party in 1952 and other campaigns. The chairman of the senatorial Campaign Committee, Senator GOLDWATER, and several other leading Republican politicians have been cleverly sending out misleading propaganda alerting the American people against large expenditures from labor organizations.

Let us get the record straight regarding the relative contributions of labor organizations as compared with the Republican Party's financial sponsors. In 1954 the Republican Party received from 738 individuals and families, a sum equal to the total voluntary contributions from 18 million members of organized labor. This amount was $1,434,000. In other words, for every voluntary contribution from a labor-union member of $1, the Republican Party received $1,943 from each of 738 wealthy contributors.

In the 1950 campaign in Ohio, the Hennings investigating committee revealed that the Republican political groups, organizations, and clubs supporting Senator Taft, spent $1,800,000. It was also revealed in the Hennings committee report through the testimony of Ohio senatorial candidate Joe Ferguson and others, that groups made up of Republic Steel, Timken Roller Bearing, NAM, American Medical Association, and so forth, spent approximately $1,200,000 in cleverly written newspaper, magazine, billboard, television, and other forms of advertising for the Republican Party in Ohio. This sum, coupled with the above, placed the cost of the Ohio Republican campaign in 1950 at approximately $3 million. Compare this with the $220,000 voluntary contributions spent in Ohio by all branches of organized labor during the 1950 campaign.

From reports in the newspapers and over radio and television, the American voters have cause to fear as to what might happen in 1956, if the special interest groups follow the same policy of election expenditures as in 1950, 1952, and 1954. No greater cloud hovers over the American system of free elections and representative Government than the fact that money is beginning to play such an important part in the elections of Presidents, Congressmen, governors, and other State officials. I read where Chairman Hall, of the Republican National Committee, has already admitted that $2 million worth of television time has already been signed. Five million dollars in addition has been raised by the Salute to Eisenhower meetings. There has not been revealed the added millions that will be derived from sources which brought about the great Republican campaign expenditures of 1950 and 1952. As of now, the Democratic Party has been unable to even talk to broadcasting companies regarding television and radio time because of a barren campaign budget.

I know the farmers of Indiana and America are very anxious to get the true facts as to why the Republican campaign promises of 1952 were completely reversed and they received the rural bankruptcy plan of Benson in 1953 and 1954. Apparently in the fall campaign the only television and radio time the Democratic Party will have available to inform the farmers of the true facts involved will be during the 6 a. m. milking hour. On the other hand, the only factual information labor can receive over television and radio as to why the Eisenhower promises of 1952 were not carried out will be the broadcasts at the 4 a. m. change of shift in factories throughout America. National Democratic

Chairman Butler's plan to equally divide radio-television time would be a great step forward in enabling the American voter to decide this election on factual information in the true record of both parties. It is highly necessary that to preserve this free republic the Congress take steps to prevent buying of elections through tremendous campaign funds. The American people must know the true facts and issues in this coming campaign and unfortunately, it costs millions to bring this information to the people. The public is entitled to know what is going on in their Government and one of the unfortunate ways to prevent this information from going into the precincts are the fabulous campaign expenditures provided by special privilege groups to buy up radio, television, newspaper, magazine, and all other forms of advertising mediums.

Congress should take steps and take steps now to prevent money from being the deciding factor in the presidential and congressional elections of 1956.

Foreign Aid Report From the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the subject of foreign aid continues to be a much-discussed and much-misunderstood question. A recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, reprinted below, puts this program in sharp perspective.

The editorial follows:

AID REPORT FROM THE PHILIPPINES

One of the most frequent questions asked about American foreign aid, point IV, and so on is, "What good does it do?"

Item: Three hundred and fifteen farmers' cooperative credit and marketing associations organized with 139,000 members in the Philippines, where usury and tenancy were the rule. Item: Subdivision of public lands creating 170,000 new family-sized farms in the islands. Item: Thirty-eight agricultural, 33 trade, and 9 normal schools organized. Item: Malaria reduced 80 percent in 3 years; 59 hospitals rehabilitated since the war, 244 rural health units equipped. Item: An Industrial Development Center is advising Filipinos on diversification and modernization of industry. Item: New liberal labor legislation passed and a labor education center set up for union leaders. Item: Nine new coal districts surveyed and coal production increased 60 percent. Item: A new modern budget system established for the Philippine Government. Item: Two hundred and ninety-five miles of new roads ready, 1,000 miles being improved.

These are only some of the measures established or promoted by the United States International Cooperation Administration with the help of the Filipinos. To this program, America has contributed $110 million; the Filipinos $145 million.

What good is foreign aid? Ask our friends, the Filipinos.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed urgent deficiency appropriations, bills on aircraft destruction, merchant marine, and Pershing memorial, and routine resolutions.

House adjourned out of respect for Representative Reed of Illinois.

Senate Agriculture Committee reported farm bill.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 2150–2169

Bills Introduced: 11 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3175–S. 3185; S. J. Res. 143, and S. Res. 210 and 211. **Pages 2151–2152**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H. R. 12, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to price supports for basic commodities and milk, without recommendation (no written report); and

S. 3183, Agricultural Act of 1956 (written report with any minority views will be filed on subsequent date pursuant to authorization granted in Senate today). **Page 2151**

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Page 2167**

Bill Placed on Calendar: H. J. Res. 514, relating to compensation of executive director of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, was ordered to be placed on calendar. **Page 2149**

Appointments to Boards: It was announced that the Vice President had appointed Senator Bush as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, and Senator Case of New Jersey as a member of the Board of Visitors to the U. S. Merchant Marine Academy. **Pages 2149–2150**

Urgent Deficiency Appropriations: Senate passed with amendments H. R. 9063, urgent deficiency appropriations for fiscal year 1956, adopting all committee amendments with the exception of two which were rejected, as indicated below:

(1) To allow utilization of Murphy General Hospital at Waltham, Mass., to meet any requirements of military, naval, and Air Forces, and other Government agencies (by voice vote); and

(2) To provide additional funds of $4.5 million for acquisition of site, construction, and equipment of additional Senate office building (Chair sustained Ellender point of order against amendment).

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed Senators Hayden, Russell, Chavez, Bridges, and Saltonstall as conferees. **Pages 2169–2172**

Farm Legislation: By unanimous consent, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to file its written report, including minority views, on S. 3183, Agricultural Act of 1956, during any Senate recess or adjournment. **Page 2151**

Willful Aircraft Destruction: Senate passed without amendment S. 2972, to punish the willful damaging or destroying of aircraft. **Pages 2172–2173**

Merchant Marine Medals: Senate passed without amendment S. 2711, to authorize medals and decorations for outstanding service in merchant marine. **Pages 2173–2174**

Committee Funds: S. Res. 210, authorizing Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ four additional clerical assistants, was adopted with an amendment by Senator Clements limiting authority to February 29, 1956. **Page 2174**

Pershing Memorial: S. J. Res. 95, authorizing American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for erection of memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing, was passed without amendment. **Page 2174**

Routine Resolutions Adopted: Senate adopted without amendment three routine resolutions, as follows: S. Res. 207, authorizing payment of gratuity to survivor of deceased Senate employee; S. Res. 195, authorizing printing of 37th biennial report of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf; and S. Res. 208, authorizing printing as a Senate document a revised

edition of S. Doc. 233, 81st Congress, entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities."

Pages 2174–2175

Condolence Resolution: S. Res. 211, expressing condolence on death of Representative Reed of Illinois, was adopted. Page 2175

Confirmations: Senate confirmed nominations of Sigurd Anderson, of South Dakota, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, along with eight nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and numerous Coast Guard nominations. Page 2182

Nominations: Senate received nomination of Ross Rizley, of Oklahoma, to be U. S. district judge for western district of Oklahoma, and numerous postmasters, Public Health Service, and Air Force nominations.

Pages 2175–2182

Program for Tuesday: Senate adjourned at 1:55 p. m. until noon Tuesday, February 14, when it will meet without transaction of major business.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

FARM PROGRAM

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: On Thursday, February 9, in a night session, the committee ordered favorably reported an original bill (S. 3183), proposed Agricultural Act of 1956, which bill would provide: (1) Establishment of 90-percent price supports for basic commodities in 1956 and 1957, (2) increase minimum price-support levels for milk and dairy products from 75 to 80 percent of parity, (3) continue the dual parity formula for the basic commodities, (4) establish a voluntary soil-bank program, (5) establish a two-price plan for rice for the 1956 and 1957 crops, and (6) give technical and financial assistance to private landowners for tree planting and management.

Also, the committee ordered reported without recommendation H. R. 12, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, regarding price supports for basic commodities and milk.

MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction concluded its hearings on the Army title of S. 3122, to authorize certain construction at military installations, after receiving testimony from Col. William R. Shuler, Chief, Construction Division, Office of Directorate of Installations, Army; Lt. Col. H. A. Gould, Deputy Chief, Public Works Planning Branch, Construction Division, Army; H. B. Zachrison, Army Engineers; Maj. C. H. Moore, Jr., Communications Planning, Army; and Col. J. H. Kerkering, Office of Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, Europe.

Subcommittee will begin hearing on Navy title of the bill on Tuesday, February 14.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION

Select committee: Select committee to investigate circumstances surrounding alleged improper attempt, through a political contribution, to influence the vote of Senator Case (South Dakota) on the natural gas bill began its hearings, having as its witness Senator Case of South Dakota.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 8 public bills, H. R. 9239–9246, and 2 resolutions, H. J. Res. 530 and H. Res. 399, were introduced. Pages 2189–2190

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H. R. 7723, a private bill (H. Rept. 1760);

H. J. Res. 518, relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco allotments and marketing quotas, amended (H. Rept. 1761);

H. J. Res. 521, relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas (H. Rept. 1762); and

H. J. Res. 455, relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas (H. Rept. 1763).

Pages 2189–2190

Condolence Resolution: House adopted H. Res. 399, providing for expressions of sympathy to the family of Representative Chauncey W. Reed, of the 14th Congressional District of Illinois, and the appointment of 14 Members on the part of the House to attend the funeral.

Pursuant to H. Res. 399, the following Members were appointed to the funeral committee: Representatives O'Brien of Illinois, Dawson of Illinois, Gordon, Hoffman of Illinois, Velde, Yates, Church, Kluczynski, Sheehan, O'Hara of Illinois, Poff, Boyle, Gray, and Murray of Illinois. Pages 2184–2189

Program for Tuesday: As a further mark of respect to the memory of Representative Reed of Illinois the House adjourned at 12:50 p. m. until Tuesday, February 14, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

FLOOD AND DISASTER INSURANCE

Committee on Banking and Currency: Concluded hearings on general subject of a Government program for flood and disaster insurance. Heard Ellsworth

Bunker, president, American Red Cross, describe its activity in time of calamity. Mr. Bunker emphasized the necessity of direct loans to distressed persons but made no recommendations for a program of Government insurance.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Indian Affairs ordered the following bill reported favorably to the full committee: H. R. 5478 (amended), to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation. H. Rex Lee, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Lewis Sigler, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, were heard.

ARTIFICIAL COLORING OF ORANGES

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Health and Science concluded public hearings on H. R. 7732, to amend the Food and Drug Act, regarding artificial coloring of oranges. Representatives Haley, Kilgore; J. Hardin Peterson, former Member of Congress, Lakeland, Fla.; Herman Heidrick, Orlando, Fla.; and Commissioner George P. Larrick, Food and Drug Administration, were heard. Statements were received for the record from Roscoe Skipper, Snively Groves, Winter Haven, Fla.; John T. Lesley, Florida Citrus Exchange, Tampa, Fla.; G. F. Siemers, Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., Nutley, N. J.; and Texas Citrus & Vegetable Growers & Shippers Association.

CIVIL AIR POLICY

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications held hearings in regard to civil air policy and H. R. 4648 and 4677, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. James Fischgrund, accompanied by Hardy K. Maclay, counsel, representing North American Airlines, was heard. The U. S. Chamber of Commerce received permission to insert a statement in the record. Hearings will be continued at a later date.

MISCELLANEOUS JUDICIAL BILLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Considered the following bills, all related to the General Pulaski Memorial Day: H. J. Res. 56, 80, 81, 101, 152, 163, 187, and 453, and heard Representative Madden in connection therewith.

The committee also considered the following bills:

H. R. 2564, to incorporate the Foundation for Community Aid to Mental Patients. Representative Broyhill, Freida Reicher, president, Foundation for Community Aid to Mental Patients, and Dr. Lyle, Arlington, Va., were heard.

H. Con. Res. 204, to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the national pure food, drug, and cosmetic law. Representative Priest; Eugene H. Holeman, president, Association of Food & Drug Officers of United States, Nashville, Tenn.; Siert Riepma, president, National Association Margarine Manufacturers, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Arthur G. Davis, president, District of Columbia Women's Clubs, Washington, D. C.; and J. A. McCallam, American Veterinary Medical Association, Washington, D. C., testified.

H. R. 4732 and 4777, to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts. Testifying were Representatives Hyde, Abernethy; John J. Parker, U. S. circuit judge, Charlotte, N. C.; John Paul, U. S. district judge, Harrisonburg, Va.; Godfrey Munter, American Bar Association, Washington, D. C.; and Henry P. Chandler, Director, Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts.

Statements for the record were received from Representatives Sadlak, O'Hara of Illinois; Howard A. Prentice, vice president and secretary, Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., Washington, D. C.; Marion B. Folsom, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Ervin L. Peterson, relative to H. Con. Res. 204, and Representative Keating on H. J. Res. 56.

BILLS SIGNED BY THE PRESIDENT

New Laws

(*For last listing of public laws, see* DIGEST, *p. D78*)

H. R. 7871, to increase the funds available to the Small Business Administration for disaster loans. Signed February 2, 1956 (P. L. 402).

H. R. 5844, to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport. Signed February 10, 1956 (P. L. 403).

H. R. 7930, authorizing completion of initial stage of development for flood control and other purposes in the Russian River Basin, Calif. Signed February 10, 1956 (P. L. 404).

H. J. Res. 471, to permit FHA title I repair assistance to new homes damaged by major disasters. Signed February 2, 1956 (P. L. 405).

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Senate Chamber

(*Week of February 13–18*)

Senate does not plan to take up any major legislation during next week.

Senate Committees

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: February 15, executive, on committee business, 10 a. m., 324 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services: February 14, 15, and 17, Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction, on Navy

title in S. 3122, military public works bill, 10 a. m., 212 Senate Office Building;

February 14, subcommittee (Senators Symington, chairman, Jackson, and Smith of Maine) to consider H. R. 483, doctors of osteopathy in Army and Navy Medical Corps, 10 a. m., 457 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency: February 15, Housing Subcommittee, on S. 2854, disaster insurance, S. 2855, to stockpile temporary housing for disaster relief, and S. 2859, housing for victims of major disasters, 10 a. m., 301 Senate Office Building;

February 16 and 17, Subcommittee on Securities, on S. 2768, 2862, 3137, disaster insurance bills, 10 a. m., 301 Senate Office Building.

Committee on the District of Columbia: February 14–16, on S. 3073, Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority Act, 2:30 p. m., room P–38, Capitol.

Committee on Finance: February 14–16, on H. R. 7225, social security, 10 a. m., 312 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Government Operations: February 14, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, to begin hearings on East-West trade, 10 a. m., 357 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: February 15 and 16, on S. 923, to prohibit transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, 10 a. m., 318 Senate Office Building;

February 15 and 16, Subcommittee on Aviation, on air service to St. Louis, 10 a. m., room G–16, Capitol.

Committee on the Judiciary: February 13, executive, on committee business, 10 a. m., 424 Senate Office Building;

February 15, on nominations of four district judges (Maryland, Florida, Wyoming, and New York), 10 a. m., 424 Senate Office Building;

February 16, Subcommittee on Patents, on H. R. 2068, private bill, 10:30 a. m., 424 Senate Office Building.

House Chamber

(*Week of February 13–18*)

The legislative program of the House is undetermined at this time.

House Committees

Committee on Agriculture: February 13, Departmental Administration and Crop Insurance Subcommittee on H. R. 7815, to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in financing the 1957 World's Conservation Exposition and plowing contests to be held in Adams County, Ohio, in September 1957, 10 a. m., 1310 New House Office Building.

February 14 and 15, Conservation and Credit Subcommittee on H. R. 8750, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

February 15, Livestock and Feed Grains Subcommittee to consider the decline in choice cattle prices.

February 16, Cotton Subcommittee on H. R. 7878, 8262, and 8388, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to increase acreage allotments for the 1956 crop of cotton.

February 17, Wheat Subcommittee on H. R. 8346, 8371, and S. 2884, bills to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Committee on Armed Services: February 15, Subcommittee No. 2 on H. R. 8500, to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Committee on Government Operations: February 16, Brooks of Texas subcommittee will hold hearing on Government-owned nickel plant, Nicaro, Cuba.

Committee on House Administration: February 15, full committee to meet.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: February 13, on bills pending before the committee, 10 a. m., 1324 New House Office Building.

February 14, on H. J. Res. 516, providing payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming.

February 15, to hear witnesses from the Defense Department and the three military departments on applicability of State water laws to military withdrawals or reservations.

February 16 and 17, Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs on H. R. 9215, 244, 7512, 8405, and 8833, all to amend the Organic Act of the Territory of Alaska, regarding Alaska fisheries.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: February 14, Subcommittee on Health and Science to continue open hearings on bills to amend the Food and Drug Act regarding chemical food additives. Representatives of Food and Drug Administration will be heard.

February 16 and 17, full committee on H. R. 4627, to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce, proponents to be heard on February 16; opponents on February 17.

Committee on the Judiciary: February 15, Subcommittee No. 3 on H. R. 6623, relative to obtaining congressional consent to interstate compacts on military aid.

February 16, regular executive meeting of full committee on pending legislation.

February 17, Subcommittee No. 3 on H. J. Res. 290 and 291, relative to interstate compacts to deal with delinquent juveniles.

February 17, Subcommittee No. 4 on S. 689 and H. R. 670, to amend section 75 of the Bankruptcy Act.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: February 15 and 16, full committee to resume review of operation and administration of Cargo Preference Act.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: February 16, full committee in executive session to hear Postmaster General.

February 17, Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations in executive session.

Committee on Un-American Activities: February 14, 15, and 16, full committee to continue the Chicago hearings.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: February 17, Housing Subcommittee at Staunton, Va., on direct loans.

Committee on Ways and Means: February 14, on H. R. 9075, Highway Revenue Act of 1956, instead of Wednesday, February 15, as previously announced. Will hear Secretary of Treasury George M. Humphrey.

February 16, executive, Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems to consider pending bills.

Joint Committees

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: February 14, to begin hearing testimony from industry witnesses on development, state, and growth of atomic energy industry, 10 a. m., 457 Senate Office Building.

Joint Committee on the Economic Report: February 13–15, on President's economic report: Monday on natural resources policy, with Secretary of the Interior McKay, Tuesday on natural resources policy, with Oscar L. Chapman, of Chapman & Wolfsohn, Washington, and Wednesday on general aspects of the report, with a panel of representatives of economic interest and research groups, 10 a. m., room P–63, Capitol.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Select committee to investigate circumstances surrounding alleged improper attempt, through a political contribution, to influence vote of Senator Case (South Dakota) on the natural gas bill, 10 a. m., 318 Senate Office Building.

Congressional Record.

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION.

Vol. 52. WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1915. No. 64.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 18, 1915.*

Rev. Robert L. Fultz, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, we devoutly acknowledge Thee to be our sovereign Lord and Master. We rejoice that Thou hast taught us to call Thee Father. As subjects in Thy kingdom, may our wills be wholly dominated by Thy will. As Thy sons, may we imbibe Thy spirit until our obedience shall be the product of an unearthly affection, and our service joyous and fruitful; inspired by the love of God in our hearts. In the name of Thy Son, our Savior. Amen.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hollis	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Hughes	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	James	Overman	Smoot
Burleigh	Johnson	Owen	Stephenson
Burton	Jones	Page	Sterling
Camden	Kenyon	Penrose	Stone
Catron	Kern	Perkins	Sutherland
Chilton	La Follette	Pittman	Swanson
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Pomerene	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Tillman
Culberson	Lippitt	Reed	Townsend
Cummins	Lodge	Robinson	Vardaman
Dillingham	McCumber	Root	Warren
Fall	McLean	Shafroth	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	White
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	Williams
Goff	Myers	Simmons	Works
Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	
Hardwick	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. POMERENE. I was requested to announce that the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is unavoidably absent, and that he is paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT], without the right of either party to transfer the pair.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, there was so much audible conversation in the Chamber I was not sure that I understood the Secretary correctly. I understood him to read from the Journal, in referring to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], that the Senate disagreed to the House amendments. I simply wish to find out what the Journal does state about it. It is the first reference in the Journal to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the part of the Journal referred to.

The Secretary read as follows:

On motion by Mr. FLETCHER, that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the said bill, and ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that seven conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Vice President.

Mr. LODGE asked for a division of the question.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is enough, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection or correction, the Journal will stand approved as read.

REGENT OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced the appointment of Mr. STONE a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for the term beginning March 4, 1915.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of papers, documents, and so forth, on the files of the Navy Department which are not needed in the transaction of public business and which have no permanent value or historic interest. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints as the committee on the part of the Senate the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE]. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment thereof.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 951).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion filed by the court in the cause of Sargeant Prentiss Knut, administrator of Haller Nutt *v.* The United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 to the bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and agrees to the same.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19445) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3362) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, to make a survey of natural oyster beds, bars, and rocks, and barren bottoms contiguous thereto in waters along the coast of and within the State of Texas, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2335) to provide for the register and enrollment of vessels built in foreign countries when such vessels have been wrecked on the coasts of the United States or her possessions or adjacent waters and salved by American citizens and repaired in American shipyards.

The message also transmitted to the Senate resolutions of the House on the life and public services of Hon. Lewis J. Martin, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 4146. An act granting certain lands to school district No. 44, Chelan County, Wash.;

S. 5449. An act to make Pembina, N. Dak., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement;

H. R. 19376. An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington;

H. R. 19545. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Fisheries and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate memorial No. 3.

To the Congress of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, in session assembled, do hereby memorialize and petition your honorable body: That—

Whereas it has been and is the policy and the practice of the Federal Government to aid and assist the several States of the Union in the propagation and cultivation of the food fishes, wherever found practicable; and

Whereas such aid and benefits as have been already given to many of the older States by the Government have not yet been extended to the infant State of Arizona: Now therefore

Your memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States will enact such legislation and make such appropriation as in its judgment may seem adequate to provide and maintain a Government fish hatchery at some suitable place within the State of Arizona for the purpose of stocking and replenishing the various streams and other bodies of water with food fishes found adaptable to such waters.

The secretary of the senate is hereby directed to forward a copy of this memorial to the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and a copy to Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST and Hon. MARCUS A. SMITH, United States Senators from Arizona, and to Hon. CARL HAYDEN, Representative in Congress from Arizona.

And our Senators and Representatives are earnestly requested to do all in their power to bring about the legislation herein prayed for.

W. P. SIMS,
President of the Senate.
OSCAR COLE,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram transmitting resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER,
Sacramento, Cal., February 17, 1915.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,
President of United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit to you and through you to the House of Representatives the following resolution by Mr. Sharkey:

"Whereas the State of California is most splendidly endowed with rivers and harbors, the improvement of which would have a marked effect upon not only the development of this Commonwealth but of the entire United States; and

"Whereas it is highly desirable, if not essential to wise national legislation and appropriation on rivers and harbors, that the congressional Committees on Rivers and Harbors acquire intimate and personal knowledge of conditions and possibilities with respect to California's rivers and harbors: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Assembly of the State of California respectfully requests and urges the Congress of the United States to empower and authorize its Rivers and Harbors Committees to visit the State of California with the express purpose of personally inspecting all of its harbors and its navigable rivers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Rivers and Harbors Committees of Congress be invited, and the invitation is hereby issued, to visit the State of California for such purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the speaker of the assembly be authorized to appoint a legislative reception and entertainment committee, to be composed of not less than one member from each congressional district of the State of California to be visited by the Rivers and Harbors Committees of Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the president of the senate and the speaker of the assembly, the State engineer, and the chairman of the State board of control be ex officio members of said committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That said legislative reception and entertainment committee be authorized to make all arrangements with respect to the itinerary of the visiting committees of Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress."

Resolution read and, on motion, unanimously adopted. The speaker thereupon named the committee.

I have the honor to remain, respectfully, yours,

L. B. MALLORY,
Chief Clerk Assembly State of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the restoration and preservation of the Mission of San Jose de Tumacacori, in Santa Cruz County, in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of stop watches or time-measuring devices, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church of five conferences of that church contiguous to New York City, praying for Federal supervision and censorship of motion-picture films, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Atoka, Okla., praying for the enactment of legislation granting a per capita payment to the Choctaw Tribe of Indians, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Public Forum (Inc.), of New York City, N. Y., praying for the authorization of internal improvements to provide work for the unemployed, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. LANE. I present a memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

House joint memorial No. 6.

Whereas a large section of the State of Oregon is now infested by wild predatory animals, principally coyotes, which are affected with rabies and are roaming about the country spreading disease and death among live stock of all kinds, also menacing the life of all persons who venture forth upon the highways and the prairies to such an extent that numerous families feel compelled to keep their children away from school; and

Whereas, in order to stimulate the destruction of such animals, the State of Oregon and the several counties of Oregon are expending large amounts of money as bounties in order to put a stop to such great loss of stock and the danger of human life: Be it

Resolved by the Twenty-eighth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, That the National Department of Agriculture be, and it is hereby, memorialized to institute a scientific investigation in the State of Oregon for the purpose of devising ways and means best calculated to eradicate the evil complained of in connection with the officials of this State and those of the counties affected.

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and to each Member of the Oregon delegation in both Houses of the National Congress.

Adopted by the house February 1, 1915.

BEN SELLING, *Speaker of the House.*

Adopted by the senate February 3, 1915.

W. LAIR THOMPSON, *President of the Senate.*

(Indorsed): House joint memorial No. 6, W. F. Drager, chief clerk. Filed February 12, 1915, at 9.10 o'clock a. m., Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state, by S. A. Kozer, deputy.

Mr. ASHURST. I present a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona relating to the Mission of San Jose de Tumacacori, in Santa Cruz County, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Reresentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialist, the Second Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represents:

That there stands on the bank of the Santa Cruz River, in Santa Cruz County, Ariz., the ruins of an ancient Spanish mission which at once affords a quaint and striking illustration of the architecture of a day that is gone and a monument to the surpassing zeal of the vanguards of Southwestern civilization.

That this mission, known as the Mission San Jose de Tumacacori, was founded by the Jesuit priest, missionary, and explorer, Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, between the years 1687 and 1690, and is therefore one of the most ancient ruins of its kind within the boundaries of the United States.

That although the ground, 10 acres in extent, upon which this ruin stands, has been set aside by the Federal Government as a national monument, no provision has been made for restoring the partially decayed walls of the mission or preserving the evidences of architectural and artistic skill which they bear, and meanwhile the structure is subject to the ravages of time, the elements, and the carelessness of passers-by.

That it would be an occasion of the greatest regret to the people of Arizona, and for that matter to all people who revere the memory of those religious pioneers who toiled and suffered and died that civilization and Christianity might live and advance, should this visible sign of their devoted labors be permitted to pass away.

Now, therefore, it is highly desirable that this milestone of civilization be effectually preserved, thus to hold its sacred history the fresher, to paint the beloved memories which cluster about it the brighter, and to offer, through the far from vanished beauty of its venerable walls, telling their eloquent story of love, courage, and patience, instruction and inspiration to the visitor: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Second Legislature of the State of Arizona, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, urged to enact such legislation as may be necessary to effect the aforesaid object, and to appropriate the sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to restore and preserve the historical mission of San Jose de Tumacacori; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial and these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the honorable Secretary of the Interior, and to the Representatives of Arizona in Congress; and that our Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to do all in their power to accomplish the enactment of such legislation.

Passed the house February 8, 1915, by a vote of 31 ayes, 4 excused.

WM. E. BROOKS,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate February 11, 1915, by a vote of 18 ayes, 1 no.

W. P. SIMS, *President.*
OSCAR COLE, *Secretary.*
By C. P. CRONIN, *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. ASHURST presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jerome, Ariz., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES. I present a large number of letters and petitions from the citizens of the State of Washington in favor of the passage of the bill prohibiting the export of arms and munitions of war to belligerent nations, which I move be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Bellville and New Braunfels, in the State of Texas, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., praying for the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Stephenson, Mich., remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. KENYON. I present a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa in favor of the passage of the officers' retired list bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House concurrent resolution.

Be it resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Iowa respectfully petition the Members in Congress of the United States from the State of Iowa that they give their influence and support to the passage of Senate bill 6857 in the Senate of the United States, being an act authorizing the retirement from active service, with increased rank, of officers now on the active list in the Army and who served in the Civil War, and who were honorably discharged therefrom, and who have since served not less than 40 years as a commissioned officer of the Regular Army: Be it further

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this concurrent resolution by the General Assembly of Iowa a copy of same be forwarded to each Member of Congress from this State.

W. I. ATKINSON,
Speaker of the House.
W. L. HARDING,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that this concurrent resolution originated in the house.

W. C. RAMSAY,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Introduced February 3, 1915. Adopted February 4, 1915. Messaged to senate February 5, 1915. Adopted by senate February 6, 1915.

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

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of the United Association of Post Office Clerks, of Lawrence and Westfield, in the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against a change in the present system of promotion of postal clerks, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present memorials of post-office employees of the city of Chicago and other towns in Illinois relative to the increased pay of clerks in post offices and remonstrating against the contract plan for rural carriers. I ask to have read the two letters marked "A" and "B" and that all the memorials be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The memorials were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and there being no objection the letters referred to were read, as follows:

A.

ILLINOIS RURAL LETTER CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION,
Aurora, Ill., February 15, 1915.

Hon. LAWRENCE Y. SHERMAN,
Senator from Illinois.

MY DEAR MR. SHERMAN: From reading our official paper, which is published at Washington, D. C., and note what it has to say on the subject of the post-office bill, which has been under consideration by the Senate committee, and am very sorry to state that this committee has cut out the increase for the rural-letter carriers, which leaves them the same as before the bill was given any consideration.

The House increased the salary for the carriers, and I hope when this matter comes up for consideration the friends of the carriers in the Senate will do all they can for us, as I feel that we are surely deserving of the increase that was voted us last March and of which only a few got the increase, when it was the intent of you all that every carrier should have 9 per cent increase all along the line.

I hope you will do all you can for the carriers both for the increase and to prevent the contract plan of our Postmaster General from going through, which would be a menace to our service.

Thanking you for the many kind favors in the past and hope you will favor us at this time, with many kind wishes, I am,

Yours, very truly,

FRED. S. PUTNAM,
Illinois State President.

B.

CHICAGO POST OFFICE CLERKS' ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, February 15, 1915.

Hon. L. Y. SHERMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The post-office clerks of Chicago protest against the enactment of the proposed Senate committee amendment, on page 14, lines 10 to 20, of the Post Office appropriation bill.

Under existing law it takes approximately six or seven years for a clerk to reach the maximum grade of $1,200 because of the necessary period of substitution, whereas under the proposed amendment it would take twice the number of years to reach the maximum, which at best is but a living wage for a man who is expected to live and rear his family decently and give his children only the advantage of a fair education.

It is our firm belief that the enactment of this amendment would bring about a most discouraging condition and that many of the best men in the service would be tempted to resign and that the right kind of men would hesitate about entering the service and dedicating their lives to the service and the constant study required on a wage of an unskilled laborer.

We call upon you, sir, as Senator of the great State of Illinois, to do all in your power to prevent the enactment of this amendment, which not only affects so many of the employees, but the efficiency of the service itself.

Assuring you of our deep appreciation of anything you may do, I am,

Sincerely, yours, LOUIS PHILIPP, Jr., *President.*

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from J. A. McElroy, secretary of the Local Branch Association of Post Office Clerks and Carriers, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., remonstrating against the substitution of biennial instead of annual promotions in the service. I ask that the telegram may be printed in the RECORD.

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

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *February 17, 1915.*

A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Local Branch Association of Post Office Clerks and Carriers ask you to kindly oppose amendment to appropriation bill providing biennial instead of annual promotions. This injures the lowest-paid men in the service.

J. A. MCELROY, *Secretary.*

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram from J. E. Cary, of McVille, N. Dak., relative to the grain inspection bill. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

MCVILLE, N. DAK., *February 17, 1915.*

Senator A. J. GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.:

We approve of the Moss bill for Federal supervision of grain grades, believing the bill will minimize the business risk assumed by the merchandise of grain owing to the uncertainty of grading, as it is now done in different terminal markets. This bill would enable them to handle the grain on smaller margins, which should mean better returns to the producer. With uniform grading in all markets, the producer would know what his grain would grade alike wherever it was shipped, enabling him to sell in the best market, freight figured. We think the Moss bill is more practical and can be operated with less uncertainty than a regular Government inspection bill.

J. E. CARY.

Mr. CATRON. I present two telegrams, in the nature of memorials, from post-office clerks and letter carriers of Albuquerque, N. Mex., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *February 17, 1915.*

Senator T. B. CATRON,
Washington, D. C.:

Post-office clerks opposed to amendment on page 14 of Post Office appropriation bill which provides for biennial instead of annual promotions.

J. A. GLESNER,
Secretary Post Office Clerks.

—

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *February 17, 1915.*

Hon. T. B. CATRON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please use your influence to defeat that portion of Post Office appropriation bill which provides that carriers in first and second class offices receive promotion biennially instead of annually. This means much to us, as we are now the poorest paid of public employees. Thanks for past favors.

ARTHUR HARNITEAUX,
Secretary Branch 504, National Association Letter Carriers.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain publications from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship-purchase bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wilmington, Houston, Farmington, Milford, Lincoln City, Greenwood, Camden, and Felton, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions from sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to exclude certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Anna Warner Bailey Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Groton, Conn., praying that an appropriation of $3,000 be made for the purpose of copying the pension records of the Revolutionary soldiers from Connecticut, on file in the Pension Office Building at Washington, D. C., and placing such copy in the Connecticut State Library, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WORKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Gurtine and Oakdale, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of San Dimas and Pomona, in the State of California, remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the Deutscher Radfahrer Club Eichenlaub, of New Britain; of Lodge No. 462, D. O. H., of Torrington; of Beethoven Lodge, No. 22, O. D. H. S., of Torrington; of the St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Torrington; of the German-American Alliance of Torrington; and of sundry citizens of Torrington, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report (No. 1000) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SWANSON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5619) to transfer Capt. Frank E. Evans from the retired to the active list of the Marine Corps, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1001) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 6623) in relation to the location, entry, and patenting of lands within the former Uncompahgre Indian Reservation, in the State of Utah, containing gilsonite or other like substances, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1002) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18686) to provide for provisional certificates of registry of vessels abroad, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1005) thereon.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20107) to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1007) thereon.

Mr. JAMES, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14197) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mrs. H. G. Lamar, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1008) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21200) quieting title to a certain tract of land located in the city of Guthrie, Okla., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1003) thereon.

JOSEPH ELIOT AUSTIN.

Mr. TILLMAN. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H. R. 2642) to authorize the President to reinstate Joseph Eliot Austin as an ensign in the United States Navy, and I submit a report (No. 1010) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to hear the bill read. Meanwhile I reserve the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to reinstate former Midshipman Joseph Eliot Austin in the United States Navy with the rank of ensign, and, after one year's service as ensign, he shall be promoted to the grade of lieutenant, junior grade, to take rank with and next after Aquilla Gibbs Dibrill, lieutenant, junior grade: *Provided*, That the said Joseph Eliot Austin, after one year's service as ensign, shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, by examination pursuant to law, his physical, mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform the duties of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy.

Mr. LODGE. This is not one of the "plucking board" cases, is it?

Mr. TILLMAN. No. This is the case of a man who was turned out of the Navy because he got married; that is all.

Mr. LODGE. Then I think the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am in favor of the passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "Senate," to strike out the remainder of the bill and insert:

To appoint Joseph Eliot Austin an ensign in the United States Navy to take rank at the foot of the list: *Provided*, That he shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, by examination pursuant to law, his physical, mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform the duties of ensign.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Mr. CRAWFORD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 20281) to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed, and I submit a report (No. 1007) thereon.

Mr. President, inasmuch as there is on the calendar Senate bill 6782, being Order of Business No. 735, which is identical with the House bill, I ask that the House bill just reported by me be substituted on the calendar for the Senate bill.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I move that Senate bill 6782, with like title, be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 20282) to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10, and I submit a report (No. 1009) thereon. I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill on the calendar.

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

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that Senate bill 6781, with like title, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 17907) granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the

Mississippi River, and I submit a report (No. 1004) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to the report.

Mr. KENYON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. LEA of Tennessee:

A bill (S. 7671) granting an increase of pension to William J. Mester; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 7672) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Joyner, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 7673) granting an increase of pension to Enoch M. Martin;

A bill (S. 7674) granting an increase of pension to George Osten;

A bill (S. 7675) granting a pension to Almira Graham;

A bill (S. 7676) granting an increase of pension to John Kremmer; and

A bill (S. 7677) granting a pension to Lucy J. Lindsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7678) granting a pension to Chester B. Goodenough (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 7679) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Houlihan;

A bill (S. 7680) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Householder; and

A bill (S. 7681) granting an increase of pension to James B. H. McDaniel (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

PROPOSED BUDGET SYSTEM.

Mr. KENYON. I introduce a joint resolution and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 241) creating a commission to prepare a budget system for the Government of the United States, with reference to its appropriations, estimates, and revenues, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Joint resolution creating a commission to prepare a budget system for the Government of the United States with reference to its appropriations, estimates, and revenues.

Whereas in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, is found the following recommendation:

"The impulse toward the development of so much of a responsible budget system as our form of government will permit was very much in evidence a couple of years ago. It, however, has not been sustained and has almost disappeared. I have referred to the matter in my previous annual reports, and feel as strongly as ever that something should be done to organize the divided consideration now given the expenditures of the Government and the interrelation of its income and outgo. The responsibilities relative to estimates, appropriations, and revenues are extremely scattered and disintegrated. The vast sums that pass through the Treasury coming and going are without any centralized study or recommendation such as other countries find it necessary to give to their Government finances." And

Whereas no action has been taken by Congress with reference to such recommendation; and

Whereas the expenditures of the Government are gradually increasing, so that they now reach an enormous sum per annum; and

Whereas various and numerous committees in Congress pass on appropriation bills, and there is no correlation between the various committees nor any system of review of appropriations asked for by the various departments of the Government; and

Whereas there should be substantial cooperation between the executive and legislative departments of the Government with reference to the interrelation of revenues and expenditures; and

Whereas other nations have adopted and put into operation budget systems resulting in great saving to the Government; and

Whereas some new system should be adopted in this Nation covering the question of estimates, appropriations, and revenues of the Government; and

Whereas to map out such a new system will require great study and labor: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That a joint commission to undertake the preparation of some budget system for the Government of the United States with reference to its appropriations, estimates, and revenues is hereby established; its membership to consist of the Secretary of the Treasury, three Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President, three Members of the House appointed by the Speaker of the House, and two economists to be appointed by the President of the United States.

No compensation is to be paid to any member of this commission except to the two appointees of the President, they to receive such compensation as the balance of the commission may determine.

It shall be the duty of said commission to prepare a plan for a budget system for the Government of the United States, and with its recommendations relating thereto to present said plan to Congress on or before the 1st of July, 1916, the said commission to terminate at that time.

To carry out the provisions of the resolution there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $20,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I desire to know what disposition of that joint resolution is proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa requests that it be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I can not conceive why that committee should have jurisdiction of a matter of this sort.

Mr. KENYON. I thought that committee would have as much jurisdiction as any other and would not be so busy that it could not take up the matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. It seems to me that the joint resolution ought to go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KENYON. I am not certain whether it should go to that committee or to the Committee on Finance or to any of the other committees having jurisdiction of appropriations. I should like to have it go to some committee where there would be some action taken.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Certainly the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department has no peculiar relation to the matter.

Mr. KENYON. It has no peculiar relation to the subject, but that committee is not so busy as some other committees.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I presume that the Senator understands that legislation on this subject is impossible at the present session of Congress.

Mr. KENYON. Yes; I understand that, of course.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. So that it is not a very vital matter; but, for the regularity of the proceedings, I simply want to suggest that the joint resolution ought not to go to the Commitee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Mr. KENYON. Where does the Senator think it should properly go?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I think it should properly go to the Committee on Appropriations. It deals with appropriations, and it seems to me that committee naturally would have jurisdiction of the subject.

Mr. KENYON. Very well; I will accept the suggestion. I hope the joint resolution may receive some consideration at the hands of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted an amendment authorizing the President to appoint George W. Littlehales professor in the grade of mathematics of the Navy, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment providing that classified civil service per diem employees of the clerical, drafting, inspection, chemical, messenger, and watch forces at navy yards, naval stations, and other outside offices of the Navy Department be granted 30 days' annual leave with pay, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GALLINGER. I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute for section 10 of the bill S. 5259, the ship-purchase bill, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan submitted an amendment to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 5259) to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration——

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order, so that we may finish the morning business.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will wait until I state my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I beg pardon. I thought the Senator was going to move to take up a bill.

Mr. ASHURST. I was going to ask unanimous consent. I was about to say when my friend the Senator from Massachusetts took charge of the affairs of the Senate that I wished to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 839, being House bill 15799, to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, which bill, I believe, passed the House of Representatives unanimously. It was unanimously reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Public Lands; and I ask at this time to submit and have placed in the RECORD a copy of the House report on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the House report being printed in the RECORD?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is ordered, then.

The House report is as follows:

[House Report No. 626, Sixty-third Congress, second session.]

TO PROVIDE FOR STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERGUSSON, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 15799:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 15799) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, having had the same under consideration, beg leave to submit the following report:

The committee unanimously recommend that said bill do pass.

H. R. 9582 and H. R. 10539, on the same general subject, had previously been referred to your committee. H. R. 9582 reads as follows:

"A bill to provide for the disposition of grazing lands under the homestead laws, and for other purposes.

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That from and after the passage of this act it shall be lawful for any person qualified to make entry under the homestead laws of the United States to make a grazing-homestead entry for not exceeding 640 acres of unappropriated public lands, in reasonably compact form: *Provided, however*, That the lands so entered shall either be such lands as theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as "grazing-homestead lands" or such lands as shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as not being, in his opinion, susceptible of successful irrigation at a reasonable cost from any known source of water supply, as provided in section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for an enlarged homestead," approved February 19, 1909.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate lands the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing, which do not contain merchantable timber, and which are not susceptible of irrigation at reasonable expense from any known source of water supply as grazing land subject to entry under this act.

"SEC. 3. That any qualified homestead entryman may make entry under the homestead laws of lands so designated by the Secretary of the Interior, according to legal subdivisions, in areas not exceeding 640 acres, subject to the provisions of this act, and secure title thereto by compliance with the terms of the homestead laws: *Provided*, That in lieu of cultivation, as required by the homestead laws, the entryman shall be required to make permanent improvements upon the lands entered, tending to increase the value of the same for agricultural and stock-raising purposes, of the value of not less than $1.25 per acre. And the inclosing by a substantial fence of the land so entered and the discovery of water in a well or wells within the boundaries of such entry shall be held to be permanent improvements under the terms of this act.

"SEC. 4. That any homestead entryman of lands of the character herein described, who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry, shall have the right to enter, subject to the provisions of this act, other lands contiguous to, or within 10 miles of his said homestead entry, which shall not, with the lands so already entered, owned, and occupied by him, exceed the aggregate of 640 acres; and residence continued and improvements made upon the original homestead subsequent to the making of the additional entry, shall be accepted as equivalent to actual residence and improvements made upon the additional land so entered; but the improvements must equal $1.25 for each acre within the original and additional entries: *Provided*, That persons who have acquired title to lands of the character herein described under the homestead laws and who own and reside upon the lands so acquired, may, subject to the provisions of this act, make additional entry for and obtain patent to public lands, designated for entry under the provisions of this act, contiguous to or within 10 miles of their said original entry, which, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead laws, shall not exceed 640 acres, on proof of expenditures on account of permanent improvements upon the original or additional entry of the required amount reckoned on the area of both entries.

"SEC. 5. That any person who has made entry under the homestead laws, but from any cause has lost, forfeited, or abandoned the same, shall be entitled to the benefits of this act as though such former entry had not been made, and any person applying for a homestead under this act shall furnish the description and date of his former entry: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any person whose former entry was canceled for fraud.

"SEC. 6. That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the minerals and coal in the lands so entered and patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The mineral and coal deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the mineral and coal land laws in force at the time of such disposal. Any person qualified to locate and enter mineral or coal deposits, or having the right to mine and remove the same under the laws of the United States, shall have the right at all times to enter upon the lands entered or patented, as provided by this act, for the purpose of prospecting for minerals or coal therein, upon the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of a bond or undertaking to be filed with him as security for the payment of all damages to the crops and improvements on such lands by reason of such prospecting. Any person who has acquired from the United States the mineral or coal deposits in any such land, or the right to mine and remove the same, may reenter and occupy so much of the surface thereof as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining and removal of the mineral or coal, upon payment of the damages caused thereby to the owner thereof, or upon giving a good and sufficient bond or undertaking to be approved by the court in an action instituted in any competent court to ascertain and fix said damages.

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations in harmony with the provisions and purposes of this act for the purpose of carrying the same into effect."

H. R. 9582 was by this committee referred to the Department of the Interior for examination and report. The report of said department is in the following words:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"*Washington, January 30, 1914.*

"Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,
"*Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,*
"*House of Representatives.*

"SIR: Referring to H. R. 6637 and H. R. 9582, bills designed to modify the homestead laws as to public-land areas to which present laws are deemed not well adapted, I have to advise as follows:

"The existing homestead laws of the United States show an evolution or adaptation to conditions which developed, or were found to exist, as public-land settlement and entry progressed. The general homestead laws carried into sections 2280–2291 of the Revised Statutes, and under which the public lands in the Mississippi Valley and in other portions of the United States where soil, rainfall, and climate justified it were entered, limited the maximum area which might be entered and acquired to 160 acres. In irrigation projects constructed by the United States under the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat., 388), the area which might be entered was fixed by the Secretary of the Interior through the establishment of farm units, each supposed to be sufficient for the support of a family, and in no case exceeding 160 acres. In other sections of the country, particularly high plateaus of the intermountain States, there are areas which will not produce remunerative crops under the ordinary methods of farming, but which will, through the soil-fallowing and moisture-conservation methods of dry farming, produce profitable crops of wheat and other grains. For this class of lands Congress enacted what are known as the enlarged-homestead laws of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat., 639), and June 17, 1910 (36 Stat., 531), under which not exceeding 320 acres may be entered, upon condition of the cultivation to agricultural crops of a prescribed acreage annually.

"In the sand-hill country of western Nebraska, an area to which none of the laws heretofore described were found adapted, Congress by the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat., 547), permitted the entry of not exceeding 640 acres of land, upon condition that entrymen comply with the homestead laws as to residence, improvement, and cultivation, and also place upon the land entered permanent improvements of the value of not less than $1.25 per acre. The settlement, home-making, and agricultural development which followed the enactment of these laws is well known and need not be here described. There remain, however, as indicated, vast areas of the public lands to which none of the foregoing laws seem well adapted, and I am of opinion that the time has arrived when a new form of homestead law should be enacted peculiarly adapted thereto. The lands I have in mind, because of their arid or semiarid character, or because of their location on mountain tops or sides, will not produce agricultural crops for sale or exportation in sufficient quantities to justify acquirement thereof and residence thereon under the existing laws. They do, however, possess some value for grazing purposes and often include tracts of greater or less extent upon which might be grown forage crops, such as kaffir corn, milo maize, fodder, or other rough feed, of little value for sale and transportation, but valuable for winter feed or for the fattening of range stock. I believe that with this class of lands a homestead of 640 acres of land would enable bona fide home seekers to establish and maintain homes for the purpose of stock raising and for such farming operations as will enable them to raise their own supply of rough feed for the stock pastured upon the remaining lands entered or acquired.

"Therefore, instead of enacting H. R. 6637 and H. R. 9582, I recommend the enactment of a general measure applicable to lands of this character wherever found in the public domain, and I inclose for your consideration and for introduction, if you deem advisable, draft of bill designed to accomplish this result.

"For the protection of the entrymen, as well as to prevent the entry of lands susceptible of irrigation, containing valuable merchantable timber, or principally valuable for purposes other than those expressed in this act, it is provided that lands shall, before being subject to entry, be designated by the Secretary of the Interior. All minerals within the land are reserved to the United States, together with the right of qualified persons to prospect upon, locate, and enter such deposits under such restrictions as will prevent the destruction or injury of permanent improvements of the entrymen or patentees or of crops upon their lands. This provision, like the requirement that the lands shall first be designated for entry, will operate to protect entrymen from protests and contests, either by individuals or the United States, because of character of the land and which would otherwise result in cancellation of entries made. Another reason for the reservation of the minerals is that this law will induce the entry of lands in those mountainous regions of the United States where deposits of minerals are known to exist or are likely to be found. To issue unconditional patents for these comparatively large entries under the homestead laws might withdraw immense areas from prospecting and mineral development and without such reservation the disposition of these lands in the mineral country under agricultural laws would be of doubtful advisability.

"The farmer stockman is not seeking and does not desire the minerals, his experience and efforts being in the line of stock raising and farming, which operations can be carried on without being materially interfered with by the reservation of minerals and the prospecting for a removal of same from the land.

"Because of the fact that the lands designated will be principally valuable for grazing and that the farming operations will be limited to the growing of forage, no specific requirement is made as to cultivation of the land, but instead the entryman is required to place permanent improvements upon the land entered, tending to increase its value for stock-raising purposes, of not less than $1.25 per acre, one-half thereof to be placed on the land within three years after entry. Those

who have already entered lands of this character under existing laws in amounts of less than 640 acres, or who have acquired such limited areas by purchase from others, should, in my opinion, be placed on an equal footing with those who make entry after the passage of this law, and provision has therefore been made for the making of additional entries for contiguous lands by such entrymen or landowners, upon condition that the entryman or landowner is the head of a family or has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a citizen of the United States and resides upon and occupies the land entered or owned by him. In some cases it may not be possible for such entrymen and landowners to exercise the right of additional entry because of the fact that no vacant lands adjoin. In such cases the bill provides for the surrender of the lands so held and owned to the United States, after which the party so relinquishing or reconveying may make original entry under this act of not exceeding 640 acres of land, upon which he must comply with all the requirements of this act and of the homestead laws.

"This provision will cause an adjustment of holdings in such areas, and the lands so surrendered to the United States may in turn be entered by the entrymen or owners of the adjoining tracts. In this connection, provision is made for the exercise of a preference right of entry within 90 days after the passage of the act by the entryman or owner of adjoining land, and provision made that where vacant lands contiguous to the tracts owned and held by two or more persons entitled to additional entry are not sufficient in amount to enable each to secure the maximum amount to which entitled for an equitable division of the lands applied for among the several entrymen or owners. The purpose of the law being to secure the establishment of permanent homes upon the land entered, the bill provides that the commutation provisions of the homestead laws shall not apply to such entries. A bill introduced in the House of Representatives (H. R. 6637) proposes to provide for a grazing homestead of not less than 640 acres and not exceeding 1,280 acres in area. The bill herewith transmitted is not designed to apply to or provide for the entry of lands suitable only for grazing. The maximum area permitted to be entered thereunder, and even the maximum area prescribed in H. R. 6637, would be wholly insufficient for the support of a homesteader and his family upon lands of that character. As already explained, the measure I have prepared is believed to be adapted to lands which possess a grazing value, which also, in part at least, may be utilized by the homesteader for the raising of forage crops. It would be an exceedingly difficult and expensive task to attempt at this time to classify and designate areas or blocks of land suitable only for grazing and set them apart for disposition in areas sufficient for the support of a family. Existing appropriations and the present force of the department are wholly inadequate for this purpose. It is believed that for the present this classification should be accomplished through the method already described, whereby the lands will be open to disposition under the existing laws and under the bill herein proposed, after which, with the information then before it, Congress may enact such other and additional laws as may be determined to be best adapted to the development and disposition of the remaining areas suitable only for grazing.

"As intimated at the beginning of this letter, I believe that this particular bill will meet a situation not covered by any of the existing land laws and will result in the early development of a very large area of our public lands, which will otherwise remain in an uninhabited and unproductive condition.

"Respectfully,

"A. A. JONES,
"First Assistant Secretary."

"A bill to provide for stock-raising homesteads.

"Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act it shall be lawful for any person qualified to make entry under the homestead laws of the United States to make a stock-raising homestead entry for not exceeding 640 acres of unappropriated public land in reasonably compact form: *Provided, however,* That the land so entered shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as 'stock-raising lands.'

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate as subject to entry under this act lands, the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing or raising forage crops, and which, in his opinion, do not contain merchantable timber and are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply.

"SEC. 3. That any qualified homestead entryman may make entry under the homestead laws of lands so designated by the Secretary of the Interior, according to legal subdivisions, in areas not exceeding 640 acres, and in compact form, so far as may be subject to the provisions of this act, and secure title thereto by compliance with the terms of the homestead laws: *Provided,* That instead of cultivation as required by the homestead laws, the entryman shall be required to make permanent improvements upon the land entered tending to increase the value of the same for stock-raising purposes, of the value of not less than $1.25 per acre, and at least one-half of such improvements shall be placed upon the land within three years after the date of entry thereof.

"SEC. 4. That any homestead entryman of lands of the character herein described who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry shall have the right to enter, subject to the provisions of this act, such an amount of contiguous public lands designated under this act as shall not, together with the amount embraced in his original entry, exceed 640 acres, and residence upon and improvements made on the original entry shall be credited on both entries, but the improvements must equal $1.25 per each acre within the original and additional entries.

"SEC. 5. That persons who have submitted final proof or acquired title to lands of the character herein described under the homestead laws, and who own and reside upon the land so acquired, may, subject to the provisions of this act, make additional entry for and obtain patent to contiguous public lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act, which, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead law, shall not exceed 640 acres, on proof of expenditure on account of permanent improvements upon the original or additional entry of the required amount reckoned on the area of both entries.

"SEC. 6. That any person who is the head of a family, or who has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a citizen of the United States, who has acquired title to lands of the character herein described, by purchase or under agricultural public-land laws other than the homestead law, and who owns and resides upon the lands so acquired, may, subject to the provisions of this act, make additional entry for and obtain patent to contiguous public lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act, which, together with the area theretofore acquired and held, shall not exceed 640 acres, and obtain patent therefor upon proof of the expenditure on account of permanent improvements upon the land so owned, or the additional entry, of the required amount reckoned on the area of all lands so acquired and held, and upon proof that he has maintained residence upon either the privately owned land or the land embraced within the additional entry for not less than three years from and after the date of the additional entry.

"SEC. 7. That any person who is the head of a family, or who has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a citizen of the United States, who has entered or acquired, under the homestead laws or otherwise, prior to the passage of this act, less than 640 acres of land, and who is unable to exercise the right of additional entry herein conferred because no vacant lands adjoin the tract so entered or acquired, may, upon submitting proof that he resides upon and has not sold or incumbered the land entered or acquired, reconvey to the United States the land so occupied and entered or acquired, and in lieu thereof enter and acquire title to not exceeding 640 acres of land designated under this act, but must show compliance with all the provisions of the homestead law and of this act respecting the new entry.

"SEC. 8. That the commutation provisions of the homestead laws shall not apply to any entries made under this act.

"SEC. 9. That any person who has made entry under the homestead laws, but from any cause has lost, forfeited, or abandoned the same, shall be entitled to the benefits of this act as though such former entry had not been made, and any person applying for a homestead under this act shall furnish a description of his former entry: *Provided,* That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any person whose former entry was canceled for fraud.

"SEC. 10. That any homestead entrymen or landowners who shall be entitled to additional entry under this act shall have for 90 days after the designation under this act of lands contiguous to those entered or owned and occupied by him the preferential right to make additional entry as provided in this act: *Provided,* That where vacant lands contiguous to the lands of two or more entrymen or landowners entitled to additional entries under this section are not sufficient in amount and area to enable such entrymen to secure by additional entry the maximum amounts to which they are entitled, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make an equitable division of the lands applied for hereunder among the several entrymen or landowners, applying to exercise preferential rights, such division to be in tracts of not less than 40 acres, and so made as to equalize as nearly as possible the area which such entrymen and landowners will acquire by adding the tracts embraced in additional entries to the lands originally held or owned by them: *Provided further,* That where but one 40-acre tract of vacant land may adjoin the lands of two or more entrymen or landowners entitled to exercise preferential right hereunder, the tract in question may be entered by the person who first submits to the local land office his application to exercise said preferential right.

"SEC. 11. That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other minerals in the lands so entered and patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The coal and other mineral deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the coal and mineral land laws in force at the time of such disposal. Any person qualified to locate and enter the coal or other mineral deposits, or having the right to mine and remove the same under the laws of the United States, shall have the right at all times to enter upon the lands entered or patented, as provided by this act, for the purpose of prospecting for coal or other mineral therein, provided he shall not injure, damage, or destroy the permanent improvements of the entryman or patentee, and shall be liable to and compensate the entryman or patentee for all damages to the crops on such lands by reason of such prospecting. Any person who has acquired from the United States the coal or other mineral deposits in any such land or the right to mine and remove the same, may reenter and occupy so much of the surface thereof as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the coal or other minerals, (1) upon securing the written consent or waiver of the homestead entryman or patentee; (2) upon payment of the damages to crops or other tangible improvements to the owner thereof, where agreement may be had as to the amount thereof; or (3) in lieu of either of the foregoing provisions, upon the execution of a good and sufficient bond or undertaking to the United States for the use and benefit of the entryman or owner of the land, to secure the payment of such damages to the crops or tangible improvements of the entryman or owner, as may be determined and fixed in an action brought upon the bond in a court of competent jurisdiction against the principal and sureties thereon, such bond to be in form and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be filed with and approved by the register and receiver of the local land office of the district wherein the land is situate, subject to appeal to the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided,* That all patents issued for the coal or other mineral deposits herein reserved shall contain appropriate notations declaring them to be subject to the provisions of this act with reference to the disposition, occupancy, and use of the surface of the land.

"SEC. 12. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations in harmony with the provisions and purposes of this act for the purpose of carrying the same into effect."

The committee thereupon substituted the draft of the bill prepared and recommended by the department and made a part of its said report, by striking out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 9582 and inserting the said draft recommended by the department in lieu thereof.

Thereupon hearings were held jointly upon said bills, to wit, H. R. 9582, amended as aforesaid, and H. R. 10539, and the advocates of each bill fully heard. Reference is here made to said hearings, which have been duly printed.

After such hearings and after exhaustive consideration by the committee of said bill H. R. 9582, amended as aforesaid, and the adoption of many amendments, the committee directed the reintroduction of H. R. 9582 as so amended, and the same was reintroduced accordingly and has been printed as H. R. 15799, which reads as follows:

"A bill to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act it shall be lawful for any person qualified to make entry under the homestead laws of the United States to make a stock-raising homestead entry for not exceeding 640 acres of unappropriated unreserved public land in reasonably compact form: *Provided, however,* That the land

so entered shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as 'stock-raising lands.'

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate as stock-raising lands subject to entry under this act lands the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, do not contain merchantable timber, and not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply, and are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act lands of such character that, in his opinion, 640 acres will not support a family.

"SEC. 3. That any qualified homestead entryman may make entry under the homestead laws of lands so designated by the Secretary of the Interior, according to legal subdivisions, in areas not exceeding 640 acres, and in compact form so far as may be subject to the provisions of this act, and secure title thereto by compliance with the terms of the homestead laws: *Provided*, That instead of cultivation as required by the homestead laws the entryman shall be required to make permanent improvements upon the land entered before final proof is submitted tending to increase the value of the same for stock-raising purposes, of the value of not less than $1.25 per acre, and at least one-half of such improvements shall be placed upon the land within three years after the date of entry thereof.

"SEC. 4. That any homestead entryman of lands of the character herein described, who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry, shall have the right to enter, subject to the provisions of this act, such amount of contiguous lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act as shall not, together with the amount embraced in his original entry, exceed 640 acres, and residence upon the original entry shall be credited on both entries, but improvements must be made on the additional entry equal to $1.25 for each acre thereof.

"SEC. 5. That persons who have submitted final proof upon, or received patent for, lands of the character herein described under the homestead laws, and who own and reside upon the land so acquired, may, subject to the provisions of this act, make additional entry for and obtain patent to contiguous lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act, which, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead law, shall not exceed 640 acres, on proof of the expenditure required by this act on account of permanent improvements upon the additional entry.

"SEC. 6. That in the event there are not contiguous lands in area sufficient to complete an entry of 640 acres, as provided for in this act, the entryman or patentee shall have the right to enter within a radius of 10 miles from his first entry, subject to the same requirements as specified for contiguous additional entries, lands in reasonably compact form which have been designated for entry under the provisions of this act, that shall, together with the first entry, not exceed 640 acres: *Provided*, That the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land.

"SEC. 7. That any person who is the head of a family, or who has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a citizen of the United States, who has entered or acquired under the homestead laws, prior to the passage hereof, lands of the character described in this act, the area of which is less than 640 acres, and who is unable to exercise the right of additional entry herein conferred because no lands subject to entry under this act adjoin the tract so entered or acquired or lie within the 10-mile limit provided for in this act, may, upon submitting proof that he resides upon and has not sold or encumbered the land so entered or acquired, relinquish or reconvey to the United States the land so occupied, entered, or acquired, and in lieu thereof, within the same land-office district, may enter and acquire title to 640 acres of the land subject to entry under this act, but must show compliance with all the provisions of the homestead law and of this act respecting the new entry: *Provided*, That the lands so relinquished or reconveyed as herein provided shall thereafter be subject to disposition only on such terms and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

"SEC. 8. That the commutation provisions of the homestead laws shall not apply to any entries made under this act.

"SEC. 9. That any homestead entrymen or patentees who shall be entitled to additional entry under this act shall have, for 30 days after the designation of lands subject to entry under the provisions of this act and contiguous to those entered or owned and occupied by them, the preferential right to make additional entry as provided in this act: *Provided*, That where such lands contiguous to the lands of two or more entrymen or patentees entitled to additional entries under this section are not sufficient in area to enable such entrymen to secure by additional entry the maximum amounts to which they are entitled, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make an equitable division of the lands among the several entrymen or patentees, applying to exercise preferential rights, such division to be in tracts of not less than 40 acres, and so made as to equalize as nearly as possible the area which such entrymen and patentees will acquire by adding the tracts embraced in additional entries to the lands originally held or owned by them: *Provided further*, That where but one 40-acre tract of vacant land may adjoin the lands of two or more entrymen or patentees entitled to exercise preferential right hereunder, the tract in question may be entered by the person who first submits to the local land office his application to exercise said preferential right.

"SEC. 10. That any person who has heretofore acquired title to land under any of the homestead laws of the United States and who is the owner and occupant of the land so acquired may purchase from the United States not exceeding 320 acres of stock-raising lands, as designated by this act, or unappropriated and unreserved lands valuable only for grazing contiguous to his said homestead, upon paying to the United States the sum of $1.25 per acre for such lands, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, which said land, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead laws, shall not exceed 640 acres.

"SEC. 11. That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other minerals in the lands entered and so patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The coal and other mineral deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the coal and mineral lands laws in force at the time of such disposal. Any person qualified to locate and enter the coal or other mineral deposits, or having the right to mine and remove the same under the laws of the United States, shall have the right at all times to enter upon the lands entered or patented, as provided by this act, for the purpose of prospecting for coal or other mineral therein, provided he shall not injure, damage, or destroy the permanent improvements of the entryman or patentee, and shall be liable to and shall compensate the entryman or patentee for all damages to the crops on such lands by reason of such prospecting. Any person who has acquired from the United States the coal or other mineral deposits in any such land, or the right to mine and remove the same, may reenter and occupy so much of the surface thereof as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the coal or other minerals, first, upon securing the written consent or waiver of the homestead entryman or patentee; second, upon payment of the damages to crops or other tangible improvements to the owner thereof, where agreement may be had as to the amount thereof; or, third, in lieu of either of the foregoing provisions, upon the execution of a good and sufficient bond or undertaking to the United States for the use and benefit of the entryman or owner of the land, to secure the payment of such damages to the crops or tangible improvements of the entryman or owner, as may be determined and fixed in an action brought upon the bond or undertaking in a court of competent jurisdiction against the principal and sureties thereon, such bond or undertaking to be in form and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be filed with and approved by the register and receiver of the local land office of the district wherein the land is situate, subject to appeal to the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided*, That all patents issued for the coal or other mineral deposits herein reserved shall contain appropriate notations declaring them to be subject to the provisions of this act with reference to the disposition, occupancy, and use of the surface of the land.

"SEC. 12. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations in harmony with the provisions and purposes of this act for the purpose of carrying the same into effect."

H. R. 15799 has been rereferred by the committee to the Department of the Interior, and there is here inserted the second favorable report, with suggested amendments, of said department upon the general principles embodied in said bill, H. R. 15799:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
"OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
"Washington, April 24, 1914.

"Hon. SCOTT FERRIS,
"Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
"House of Representatives.

"MY DEAR MR. FERRIS: I am in receipt of request for report on H. R. 15799, a bill to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes.

"As stated in my letter to you of January 30, 1914, I am heartily in favor of legislation which will permit and encourage the settlement and development of public lands to which the present homestead laws are not adapted, but which, under a somewhat more liberal measure, would be settled upon, improved, and developed for the purpose of stock raising. I understand that your committee has fully considered all questions of policy as presented in the above-mentioned bill, and that the same is now referred to this department for report with reference only to the administrative features of the bill. With this assumption I beg to submit for your consideration the following:

"1. As a part of section 2 it is provided 'that the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act lands of such character that in his opinion 640 acres will not support a family.' The two negatives used in this proviso would be construed to imply that the Secretary of the Interior shall only designate land of such character that in his opinion 640 acres will support a family. This language practically imposes upon the Government the responsibility of assuring an intending settler that he can support his family upon a designated 640 acres of land. I suggest, therefore, for your consideration in connection with this proviso the following:

"(a) If the proviso were entirely eliminated, the administration of the act would be comparatively simple and inexpensive, and upon the settler alone would be placed the responsibility of ascertaining whether or not 640 acres of land classified under the act would be sufficient for his purposes.

"(b) The classification contemplated by this proviso would involve undue labor and expense.

"If, however, your committee believes some limitation to be essential, I respectfully suggest for your consideration a substitute proviso, as follows:

"'*Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.'

"2. Line 24, page 4, section 7, requires the entryman described in section 7 to show compliance "with all the provisions of the homestead law and of this act respecting the new entry." Section 3 of the bill requires all entrymen who secure lands under this act to show compliance with the terms of the homestead law, but this is modified by a proviso which permits the making of improvements of a certain character and value in lieu of cultivation. The clause described in line 24 of section 7 would, in my opinion, require an entryman under this act who falls within the purview of section 7 to not only comply with the provisions of this act, but also to cultivate his land to the extent and in the manner prescribed by the general homestead laws. Evidently this is not the intent, and I therefore suggest that the words "of the homestead law and" be stricken from line 24, so that same as amended will read "with all the provisions of this act." As so amended this will make operative and applicable the general homestead laws as modified by the terms of the proviso to section 3.

"Very truly, yours,
A. A. JONES.
"First Assistant Secretary."

The object of H. R. 9582, as well as of the substitute prepared by the Department of the Interior for H. R. 9582, and of H. R. 15799 is to restore and improve the grazing capacity, and therefore the stock-raising and meat-producing capacity, of the semiarid lands of the West, and at the same time to furnish homes thereon to the people.

It appears in the hearings, in the statements of officials of both the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, that there remain of unappropriated public lands in the semiarid States, exclusive of Indian, forest, military, park, and other reservations, the enormous total, in round numbers, of 330,000,000 acres. It also appears that the area of public lands in said States now included in forest reservations alone amounts, in round numbers, to 165,000,000 acres.

The problem confronting the statesmanship of this day is just as great as that met by the statesmen of that early day when originated the homestead system, ever since adhered to, of making the prime object, in disposing of the public domain, the furnishing of homes for the people.

Two plans for legislating as to the future use or disposal of this semiarid domain were before your committee, the one embodied in H. R. 9582 and the other in H. R. 10539. These bills were heard together and the advocates of each plan fully heard.

The testimony of the advocates of said bills generally agreed upon this proposition, to wit, that free grazing upon the public lands in the semiarid States has depleted the range and reduced the carrying capacity of such lands from one-third to one-half; and both sets of advocates agreed also that further legislation is necessary and needed now to stop further destructive use of such lands and secure for the future their highest use to our civilization.

Looking to this end, H. R. 10539 proposes a system of leasing the remaining public domain of the semiarid States, amounting to about 330,000,000 acres, while H. R. 9582, now H. R. 15799, proposes to accomplish the same end by a system of stock-raising homesteads, giving to each settler a home on such lands with sufficient acreage to support his family by combining forage farming with stock raising.

The hearings establish the fact that on the lands under consideration homesteads of 160 or of 320 acres each are not sufficient to support a family, and that at least 640 acres are necessary to each stock-raising homesteader.

The committee does not hesitate, as far as may be practicable, to adhere to the time-honored plan of using the public domain to furnish homes to the citizens of our country. The fact that the State of Iowa, where 160 acres proved sufficient to support, even to enrich, an industrious citizen, is in the front rank as a producer of agricultural products, and, at the same time, is near the front in the production of beef and mutton and dairy products, shows that farming and stock raising may be successfully combined on the same homestead, and the printed hearings on H. R. 9582 are replete with statements by many citizens of large experience on these semiarid lands that by combining the farming of dry-land forage crops and the raising of cattle or sheep 640 acres will support a family. Mr. I. S. Bartlett, of Cheyenne, Wyo., in his statement beginning at page 316 of the hearings, uses these words:

"A grazing-homestead bill giving 640 acres, or even 2 sections, to each settler would soon add 200 per cent to the live-stock production of the public-land States and solve the beef problem for the next half century. Not only that, it would break down the high prices of beef, pork, and mutton, as well as dairy products.

"Better than all, it would settle up the vast area of waste lands in the Nation with a hardy, intelligent, and progressive American citizenship.

"Think for a moment what our desert or grass ranges will produce, situated, as they are, in an environment of mountains and plains and flooded with sunshine.

"Here are some purely range products: Cattle, sheep, horses, hogs, goats, hides, wool, butter, cheese, milk and dairy products, poultry, and eggs. All these can be produced in our native grass regions without any plowing or land cultivation.

"The irrigated and dry farms in the same section will supplement all the needed fattening and forage crops, and both the farming and stock-raising interests will be mutually and correspondingly benefited.

"The range homestead proposition can be easily worked out. Instead of the requirements of plowing up the land and crop cultivation, the law should require expenditure for sinking wells, building of sheds and corrals, the possession of a certain number of animals, etc. The residence requirements should be the same as in other homestead acts.

"In nearly every section of the grass ranges water can be found at depths varying from 20 to 500 feet. In many cases artesian water and flowing wells are obtained, giving a sufficient supply of water for irrigating many acres and raising fine crops. With the passage of a grazing homestead bill the so-called desert lands would be penetrated with wells and the whole landscape dotted with windmills and improvements in the form of houses, barns, corrals, and fences.

"In a very few years a wonderful transformation scene would be enacted in the vast cattle ranges of the West, now practically uninhabited by settlers. That this is no dream has already been demonstrated by the results of the Kinkead 640-acre homestead act, which applied to the desert wastes of western Nebraska. That entire section is now settled up with a high class of prosperous and successful farmers. Five million acres of arid lands have been reclaimed there, and the wave of incoming settlers has overflowed into Wyoming in the search for dry-farming lands.

"Even under the late repressive land administration the Commissioner of the General Land Office advocated the 640-acre homestead for the semiarid West, and in so doing stated that 'the largest part of the unappropriated public domain would never pass to private ownership under smaller allotments.'

"Local bills are good enough so far as they go, but the whole subject should be treated from a national point of view and a bill passed applicable to all the States having public lands."

Representative KINKAID, referred to by Mr. BARTLETT, appeared before this committee, and his statement appears in the hearings, beginning at page 334.

This plan of providing homes is best for the Nation, as a whole, because it tends to increase the supply and at the same time to lower the price of meat, a universal necessity, especially to the laboring classes; and because it affords an outlet to the congested civic and labor centers of our population without driving home seekers to take advantage of the liberal land laws of Canada. Moreover, the Nation as a unit needs more States like, for instance, Kansas and Iowa, where each citizen is the sovereign of a portion of the soil, the owner of his home and not tenant of some, perhaps distant, landlord, a builder of schools and churches, a voluntary payer of taxes for the support of his local government.

Of course, the homestead plan is best for the individual States of the semiarid West. It takes homes to insure permanent settlers and taxpayers; it takes homes to bring schools and churches; it takes homes to build cities and towns that attract and support laborers and mechanics; population invites railroads, which in turn bring more immigration and capital to develop the barely touched resources of this great semiarid West.

This subject has been under consideration in previous Congresses. In the Fifty-eighth Congress, third session, a bill creating a 640-acre homestead for a portion of the State of South Dakota was reported favorably (Rept. No. 4013), and from said report we quote from the President's message to Congress at the beginning of the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, as follows:

"Moreover, the approaching exhaustion of the public ranges has of late led to much discussion as to the best manner of using these public lands in the West which are suitable chiefly or only for grazing. The sound and steady development of the West depends upon the building up of homes therein. Much of our prosperity as a nation has been due to the operation of the homestead law. On the other hand, we should recognize the fact that in the grazing region the man who corresponds to the homesteader may be unable to settle permanently if only allowed to use the same amount of pasture land that his brother, the homesteader, is allowed to use of arable land. One hundred and sixty acres of fairly rich and well-watered soil, or a much smaller amount of irrigated land, may keep a family in plenty, whereas no one could get a living from 160 acres of dry pasture land capable of supporting at the outside only 1 head of cattle to every 10 acres."

We quote further from the same report, as follows:

"Hon. Charles D. Walcott, present Director of the United States Geological Survey, in a communication to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the Kinkaid bill, which became a law at the last session of this Congress, said in part as follows:

"'The central idea of this bill is that of enlarging the area of homestead entry to suit the conditions of the semiarid West. There is general recognition of the fact that the present land laws, designed for the humid region, are not applicable to the arid region. Attention has been called to this matter many times by various individuals, and in particular by the writings of Maj. J. W. Powell, the former Director of this Survey, who devoted much of his life to the exploration and study of the West. In his report prepared in 1878, entitled "Lands of the Arid Region," Maj. Powell suggests that the farm unit where water is scanty should be not less than 4 square miles, the divisions of such farms being controlled by topographic features.

* * * * * * *

"'The arbitrary limit stated by the present land laws of 160 acres for a homestead does not suit existing conditions in the arid regions. If the water supply is ample, 160 acres is usually far too much, and would support two, three, or four families. On the other hand, throughout 90 to 95 per cent of the vast extent of remaining public land 160 acres is so small as to be useless for a homestead.

"'No general rule as to what shall constitute a homestead can be laid down. In order to determine this matter local knowledge must be had and exercised in the same manner as it is under the reclamation projects. The question is one largely of altitude, climate, and water supply rather than extent of land.

* * * * * * *

"'After cutting out the irrigable lands there are left great areas where it is known that water can not be had in any considerable amount and where the homestead area must be very large to furnish support for a family. In short, it is practicable after eliminating the irrigable land for the Geological Survey, through its organic act and through the Reclamation Service, to classify the remaining public land and obtain information upon which to base the disposal of these lands to actual settlers in tracts sufficient for the support of a family.

"'Under the operation of the present laws the securing of a tract of land large enough to support a family in the arid region is a cumbersome and expensive process. The nucleus of the home farm may be a 160-acre tract, which the law allows as a homestead.

"'All persons admit that this nucleus is only the first step, and that the man who actually desires to make a home there by stock farming must proceed to resort to various expediencies to secure control of additional land in order to support himself. To do this requires either capital to purchase the lands of other homesteaders or the stock farmer must secure some form of title through the desert-land law, timber and stone act, etc. In the majority of cases the practices absolutely necessary to secure an adequate area are open to the charge of fraud or collusion. It should not be necessary for a man desiring a homestead upon vacant public land to resort to indirect or possibly fraudulent means. On the contrary, he should be allowed and encouraged to take up as much land as he actually needs and be given every facility for so doing.

"'The development of the arid West has reached a point where it is now possible to see the ultimate character of settlement and utilization of the land. Where, as above stated, water can be had, the irrigable lands may be cultivated in the most intensive fashion. With favorable climatic conditions several crops a year will be raised, and a 40-acre farm will more than furnish support for a family. The average size of an irrigated farm in Utah is, for example, less than 30 acres.

"'Assuming that there are 600,000,000 acres in the arid and semiarid West, not to exceed 10 per cent of this, or 60,000,000 acres, will be utilized for irrigation. Most of the remainder is useful for stock-raising purposes, a portion being devoted to forest reserves, within which grazing may be largely permitted. In round numbers, 500,000,000 acres of land will have its highest use in the raising of cattle and sheep. Most of this is still in public ownership, and it is for the interest of the Nation to have the land subdivided into the smallest tracts which will support a family and have these pass gradually into private ownership, so that the land may in time bear its share of taxation.'"

A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE BILL BY SECTIONS.

The reasons for sections 1 and 2 of the bill hereby reported are obvious from the reading of them.

Section 3 contains a change in the proviso thereof in existing homestead laws, in that under this bill, H. R. 15799, in lieu of cultivation of a portion of his entry the entryman is required to make permanent improvements upon the land entered tending to increase the value of the same for stock-raising purposes, of the value of not less than $1.25 per acre, one-half of such improvements to be made within three years after the date of entry.

The object of the law-making power in requiring a certain amount of cultivation of the land by the entryman in homestead laws when farming was the prime object was, first, to insure good faith on the part of the entryman; and, second, to require the entryman to show that good faith by doing something, at his own expense, of value to the land, tending to improve it for farming purposes. Moreover, the statements in the hearings show that the efforts of entrymen under the 320-acre homestead law to comply with the requirements as to plowing a certain number of acres each year simply destroyed so much valuable sod by turning it up to the sun and killing the roots of the native grasses. So under section 3 the entryman may show his good faith by improving his land by sinking wells, building fences, silos, and such things as will improve his entry for stock-raising purposes.

Section 4: This section is for the relief and equitable treatment of entrymen who entered homesteads under the 160 and 320 acre homestead acts upon lands chiefly valuable for grazing, and who afterwards found, by costly experience, that farming was impossible on small tracts of such lands. The hearings show that many of them have held on and eked out their existence by grazing a few head of stock on the unentered public lands near enough for grazing purposes to their respective

small homesteads. But upon the enactment of a 640-acre homestead law such near-by public lands will soon be taken up by other entrymen of 640-acre tracts. Thus the already empoverished pioneer would be condemned to final extinction, as he could not live by farming, and would be deprived of the use of public lands for grazing. Section 4 therefore provides that entrymen of tracts of 320 acres or less on lands subsequently made subject to the 640-acre homestead, who have not submitted final proof upon their said prior entries, shall have the right to enter upon other such lands of like character contiguous to their said prior entries as shall not exceed, together with their said prior entries, 640 acres in each case; but residence upon the original entry shall be credited upon both entries, and the expenditure of $1.25 per acre must be made on the additional entry in each case.

Section 5: While section 4, just explained, relates to entrymen who have not submitted final proof on such prior entry, section 5 extends the same right of contiguous entry, up to a total of 640 acres, to such entrymen as have submitted final proof or received patent on such original entries, but the expenditure for permanent improvements must be made upon the additional entries.

Section 6: While sections 4 and 5, just described, relate only to lands contiguous to the original entry, section 6 is for the relief of such entrymen on lands of the character herein described, in tracts of 320 acres or less, as have entries entirely surrounded by other entries, and contiguous to whose respective entries, therefore, no public lands are to be found subject to entry. For the relief of such entrymen, therefore, any entryman of lands of the character herein described is given the right in section 6 to make an additional entry of sufficient land to make, with the amount of his original entry or patent, 640 acres, within 10 miles of his said original entry. This is subject, however, to the same requirements as other additional entries, and the entryman must exhaust all contiguous land subject to additional entry before availing himself of noncontiguous land.

Section 7: This section is proposed for the relief of such entrymen of the lands of the character herein described, in amounts of 320 acres or less, as are unable to exercise the right of additional entry herein conferred, because no lands subject to entry under this bill are contiguous to his said original entry or lie within the 10-mile limit of his original entry. If such entryman is the head of a family or 21 years of age and a citizen of the United States, and first submits proof that he resides upon and has not sold or encumbered the land as occupied, entered, or acquired, he may relinquish or reconvey to the United States the land so entered, occupied, or acquired, and in lieu thereof, within the same land-office district, he may enter and acquire 640 acres of land subject to entry under this bill; and he must also show compliance with all the provisions of the homestead laws and of this bill, as if an original entryman under this act, provided that the lands so relinquished or reconveyed, as herein provided, shall thereafter be subject to disposition by the United States only on such terms and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. This proviso is intended to serve a double purpose—to prevent speculation in relinquishments and to empower the Secretary of the Interior to see that justice is done the prior owner in the matter of any improvements on the relinquished land that the prior owner may have left on his said original entry.

Section 8: This section forbids the application of the commutation provision of the homestead laws to entries under this act.

Section 9: This section gives a preference right of 30 days to a prior entryman to enter lands contiguous to his said original entry, with a provision for an equitable apportionment of contiguous lands between two or more prior entrymen who may each desire to enter the same lands as contiguous to their respective prior entries.

Section 10: This section extends the right of an entryman under any existing homestead law to acquire, by direct purchase from the Government, at the rate of $1.25 per acre, public land of the character herein described, contiguous to his original entry, in amount sufficient to make, with his original entry, not more than 640 acres. It appeared to your committee that many homesteaders have entered small tracts of land, even as small tracts as 40 acres each, in the canyons in mountainous districts, surrounding small springs of water sufficient to water a few head of stock and perhaps irrigate gardens in the bed of the canyon, and have used the public lands and mountain slopes adjoining for grazing purposes. Your committee would allow such small stockman to supplement his original entry by purchase, as set out in section 10, but only of contiguous lands of the character herein described, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 11: It appeared to your committee that many hundreds of thousands of acres of the lands of the character designated under this bill contain coal and other minerals, the surface of which is valuable for stock-raising purposes. The purpose of section 11 is to limit the operation of this bill strictly to the surface of the lands described and to reserve to the United States the ownership and right to dispose of all minerals underlying the surface thereof. This section also provides a method for the joint use of the surface of the land by the entryman of the surface thereof and the person who shall acquire from the United States the right to prospect, enter, extract, and remove all minerals that may underlie such lands, this method to be under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

A. J. G. KANE.

Mr. O'GORMAN. In the second session of the Sixty-second Congress I introduced a bill, being Senate bill 5497, for the relief of A. J. G. Kane, and which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I find that the relief sought can be procured in another way, and I ask for the adoption of the following order:

The order was read and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the papers in the case of A. J. G. Kane, Senate 5497, Sixty-second Congress, second session, be withdrawn from the Senate files, no adverse report having been made thereon.

NOTE FROM THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I submit a resolution, for which I ask present consideration. I will state, by way of explanation, that the document I am asking for was partially printed in the press this morning. It has been given in full to the press, and I think we ought to have a copy of it here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 548) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to send to the Senate the note received from the British Government dated February 10, 1915.

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

Mr. STONE. What is the resolution, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has just been read.

Mr. LODGE. It is a request to have sent to the Senate a copy of the note from the British Government which was published in the papers this morning. It was given in full at the State Department in print to the newspaper press, which has partially printed it. I think we would all like to have a full copy of it.

Mr. STONE. I should like to have the resolution read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. LODGE. That is the note printed in part in the Post this morning.

Mr. STONE. Yes; I saw that.

Mr. LODGE. And it was given in full in print to the newspapers—in type. They have offered to furnish Senators with that copy, and I do not see why the Senate should not have it.

Mr. STONE. Although one or two Senators have suggested that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am very frank to say, so far as I am concerned, that personally I do not see any objection to agreeing to it. I make no objection, so far as I am concerned.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

WAGES ON AMERICAN VESSELS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, perhaps I ought to have submitted the matter I am about to submit under another order, but on yesterday I presented some replies from steamship companies as to the rate of wages paid on the ships that came under the new registry. I desire to submit a letter from Barber & Co., steamship agents, of New York, and ask that the first part of it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, *February 17, 1915.*

Hon. J. H. GALLINGER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We acknowledge receipt of yours of February 10 inquiring as to whether foreign-built ships which have been admitted to American register cost more to operate than under the British flag, and in reply would advise you that as far as we know the only increase at the present time in operating expenses under the American flag is on account of the increase in wages.

The following is a list of wages that was paid to a lascar crew, with British officers in command, also showing the wages which we pay to the officers and men under the American register:

Crew.	American, per month.	British, per month.
Master	$200.00	$160.00
Chief officer	100.00	78.00
Second officer	70.00	54.00
Third officer	60.00	44.00
Carpenter	40.00	20.00
Boatswain	40.00	17.00
Sailors	28.00	8.00
Chief engineer	150.00	112.00
First refrigerating engineer	110.00	.....
First assistant engineer	100.00	73.00
Second assistant engineer	90.00	49.00
Second refrigerating engineer	85.00	.....
Third assistant engineer	80.00	39.00
Oilers	35.00	.....
Donkeymen	35.00	11.50
Firemen	32.00	9.25
Coal passers	28.00	.....
Chief steward	50.00	22.68
Second steward	30.00	9.63
Assistant steward	22.00	.....
Chief cook	50.00	[1] 17.00
Second cook	30.00	8.50
Mess boy	25.00	.....

[1] And bonus $10

Yours, truly,

BARBER & CO. (INC.).

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have here a clipping from the Philadelphia Public Ledger of February 18 which reads in this way:

SHORTAGE OF SHIPS SENDS WATER RATES TO NEW HIGH MARK—AMERICAN BUSINESS OPPORTUNITIES AFFECTED BY LACK OF VESSELS AND EXORBITANT TARIFFS.

Business opportunities are being lost to America because of the scarcity of vessels, said several steamship men yesterday. According to these men there is the greatest shortage of tonnage ever known, and the only reason that there is not a congestion at this port is because shippers in the interior are not forwarding their goods for shipment until they have obtained cargo space. Most of the regular lines, it was said yesterday, have all of their vessels booked up until the last of March, and many of them into the middle of April.

Although many of them admitted that they were turning down business because of the lack of vessels, some were opposed to the ship-purchase bill. Walter F. Hagar, one of the best-informed shipping men in this city, said that there was such a lack of vessels that it was impossible to get steamships.

According to Mr Hagar, shippers are compelled to charter schooners at exorbitant rates because of the lack of steamships. Some schooners, he asserted, had been chartered to carry ore at high rates, a thing almost unheard of in recent years. "Usually boats are offering for freights, but now the case is reversed and it is impossible to get carriers," he continued. Mr. Hagar declared that 15s. had recently been paid for a grain cargo to Denmark, which is the highest rate ever paid for freight of that class.

Shipping men realize the gravity of the situation, he said, and that one vessel had recently been chartered as far ahead as March 1, 1916, for a period of 18 months at 8s., which is about twice as high as the rate that was being paid six months ago. He also said that the steamship *Thelma* had recently been chartered to carry sugar at 32 cents. Six months ago this vessel was carrying sugar at 8½ cents, or about one-fourth of the present rate.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY M'ADOO (S. DOC. NO. 950).

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a public document the address of Secretary McAdoo before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, heretofore printed in the RECORD of February 16, in which form it is not available for public distribution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON (S. DOC. NO. 949).

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, we have been very liberal in publishing the utterances of Secretary McAdoo. They have gone into the RECORD, and we now propose to print one of his addresses as a public document. I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] delivered before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States be likewise printed in the RECORD and also as a public document.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

The address is as follows:

THE OPPOSITION AND THE SHIPPING BILL.

[Address by Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, United States Senator from Ohio.]

"I congratulate you on your organization and its aims. Ten years ago I addressed a somewhat similar gathering, intended to be national in its scope, and foretold for them a field of usefulness far and away beyond that of any local organization. This body represents the United States. No pent-up Utica restrains your activities, but a whole boundless continent is yours, and in the ramifications of your work you seek to put Paris and Berlin and London and Hongkong on the map alongside of New York and Chicago. I trust that you may succeed in enlarging the trade of the United States and that your aims in every line, commercially and industrially, may also join with civic activities in which you will give a wholesome stimulus to our political life; for in this age no man can be a business man alone; he must keep in touch with the great movements of humanity which are so powerful in this day.

"First of all, is this policy to be permanent or is it to be temporary? If it is to be temporary, one set of reasons would apply. If it is to be permanent, an entirely different set of questions are raised. I want to read very briefly some of the varying statements on that subject.

"In the report filed by the chairman of the House committee, Mr. ALEXANDER, is this language:

"While we need merchant ships to meet the present emergency, let us pursue a policy that will secure them to us after the present conflict in Europe is past.

"In an address at Boston on the 5th of January he said:

"The Government ownership bill is spoken of as an emergency measure. It should not be so called. European Governments have in the past laid the foundation for their merchant marine by Government protection.

THE FLETCHER BILL.

"I might read divers other expressions to the same effect. Now let us listen to a different note. Senator FLETCHER in bringing forward this bill in the United States Senate on the 4th of January, one day before the speech from which I have read an extract, said:

"Without going further into the details of this bill, I assure the Senate in the first place, and the country, that it is not a permanent business undertaking on the part of the Government that is intended here.

"And the language of the President, as used in his message in December, would seem to point in the same direction:

"It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable, and then when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.

"Now, there you have those two sides. Which are we to take as authoritative? There has not only been a change from December to January, but apparently a change from Monday to Wednesday, or rather from Tuesday to Wednesday; for upon the hill on Tuesday a coterie of those favoring the measure were seeking to conciliate seven of their colleagues by promising them the minimum of Government ownership, agreeing to limit the operation of the bill to a year or two and to provide for leasing the ships to private operators; while on Wednesday morning, after failing in their first endeavor, they were promising another group to embark the Government on a permanent policy of Government ownership. Apparently the proponents of this measure have utterly lost the bearings of their traditional statecraft and are ready to plead an emergency or fly to socialist doctrine, whichever will win the votes.

OPERATING AT PROFIT OR LOSS.

"Again, is this to be an enterprise for profit or not for profit? Is it supposed that by running at a loss for a period, in some mysterious way the business would become profitable, as implied in the President's message, and the Government then be able and willing to turn it over to private hands? Of course, such a supposition is without any foundation in reason. The sure result of the Government operating merchant ships at a loss would be the complete demoralization of the shipping trade, the destruction of such merchant marine as we now have, and a long postponement of the day of its revival.

"Again, there has been another change, this time in the purpose to be accomplished. When this measure was brought forward in August, and when it was advocated in December, it seemed that what was under consideration was trade development with South and Central America. New avenues of trade—"empty markets," to use the expression of the President—"were the objects in view." Nothing was said about the settled countries of Europe. Now there is an entire change and the advocacy of the bill is based upon the necessity of sending freight to Europe. The idea that we need more shipping for South America at this time, although it was the first reason for the passage of this bill, although for months that was exploited as a reason why the Government should engage in the business, is a chimera.

THE SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

"Ten boats leave every month on the average from New York for Rio de Janeiro and the east coast of South America. What are the facts? Before and since the war they have been running with a surplus of cargo space, sometimes being only half filled. A few weeks ago a passenger boat fit to engage in the trans-Atlantic trade came in from Rio with 6 first-class passengers and 17 third-class passengers, and that was the whole passenger list. On the west coast of South America, notwithstanding the stimulus afforded by the opening of the Panama Canal, the Peruvian and the Chilian navigation companies, which jointly ran boats weekly, have withdrawn the weekly service and made it fortnightly. I trust that the old conditions are soon to be restored.

"Here I want to call attention to one phase of this whole freight situation. While there may be sporadic instances of high rates to those portions of the world that are at peace, there has not been a rise in the charges so great as that which has frequently happened in the times of profound peace. Generally speaking, the rates to South America, to South Africa, to India, and to Hongkong have been raised about 25 per cent. In sporadic instances rates in the war zone have been raised eight or nine times. Thus the disparity in the increases is the substance of the whole matter, and shows conclusively that the increases are in direct proportion to the dangers of war.

AN INTERNATIONAL WAR CRISIS.

"I am sorry to say that there are a great many people in the United States who do not seem to realize that we are in the

midst of the most titanic conflict between nations that the world has ever seen. We should have a deep realization of what it means. Happily we here in America are at peace. The sun shines over peaceful fields and witnesses people joyous because they are not engaged in war. Heaven be thanked for the blessing that belongs to us, and woe to the man who would stir up strife or interfere with that neutrality, that strict impartiality, which the American people should maintain at this time.

"I may have sympathies. I may think one nation or the other is more to blame, but I do not tell anybody; and I do not think anyone who has in the remotest degree any official responsibility should do so. We should not at this time allow fondness for the enlargement of trade—a disposition with which I sympathize—to erase from our minds a realization of what this war means and of the duty of the American people. The brightest page in it all is the work of this whole Nation for the suffering of Europe, the activities of the Red Cross Society, the great foundation in New York, and the universal response of the American people in sending food and supplies to the suffering and dying of Europe. When the contest is over this will be our chief distinction, rather than sending war material or capturing trade.

"I want you to realize this fact: There is war, and this war has deranged the routes of trade. It has destroyed many of the agencies of transportation. It has diminished shipping facilities. It has introduced demoralization, partial destruction in almost every branch of commercial and industrial activity. Do not ignore that fact, and do not treat this question as if it was one to be settled as if we were now at peace.

A NONPARTISAN QUESTION.

"I agree with the honorable Secretary of the Treasury that this matter should be considered as a nonpartisan one. I took that stand in the first remarks made in the Senate some days ago which undoubtedly were much longer than any remarks I shall make to you to-day. Last Monday, when I saw seven Democrats, in the face of objurgation and censure, stand up and vote to recommit this shipping bill to the committee—which meant its defeat—I thought it was beginning to assume a nonpartisan phase in the Congress.

"Will the conditions of European trade be relieved by increased shipping? Do not let us deal with generalities. Let us get down to the facts. What is it that has caused this decrease in the supply of shipping and an increase in freight rates? In the first place, German and Austrian shipping is withdrawn from the seas. Those boats probably carried about 14 per cent of the foreign trade. But let us consider that for a moment. If German and Austrian shipping is withdrawn from the seas, so also are Germany and Austria shut off from the trade of the world. The Baltic Sea is practically closed to trade; so also is the Black Sea. And, roughly approximating an estimate, we may say that the trade of the world has decreased because of the war in just about a like proportion with the loss of shipping. The situation would naturally call for an increase of our exports—more food and more supplies. More food and more supplies are destroyed when war is in progress. This tendency is emphasized by the desire of the nations, as Italy and Sweden and Norway, near to the theater of war, but not engaged in the conflict, to prepare themselves for all exigencies. That has increased the measure of their purchases. All factors considered, the withdrawal of this German shipping is no doubt a factor in the increase of freight rates.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

"Another factor of great importance is the liability of boats to search and seizure. Still more important is the cost of war-risk insurance. Even if it be only 2 or 3 per cent for a voyage, just think what that means. Suppose there are half a dozen voyages in the year; 12 or 18 per cent must be paid for war-risk insurance. That would be far and away beyond the ordinary income on investments of capital. Another reason is the dangerous channels through which shipping may go. If there is any one thing that the mariner fears more than others it is a hidden obstruction. He fears that his boat may run upon the rocks. But infinitely more dangerous is the mine which, when it explodes, not only stops the vessel and blows up the hull, but perhaps carries captain and crew and all into kingdom come. Then there is another reason. The requisition, especially by Great Britain, of a good share of its shipping to be used for military purposes.

"But when I name all these I have not named that which is at present the most decisive in the situation—that is, the delay in foreign ports.

FOREIGN PORTS CONGESTED.

"As a man said a few days ago—and I am not sure but that he was pretty nearly right—more ships would add to the congestion, for they would be in each other's way in foreign ports. Let me give you a few illustrations. Not very long ago an American boat was chartered to carry horses to a port in France. It had additional cargo capacity of 8,000 tons dead weight, but the owners learned that in the port to which they were going there had been a delay of 60 days in loading and unloading. What did they do? They went from this country to France without filling a foot of the space rather than to take the risk of delay and detention. Delay and detention are not limited to the ports of countries at war. It is just as bad at Genoa as anywhere, where a few days ago 30 ships were waiting in vain to be unloaded. It is a marked factor at Liverpool and at London—perhaps not so large in the German ports, if you can reach them, but generally in all European ports—and the cause of it is perfectly obvious. Government ships and other ships gather in the harbor. The Government claims for its military purpose the first use of quays and docks. The men who would be engaged in loading and unloading have gone to the war. The men who would be making necessary repairs have gone to the war, and thus it is necessary to wait 20 or 30 or 40 or 60 days before a boat can be unloaded.

"On this subject I want to read very briefly from a report by Norman Hill, made on the 12th of January last. I think there is no one who is a higher authority in England in regard to shipping. He says:

"There is nothing in any of the above figures to account for the congestion of the ports in which fewer vessels have been available, and there has probably been as great a fall in the volume of the trade carried. The tonnage remaining available has been sufficient to carry the cargoes offering, for cargoes have not had to be shut out; although in the trade of the United Kingdom the amount carried in each of our ships has not substantially increased, the time employed in the discharge has increased most seriously. In London and Liverpool vessels have to wait for days for discharging berths, and when they can obtain berths the discharge is hampered and delayed by the block on the quays and on the railways. It is clear, therefore, that the causes of the congestion must be other than the one of ships or the one of quay space. The main cause is beyond question the shortage of labor.

"And that applies in an even greater degree in the countries more affected by the war than Great Britain, where, in a degree, industrial and commercial activities have gone on as heretofore.

"Where are you going to get your ships? My good friend Mr. Baker, who has been quoted by the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, says that there are not more than 10 ships available under neutral flags that would be suitable for the purpose, and he advises the building of ships. Well, it is a "present emergency" that is on us. We all fervently hope that this war will close in a less time than ships could be built. Strangely, most of our shipyards are busy already, and it would be 10 to 16 months before a boat of any considerable size, suitable for the trans-Atlantic trade, could be built in one of our shipyards. In the meantime you have those 10 ships. What are you going to do with them? How much will they help you? What better would the Government do with those 10 ships than the private owners are doing? Is the Government, which we must concede is sometimes very unwieldy, going to manage the shipping business better than the private owners?

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

"There are three phases of Government ownership presented in this proposal. I am not one of those for whom Government ownership has the terror that it has for many. Under proper restrictions it does not frighten me. But what is the proper field for Government ownership? It is in some branch of public service monopolistic in its nature, like waterworks in a city, electric light or gas plants—possibly telephone service and street railways, or those activities that are in close association with the moral and social conditions of a country, such as bathhouses or lodging houses. Here you are proposing partial Government ownership, though there is nothing more disastrous than to have part Government and part private ownership. This is not a fair test of Government ownership and operation. The ships that could be purchased with forty millions would be a mere bagatelle in the shipping of the world. You would be at best, even if it were half, in about the same condition that you are in when there are two telephone lines in the city. Oh, I have been through that! I have heard the statement made, 'You have one telephone line here. If you put in another you will have the benefit of competition.' What was the result? Each telephone line has to wire every building, put separate conduits in every street, and each office must have two phones. There is inconvenience all along the line, and finally either there will be insufficient service or the public will have to pay interest on both equipments.

"I remember some 30 years ago that there was a new railroad projected paralleling the Lake Shore Railroad between Buffalo and Cleveland. You could flip a copper between the different tracks much of the way. The right-of-way man went out and said, 'Now, farmer, we are going to have a competing line here. You can go to town more cheaply; you can ship your produce more cheaply; you will have all the blessings of competition; and a new avenue to happiness will be opened to you.' In about three years they were both under the same management. It proved impossible to run the two side by side under the laws of competition.

"What are you going to do if you have only one-fourteenth or one-twentieth of the shipping of the world? In the first place, the question has been asked, Have you any special route on which you will put these boats? And the answer is made, No; we will cross that bridge when we come to it. I think that question ought to be answered. I do not think Congress should be asked to appropriate forty or fifty millions of dollars without knowing something about what is to be done with the money.

PORTS OF CALL.

"Will special ports be selected? Then what happens? If you choose Galveston, will not Mobile and New Orleans have occasion to complain? Will you choose a special product, such as wheat or cotton? Then, will not every other class of producers have a right to complain that you are giving a special advantage to this line of business to the disadvantage of every other? Suppose the Government carries at lower freight rates than private owners; what would be the result? Why, perhaps one-twentieth of the traffic of this country—a fraction certainly not greater than one-tenth—would be carried at a lower rate. What is the result? Does the great body of the American people get the benefit of it? No; it is the few who are benefited by those rates. It is exactly like the days of railroad wars, when the railroads in times of sharp competition put down their rates to a low figure. Those who were on the ground floor and took advantage of it were able to get their stuff carried at low figures, and they put the benefits in their pockets. The consumer got no benefit from it. You can not go into this business partially and make a success of it. If you are going into Government ownership, it is necessary that you shall control the whole business. There is no middle ground.

"I recognize a disposition on the part of many of the American people to disparage expert knowledge. It is thought that inexperienced men may gather around a table and smoke cigars and make plans and advise orgnizations for trade or industry just as well as those who have given their lives to it. A distinguished public man went out to Trenton not long ago to address a high school, and he said that the youth who has written a bright epigram gains more éclat than the student who has studied for two years. I want to say a few words for the student that studies for two years and who masters the subject. It appears sometimes to be imagined that great inventions and discoveries are the result of a chance inspiration; that a man, peering out into the outer void, puts his hand out and brings in a telephone or an electric light. But, ladies and gentlemen, that is not the case. The rewards in business and in science come to those who labor and who acquire qualifications.

SHIPPING TRADE NECESSITIES.

"Thus the shipping trade has been developing for centuries. It has adopted new routes of trade; it has adopted new methods; it has preceded rather than followed demands. There are certain necessities in regard to it. There must be terminals for the loading and discharge of freight. It is not sufficient to have ships. There must be wharves and quays. Is the Government going to secure those also? There must be affiliations with shippers. Is the Government going to secure such in a month or in two months? There must be a familiarity with the routes of commerce; a most careful calculation must be made so that the ship will have not only an outgoing but a return cargo; that she shall have something to do the year around. And then again oftentimes the owner of the ship is a merchant. He has a cargo one way supplied by some shipper. He buys something to bring back. That is in a considerable degree true of the trade on the west coast of South America, where nitrates constitute the return cargo. Is the Government going into that business and going to buy merchandise to carry at this time? I must say that in whatever phase we consider this bill we meet with difficulties. Not only is partial Government ownership defective in any field, but this is a line of business which it would be particularly dangerous for a newcomer to enter under the most favorable circumstances.

"The Revenue-Cutter Service, referred to by the distinguished Secretary, I commend very much, but it discharges a purely governmental function in the first place, and to that has been added the most commendable object of saving life. But that was not a creation overnight. That was not adopted under a bill never declared for in a party platform. It is the growth of a hundred years. I read a report by one of the Cabinet officers a few days ago about the frightfully dilapidated condition of the boats in one branch of the Government service, and I thought, 'Is it possible that alongside such a condition as this under Government management we are going to be asked that the Government go into the shipping business on a large scale?' If the Government can not manage boats that are used for its own agencies, how is it going to manage them when they are used for the general purposes of trade?

PURCHASE OF BELLIGERENT SHIPS.

"There is one question I must consider before I close: Are you going to buy ships of any of the belligerent nations? It would take too long for me to go into this question in detail, but I wish to state the situation briefly: Formerly England maintained the idea that a neutral could buy the ship of a belligerent in time of war if it was done in good faith. The doctrine on the Continent of Europe was always the contrary; that a purchase by a neutral of a belligerent ship in time of war was void, and that if she sailed with the neutral flag she could be seized, taken into the prize court, and condemned. In the declaration of London, formulated by a convention in London in 1909, all the commercial nations practically agreed with the continental doctrine; that is, a transfer before the beginning of war was valid if made in good faith, but if made after war had commenced it was void unless it was shown that it was not done to evade the consequences of war. Suppose there is a merchant ship of Germany or England in the harbor of Charleston or Galveston. What are the 'consequences' to which such a boat is exposed? Why, if it sailed out under the German or English flag it would be seized by the other of the belligerents. If transferred to the American flag, it would be to evade the consequences of war, and the boat would still be subject to seizure. This war is not going to last always. We must take into account the feeling of these foreign nations toward us when the war has finished. I am afraid we have been a little too commercial in many of our ideals.

"Germany has issued a statement confirming the declaration of London. It is true she has intimated that she might waive her objections to the sale of certain boats detained in our harbors if the boats sail exclusively to German ports, and saying that such boats must have a passport issued by the German consul and that it must be taken to the State Department for approval, and then it is good for only one trip. England and France have also proclaimed the declaration of London, with some modification, as their policy during the war.

OUR NATIONAL RIGHTS.

"With these belligerents all united in the idea that ships can not be transferred under these circumstances, I want to say that we can not afford to take the chance. I am not one of those who say with bluff old Commodore Hull, 'My country: May she be always in the right; but, right or wrong, my country.' I can not agree with the last clause. No nation has insisted upon the rights of belligerents more earnestly than we did in the Civil War. We took it upon ourselves to determine the ultimate destination of cargoes; that is, if a boat sailed for Nassau and her cargo was suspiciously large, we reserved the right to investigate the question as to whether the goods were not intended to run the blockade. If a boat went to Matamoras, even though Mexico was at war, and the owners said, 'This may be intended for Mexico,' our prize court said, 'No; the chances are that it is intended for our enemies, and we will confiscate your boat and its cargo.'

"We can not afford to take the chance of trouble in buying belligerent ships. Thus we are driven back on the 10 ships that are available.

TERMS OF PROPOSED BILL.

"I am compelled to differ with some things that have been stated to-day in regard to this being in reality a private enterprise. Instead of buying the boats directly the Government is to organize a corporation, 51 per cent of the stock of which is to be paid directly from the Government Treasury; and if the remaining 49 per cent is not taken by private subscription, then the Government takes that also. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce exercise certain supervision over this corporation, with three others, who constitute a shipping board. The very statement of my honored friend, the Secretary of the Treasury, in which he said the President is to have control of all this, and made an appeal to you, in which I most cordially join, of confidence in the President of the United States, disproves its private character; for, whatever

difference I may have with him, I honor him as a man, and he is our President. But you are asked to favor this bill because the President is going to control it all. How is that consistent with private business of a private corporation? The fact of the matter is that this corporation is a mere mask. Every dollar of the stock, no doubt, would be subscribed by the Federal Government. It is a Federal enterprise. The corporate form is a mere cloak to cover the real nature of the transaction; not intentionally so, but in effect. I may weary you perhaps by dealing in the distinction between the rights and obligations of a government and of a citizen in relation to belligerents. A citizen can ship munitions of war to a belligerent, and the Government is not compelled to intervene. The citizen must take his chance. If the boat is caught, he loses that which is contraband; but the moment the Government of the United States does a thing of that kind it is an act of hostility, leading to the most serious complications. You can not get out of that situation by passing a bill of this kind and going through this fiction of organizing a corporation of the District of Columbia.

DANGER OF SEIZURE.

"I should tremble with apprehension, if this corporation should be organized, and a boat owned by it, under the direction of the Government, or as Secretary McAdoo has said, under the general direction of the President of the United States, should go out to sea and be seized by England or Germany on the ground that the cargo was contraband or that the ship had been transferred to our flag by a belligerent in time of war. I do not want such a bone of contention, such a source of friction and quarrel brought into our international relations at this time when everything is so tense and we must maintain neutrality and equal friendship for all. But suppose it were possible to obtain boats from neutrals, no doubt at a very high price, what advantageous use could we make of them? I dwell upon that subject again at the risk of repetition.

GOVERNMENT BOARD QUESTIONS.

"Do you believe that a Government board entering into this business without affiliation with shippers, without wharves and docks, can utilize those boats and carry any more freight on them than the private citizen who has made it a business all his life? You say private owners are charging extortionate prices. I think they are high, and I will join in any reasonable measure that will submit charges to supervision and control. You can not go as far as you can in the control of the railroad rate, because the business is vitally different, but you can at least supervise conference agreements. Why, it is said that there is a Shipping Trust. If ever there was an old and decayed derelict ready to be blown up, it is the Shipping Trust.

IF THE GOVERNMENT GOES INTO BUSINESS.

"Just at this time I must most vigorously dissent, if the Secretary will excuse me, from something that he said at Chicago—he did not quite say it here. I read from his Chicago speech:

"The objection that the shipping bill puts the Government in the shipping business, is not tenable. Those who urge it seem to forget that it is the duty of the Government to engage in any activities, even of a business nature, which are demanded in the interest of all the country when it is possible to engage private capital in such operations.

"Where will you stop upon that kind of a platform? Whenever there is a political agitation against some line of business, whether it is buying ships or marketing wheat, the Government has got to go into the business. The crowning glory of American life has been the initiative, the energy, the opportunity of the individual. I join with old Thomas Jefferson when he said 'that government is best which governs least.' I do not want to see the Government taking over business enterprises, and selecting men who are to manage them more or less according to political favor. There is too great a multitude that has come here already seeking office; going first to high-grade hotels, then to cheap boarding houses, and then going home despondent. If the Government goes into business, I am afraid they will take the first train and come back again and say, 'While we may not have succeeded very well in the business in which we have been engaged at home, it is only because we did not have opportunity to carry on operations on a large enough scale. Just put us in the Government service, and we will make a success in any position in which you place us, and in that way you will reward us for the services conferred in the campaign.'

"This is a situation true in a large degree with Democrats, and in some degree with the Republicans. I am not criticizing any political party, but I want to say to this audience that we will never have efficient Government management, certainly Government ownership, until the wide shield of the civil service and appointment in regard to merit rests over all our governmental activities.

OBJECT OF BILL.

"This bill, should it facilitate export, would certainly raise prices. I have heard in a political campaign that it was a requisite of usefulness that men should go their round with different speeches in their pockets—one for use when they went among the farmers telling them, 'You are going to have higher prices and everything is going to go better if you put us into office;' and then they would go into cities and say, 'You are paying too much for bread, and the prices are going to be lower.'

"Now, what is the object of this bill? Is it to raise prices? Why, wheat is quoted at a figure higher than it has been, save in some sudden rushes in the market, since the year 1866. Persons are coming here to Washington asking that an embargo be placed on the export of wheat and wheat products. There was a headline in one of the papers night before last that said the cost to the Capital City alone would be $600,000 because of the added price of wheat. It has got to be either a smaller loaf or a higher price. The Government ought at least to be neutral under those circumstances. Is it going to use its strong hand? Is it going to tax the people, consumer and producer alike, to facilitate the export of wheat and hence raise the price of our primary food product?

"Now, let us look into the cotton situation for a minute. We have an unprecedented crop this year—16,000,000 bales. Very early in this war the Liverpool cotton exchange passed a resolution that they would not buy any cotton at present; the sources of demand were shut off; the cotton textile industry is demoralized by the war. There is consequently a very much diminished demand. Is it not perfectly inevitable that the price should be lowered under those circumstances, namely, the large crop and the diminished demand abroad? In this terrible war the consumer pays the freight as he never did before. If wheat were available from Odessa, if it were available from Siberia, if it were available from India, there would be competition, but, as it is now, the main source of supply is the New World. You can fix the price in Chicago or in Buenos Aires and add on the freight, and the consumer abroad has got to pay the freight. In Bremen the cost of cotton is 19 cents. Why is it so? Because of the high rate of freight between Galveston or Savannah or New Orleans, and the danger of capture, the danger of detention, and the danger of being blown into eternity by mines when you are on the way.

CONSIDERATION FOR THE CONSUMER.

"Why, it was rather understood when this new régime commenced that we were to have lower prices. That was one of the promises that were made. Now, is it to be the sole aim of governmental activity to raise prices? Is not the consumer entitled to the considerate attention of the administration? Will you tax the consumer and the producer alike to help the producer alone? Is that the new governmental idea that you are going to bring into effect?

"Now, there is one point in this connection that I would like to mention while speaking in regard to cotton. The total production, as I said, is about 16,000,000 bales. A little more than a third of that is retained at home. The other two-thirds or less goes abroad. That would mean the export of about 10,400,000 bales in the year, 200,000 bales in a month. Let us look at the recent shipments of cotton. I say this to hold out a word of hope to those who are interested in that line of production. Since January 2 there has not been a single week when the average export has not been above 200,000 bales. It is true that there would naturally be large shipments at this season of the year, but when you take into account the war, we are doing well, and conditions approximate the normal when you send an average of 200,000 bales per week. For the week ending January 2 there was sent abroad 191,000 bales; January 9, 315,000 bales; January 16, 218,000 bales; January 23, 255,000 bales; and January 30, 398,166 bales. Keep up that rate for 26 weeks of the year, and the whole we have for export will be carried abroad to a variety of ports.

"There is another thing that some of you may have noticed in a newspaper paragraph this morning, which is exceedingly significant. In the port of Galveston the quoted rate on cotton has fallen from $3.50 per hundred to $2.50 to Bremen; to Rotterdam, from $2.50 to $2 and $2.10; to Barcelona, from $1.35 to 85 cents. It would seem from this that while we have been talking on the shipping bill prices have been going down, and that raises the very important question as to whether it is not best to deliberate and to talk once in a while.

DANGEROUS POSSIBILITIES.

"I have been interested in many measures in the Senate and House of Representatives, but, my fellow citizens, I know of none that seems to me is fraught with more dangerous possi-

bilities. You must always take into account in every piece of legislation not only what it is in itself but the precedent that it establishes. What will be done next? Why, it seems to me that in every word that Secretary McAdoo uttered against the lending of $250,000,000 to the cotton growers he was condemning the spending of money out of the Treasury which would inure to the benefit of some particular locality in this country. He referred to $28,000,000 loaned to the States. Does anybody deny that that is a fair debt? But the Treasurer of the United States was directed by Congress never to collect a nickel of it until further ordered, and you and I will have passed into another sphere before that further order is issued. So it is in regard to this shipping bill. If the shipping corporation is once organized and some one can get lower rates than the normal—can get advantages over his competitor—the agitation to continue it will remain long after its usefulness has been disproved and the boats ought to be sold.

"There are some things that it does not do to trifle with, my friends. If above anything else in my life I have wanted to take a stand, it is for the people and all the people of the United States against any section and any party. I deplore the fact that an organized minority or interest, small in number, is often more influential here at Washington than the great body of the people who, hampered by inertia and lack of interest, do not give sufficient attention to the general good. A public man oftentimes promotes his political chances more by a single bill that helps a single person than by any statute for the general good that he may be instrumental in enacting.

"I repeat—while we have been deliberating the reason for this bill has gone by or is going by. The arguments on behalf of it made at the beginning were abandoned. Now that relations with South America do not require increased shipping, some other reason is proposed.

OPPOSITION TO SHIP SUBSIDY.

"I have always opposed ship subsidy. I have stood with the minority of my party against this measure for these many years. I do not believe you will succeed in building up a merchant marine in that way. The more subsidy you pay the more you will be asked. There is a misapprehension about it. It is said that Germany and England have subsidized their ships. It is true that they do subsidize naval auxiliaries and boats like those belonging to the Cunard Line, but the tramp boat, which does most of the freight business, takes its chances on the waters of the sea. What is the reason our merchant marine has been decadent? It is closely associated with conditions which explain the marvelous progress of the American people.

SHIPPING-TRADE PROFITS.

"There is no trade which involves so little profit and so much hardship as the shipping trade. In Great Britain boats are built and then bonds to 65 per cent of their value at 4 per cent can be issued on them. They are built much more cheaply because they build many of the same type. Then when boats are sent out to sea our spirit of humanity toward the seaman is stronger than in Europe. We give him better food, we give him better wages, and we give him less hours. After all, you come up against this great proposition that in this land of ours there is a panoply of opportunities for investment on the land. We have here a great continent only partially developed, in some portions only scratched, and the genius of our people, their desire for investment, runs in that direction.

"Then, over on the other side of the water they have a class of sailors who for generation after generation, father, son, grandson, and on down indefinitely, follow the sea, while in our country when a man gets to be a mate he sends his son to the high school; he gets an education there, and in the abundant growth of American life that young fellow becomes a lawyer or a doctor and forsakes his father's calling.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

"Something has been said about the Panama Canal. The Government of the United States bought the rights of the new Panama Canal Co., and in buying them they got the railroad and ships and had them on their hands. In the building of the canal, that colossal enterprise, it was necessary to ship a great quantity of freight, such as cement, machinery, and supplies, and incidentally it has transacted a certain amount of general freight business. It is not in any way analogous to the present proposal.

"With reference to the currency bill, I want to say here that I was one of the men who had to do with the framing of the Aldrich-Vreeland bill, in the face of stubborn opposition from the other side, but the time came when the stone that the builders rejected became the head of the corner. With regard to the Federal reserve act, I did not vote in favor of it, but I did say, however, it would better the conditions as they previously existed. There was a commission which worked on the currency and banking problem, of which commission I had the honor to be a member for something like four years, and the accusation of plagiarism can be made with absolute certainty against the framers of the Federal reserve act when they look to that report, because its essential recommendations were all embodied and it furnished the basis for the present measure. I do not myself believe in this idea of the Government owning notes—I do not know that I would express myself so strongly as Senator ROOT, whom the secretary has quoted, and I do not believe that the experiment of issuing or guaranteeing currency which has been abandoned by every Government in the world, after it was tried by them and they had burned their fingers, should, even in this indirect way, be tried by our Government. Let the banks that issue this currency and get the benefit of it take care of the gold redemption and not call on Uncle Sam to help them out if they get into trouble. It may be a good thing, but I do not believe in the principle of it."

ORGANIZATION OF CITY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present an article entitled "An outline for a preliminary municipal survey and a description of the organization of city government," by Mr. Le Roy Hodges, of Petersburg, Va. I desire that it may be printed as a public document, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The article will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the report of the Chief of Staff, United States Army, Maj. Gen. W. W. Wotherspoon, to the Secretary of War, dated November 15, 1914, is out of print. There is a great demand for the report, and I should like to have it printed as a public document. It is a short report, comprising only 15 pages.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator from Connecticut if that is the report from the War Department?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; it is the report of the Chief of Staff of the Army. I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED SHIPS.

Mr. McLEAN. I ask to have printed in the RECORD about 25 lines from the London Spectator, which relate to some experiences of Australia and Brazil with government-owned ships.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Spectator, January 30, 1915.]

THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AS A SHIPOWNER.

To the EDITOR OF THE SPECTATOR.

SIR: Your correspondent "A Jeffersonian Democrat" asks in his letter under the above title in the Spectator of January 16 whether there is any modern precedent for State ownership of a merchant marine. One is to be found in Australia, where the labor factions have had a good run of late. According to the Shipbuilding and Shipping Record of August 6 last, the Fisher government some two and a half years ago bought a steamer—the *Stuart*—from a private company for £10,400, and another £5,900 was expended in refitting her. She earned in two years £2,381, and was sold last summer for £6,200, the estimated loss of £10,000 falling on the shoulders of the electorate. Another State-owned steamer is the *Western Australia*, purchased in 1912 by the labor-governed State bearing the same name. She was bought for £39,500, and altogether cost about £73,000. The Government was then trying to sell the ship for £45,000. There are, of course, other instances, particularly where a shipping company has been so backed up, subsidized, and financed by a State as to make the concern to all intents and purposes a State-owned company. One of this class is the Lloyd Braziliero fleet, which the Brazilian Government put up for sale last year, without, however, finding a purchaser.

I am, sir, etc.,

SHIPOWNER.

[Our correspondent forgets an earlier precedent, the London County Council's attempt to run a fleet of passenger steamers on the Thames. The result is never mentioned in progressive circles in the metropolis.—EDITOR SPECTATOR.]

LIMITATION OF DEBATE.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, have we passed the point in morning business when Senate resolutions are in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. We were on the order of concurrent and other resolutions. That would include Senate resolutions.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I submit the resolution of which I gave notice several days ago, which is now on the desk, proposing to amend the standing rules of the Senate, and I ask that it be read.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I understand it is not a question of the consideration of resolutions at this time; it is

a question of submitting resolutions. The order of business is the presentation of resolutions, as I understand.

Mr. NORRIS. This is a resolution which I am offering, and I have asked that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator gave notice of the resolution, and he now offers it. The Secretary will read it.

The resolution (S. Res. 549) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the standing rules of the Senate be amended by adding a new rule, as follows:

"Rule XLI. It shall be in order during the morning hour to make a motion that any bill or resolution then on the calendar shall be considered under the terms of this rule. Such motion when made shall lie over one day and shall then be decided without debate. No Senator shall be allowed to vote on a motion to consider a bill or resolution under this rule who is bound by any caucus or conference of Senators to vote in any particular way on said bill or resolution or any amendment thereon; but when any Senator's right to vote upon such motion is challenged such Senator shall be allowed to determine for himself whether he is disqualified from voting on said motion. When it has been decided to consider a bill or resolution under this rule the same shall first be considered in general debate, during which time no Senator, except by unanimous consent, shall be allowed to speak more than three hours. At the close of general debate the bill or resolution shall be read for amendments, and on any amendment that may be offered no Sentor, except by unanimous consent, shall speak for more than 15 minutes: *Provided*, That any Senator who has not spoken for three hours in general debate shall, in addition to said 15 minutes, be allowed additional time; but in no case shall such additional time or times, including the time used by such Senator in general debate, exceed in the aggregate three hours: *Provided further*, That if unanimous consent for additional time is asked in behalf of any Senator, either during general debate or when the bill or resolution is being considered for amendment, and the same is refused, it shall be in order by motion to extend the time of such Senator for a time to be named in said motion, which motion shall be decided without debate. When the bill or resolution is being read for amendment all debate shall be confined to the amendment which is then pending."

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Every proposition in this proposed rule has been discussed both ways, up and down, for several days, and I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. NORRIS. Do I understand that objection is made?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, as I understand, the resolution goes over for a day under the rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 17, 1915:

S. 145. An act for the relief of Charles Richter;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of Byron W. Canfield;

S. 1377. An act for the relief of Alfred S. Lewis;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of George P. Chandler;

S. 2304. An act for the relief of Chris Kuppler;

S. 2882. An act for the relief of Charles M. Clark;

S. 5695. An act for the relief of the Southern Transportation Co.; and

S. 5970. An act for the relief of Isaac Bethurum.

On February 18, 1915:

S. 1304. An act authorizing the Department of State to deliver to Capt. P. H. Uberroth, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, and Gunner Carl Johannson, United States Revenue-Cutter Service, watches tendered to them by the Canadian Government.

IMPORT DUTIES COLLECTED AT VERA CRUZ.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent to take from the calendar Senate resolution 514, being Order of Business No. 800, and, in accordance with the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], to have it referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wanted it disposed of in the Senate, but it is very evident that I can not secure disposition of it; and I ask that it be disposed of as desired by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and that course will be taken.

DETAIL OF MAJORS IN ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who is not able to be present, I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 17765, to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the bill?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is a bill to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I have received a number of letters in relation to the bill, and I think I referred one letter to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] yesterday or the day before, asking him to consider the objections to the bill that are raised in the letter. I hope the Senator will not ask unanimous consent this morning for the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It was desired by the War Department to secure, if possible, the passage of the bill, which proposes to correct what was probably an error in an appropriation bill passed a year ago. The bill really reenacts the law which was in effect for five or six years preceding the passage of the last appropriation bill; but, of course, if there is any objection, I suppose it can not be considered. It is requested by the Secretary of War, and was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if it is necessary, of course, in an emergency matter I will not object. I really wanted, however, to have the Senator who reported the bill consider the letters I have received in reference to it.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that majors may be detailed in the Ordnance Department, under section 26 of the act approved February 2, 1901, and acts amendatory thereof, without a compulsory period of service out of that department.

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

PROMOTION OF AMERICAN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. LODGE and Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, is there not a resolution coming over from yesterday?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not morning business.

Mr. LODGE. Then a resolution which goes over under the rule one day loses all privilege and is not taken up automatically? It always has been done. If a resolution is introduced, and objection is made, it goes over under the rule one day and comes up the next day automatically.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Where is the rule for it?

Mr. LODGE. If there be no rule for it, then the objection that carries it over one day kills it. I have never seen it questioned. That is the reason why I made the inquiry.

Mr. FLETCHER. It comes up on motion.

Mr. LODGE. I only want to know the new rules as they are made; that is all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has been no new rule made.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly it is new practice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is probably true. It is new practice, but not a new rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will venture to inquire if the fact that, under the rule, a resolution goes over one day does not carry with it the assumption that it comes up the next day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presumption has always been that it came up on the next day, and the Chair has been in the habit of automatically laying such resolutions before the Senate; but upon attention being called to the rule, the Chair does not find any rule which authorizes the Chair automatically to lay it before the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit, Mr. President, that it comes up on application under the rules.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, may I make a suggestion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly. The Chair has no——

Mr. ROOT. The rule that a resolution or other matter which is brought before the Senate shall lie over one day for consideration by necessary implication brings it before the Senate at the expiration of that period. Otherwise it would lie over indefinitely; but when the time is stated for which the matter shall lie over, then, upon the expiration of that time, the matter is in the same position that it was when it was originally presented to the Senate, just as when there is a recess or an adjournment to a certain day and hour, upon the expiration of that period the session begins.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may be pardoned, since the Chair has stated that there is no rule on the subject, the rule is:

All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration.

Of course by unanimous consent they can be disposed of at once, as they have been this morning; but if the request that they lie over one day ends them the rule is, of course, pointless. The rule is that a resolution shall lie over one day for consideration.

Mr. STONE. Is it not also true, if the Senator will permit me, that when it is brought up or laid before the Senate by the Chair on the day following, and is taken up and considered, if its consideration is not completed by 2 o'clock it goes to the calendar?

Mr. LODGE. Undoubtedly, but it is entitled to its day in court.

Mr. STONE. I think so. That has been the practice.

Mr. LODGE. That has been the unbroken practice.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts let me call his attention to Rule XXVI?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That rule provides that all reports of committees shall lie over one day for consideration. If the language that the Senator quotes requires a resolution to be disposed of on the next day and gives it precedence, then the similar language applied to the report of a committee would require every committee report to be considered the next day.

I am not objecting to the old practice. I do not want to be misunderstood about that; but just as a matter of curiosity I have myself sought to find a rule which sustained that practice, and I have not been able to find it.

Mr. LODGE. The rule is very simple, that a resolution shall lie over one day for consideration. Of course otherwise the request to lay it over one day kills it at once. It sends it to the calendar at once.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then what becomes of the report of a committee?

Mr. LODGE. But this is not the report of a committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand; but the same language is used in another rule in connection with the report of a committee.

Mr. LODGE. I understand that, but——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If it means necessarily that the resolution is to be considered the next day, would not the same language applying to the report of a committee mean equally that the report of a committee is to be considered the next day?

Mr. LODGE. But, Mr. President, the distinction is very obvious. The report of a committee or a bill goes to the calendar under the rule. A Senate resolution that is introduced does not go to the calendar unless it has been considered and the hour of 2 o'clock has arrived.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But there is nothing in the rules which says it is to be considered the next day.

Mr. LODGE. It has never been to a committee, and it does not go to the calendar until it has had its hour in court, or its day in court. That is the universal practice.

Mr. FLETCHER. Like any other matter, it has to be taken up on motion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not questioning the practice.

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not come up of itself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not objecting to the old practice. I was trying to find something in the rule which required the old practice.

Mr. ROOT. May I make a suggestion there as to a distinction that occurs to my mind upon the observation of the Senator from Georgia? The way in which the report of a committee gets consideration is by being put on the calendar, when it comes up in its regular order. The way in which a resolution which has never been to a committee gets consideration is by being brought up during the morning hour after the routine business. A resolution which has never been to a committee can not get on the calendar except by having consideration during the morning hour after the routine business, and it being ascertained that the period of the morning hour is not sufficient for its consideration, so that the hour expiring while the consideration is still in course, it then goes to the calendar. So the same view which sends the report of a committee to the calendar brings a resolution which has not been to a committee before the Senate in the morning hour of the day after it has been presented.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will allow me, I find nothing in the rule that provides that it is to go to the calendar, and I find nothing in the rule with reference to the report of a committee going to the calendar. It all seems to be based upon practice.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate will permit the Chair to make a statement about this matter, the view of the Chair will be made plain to the Senate.

It has always been the custom since the Chair has been here that after the order of concurrent and other resolutions the Chair has laid before the Senate resolutions coming over from a preceding day; but upon investigation of the rules it appears that there is nothing in the rules which requires the Chair to do any such thing. Resolutions are provided for in clause 5 of Rule XIV:

> All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration, unless, by unanimous consent, the Senate shall otherwise direct.

While the Chair believes that it would be to the interest of the orderly transaction of business for the Chair to lay down resolutions as they come over from a preceding day, the Chair thinks it is the duty of a Senator who has introduced a resolution which has gone over one day for consideration, at the time when concurrent and other resolutions are called for to call up his resolution. He has a right to call it up and to have it either considered or referred to a committee, but it is not, under the rules of the Senate, the unqualified duty of the Chair to lay it down.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let me ask a parliamentary question, Mr. President. I desire to ask the Chair whether Senate resolution 545, which I introduced three days ago, is upon the desk of the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It undoubtedly is.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to inquire whether it has not been the custom for resolutions of that character, calling for information, to be laid before the Senate the day following their introduction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any question about that; it has been the custom of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That being true, the author of that resolution having no notice of any departure from the usual custom which has prevailed in the Senate, as announced by the Vice President, I ask that the resolution be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is only just, and, unless there is to be an appeal from the ruling, the Chair, on the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, lays his resolution before the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I be heard just a minute on the question of order?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not intend to discuss the resolution at length.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to say this much——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not want to yield the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not asking the Senator to yield the floor. In this connection I wish to state my opinion in regard to the rules, and I think it is absolutely correct. As I construe the rules, the last order of business stated in the rules before the close of the morning business is the presentation of concurrent and other resolutions. When that order is passed the order of morning business is closed. It is still the morning hour, and it is in order to consider such a resolution during the morning hour, provided it is taken up, but the resolutions are not necessarily laid down. Anyone can move to take up such a resolution, as anyone can move to take up other matters. If not taken up during the morning hour, then it goes to the calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, a resolution asking for information ought not to take very much time, and it is not my purpose to do so. It is a very simple matter. I had supposed it would be laid before the Senate in the ordinary course of procedure, and it is before the Senate.

I desire, Mr. President, simply to say this about it: This is a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Department of Commerce for certain information which he has said is in his possession, regarding correspondence between himself and a European monarch and a prime minister of a foreign country, wherein he says that he has dispatched an attaché to a foreign port—an attaché who, thank God, to use his own language, speaks the language of that court—and that certain arrangements are under way affecting the foreign policy of this Government.

I regret that the Secretary of the Department of Commerce has felt called upon to discuss a matter of so much importance in such a mysterious way. I think it is outside of the scope of his authority under the law. At a time like this it is most serious if any official of the Government of the United States may undertake to conduct correspondence with a European power without having it pass through the ordinary channels of diplomacy.

I have no feeling about the matter at all. I am sorry that he used the language attributed to him. I have only pointed out the language which I think is very inappropriate in the speech. His entire address meets with my unqualified disapproval. There are insinuations and suggestions throughout that address which do no credit to its author. But the language that is quoted in my resolution, it seems to me, does call for some

answer at the hands of the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, and I should like, as the language has not been read, to quote the exact language used by Secretary Redfield.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I would first ask that the resolution be read.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to have the resolution read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read it.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 545, submitted by Mr. SMITH of Michigan on the 15th instant, as follows:

Whereas the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, Hon. William C. Redfield, delivered an address before the United States Chamber of Commerce, at its session held in the city of Washington, February 4, 1915, in which the following statement was made:

"I have had a dispatch from the prime minister of a great country abroad, so frank as hardly to be publishable in its original form, almost begging—let us say strongly urging—that America take the place in his country that Europe has laid aside. I have another from a monarch himself of a European power saying frankly that he wanted America to come into his land and take the place which others had hitherto filled.

"To-day an able attaché is there at the court of that monarch, speaking the monarch's language, thank God, and entering his country to do what he can do to unite that nation to ours. The King has said that he will put into America a branch of the bank of his country if we will undertake to establish banks in his country, and that whatever he can do officially to forward American commerce in his land shall be willingly and continuously done"; and

Whereas under the present delicate and critical state of international relations arising from the assertion of neutral and belligerent rights and obligations during the present war, it is desirable that Congress shall know how many and what different departments of our Government are engaged in carrying on negotiations with foreign powers, and whether such negotiations are of a character to disturb the balance of conditions created by war between other powers and to involve the United States in violation of neutrality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate copies of the communications referred to in the remarks above quoted and of the instructions to and the reports from the attaché therein mentioned.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand the Chair to hold that such resolutions are before the Senate subject to a motion to take any particular one up, but that they do not come up automatically for consideration and there is no rule which puts them before the Senate. I shall not object to a motion by the Senator from Michigan to take up this resolution. I have not any objection at all——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that was not the ruling of the Chair. The ruling of the Chair was that there is no particular order of business which requires the Chair to lay such resolutions before the Senate, but as there is a clause calling for "concurrent and other resolutions," a Senator who on yesterday introduced a resolution which was laid over under the rule has a right during the morning hour to call it up for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Without a motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion is not necessary. He has a right to call it up.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I will make very short work of what I have to say about the resolution. This is not a pleasant duty. My attention has been called to what I regard as a somewhat serious error upon the part of the Secretary of the Department of Commerce in the address which he delivered to the United States Chamber of Commerce. My attention has been called to it by citizens of my own State who felt that if the Secretary was in correspondence with European monarchs and prime ministers they ought to know with whom he was in correspondence and what that correspondence was about. Whether Teuton or Slav or Hottentot, or whoever it was, they felt that they were entitled to know what this officer of the Government, whose duties do not take him into the field of diplomacy, has been writing to foreign monarchs about.

I have formed no hasty conclusion. I did not accept a newspaper report of the language used and most severely criticized, but I sent to the secretary of the chamber of commerce and asked for an official copy of the address of Secretary Redfield. I have that revised address before me now. I think this language is unfortunate. I think it is due to the Senate that he explain it. I have not the slightest wish to humiliate him. If what he has done is in the interest of the Government which he serves, and serves faithfully, I shall be very glad, but a mysterious statement of that kind affecting our diplomatic status with European powers is altogether too important to be overlooked.

It is not the first time that we have called upon the departments of the Government for an explanation of utterances. If the party to which I belong was in control of the Government of the United States at this time, so critical, I should be the first to say that language of that kind was inappropriate. I hope that the Secretary can make some explanation which will at least take away the sting of inappropriateness which now seems to surround it.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator rise to ask a question of me, or is he addressing the Chair in his own right?

Mr. STONE. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am through. I do not want to say any more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, in the resolution offered by the Senator from Michigan he quoted some excerpts from what he says is a stenographic report of a speech delivered by the Secretary of Commerce before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States on the 4th day of the present month. From these quotations it is apparent that the communications referred to by the Secretary, and to which the Senator referred in his speech, were personal rather than official communications made to him. They were not, as I understand, drawn out by any request emanating from the Secretary, but were communications voluntarily made by certain officials of certain foreign Governments.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. I would think, Mr. President, that the Secretary would be entitled to use a correspondence of that character in such way as he saw proper. As to the wisdom of using it as he did, that was a question addressing itself alone to his judgment and discretion. I can not see upon what theory or by what authority the Senate can call the Secretary to account and demand that he lay before the Senate a correspondence of that kind.

Nevertheless I am prepared to say that the Secretary of Commerce is entirely willing to give to the Senate all the information asked for by the resolution of the Senator from Michigan.

I have just received a communication from Secretary Redfield relating to this resolution, which I will read, and I think it constitutes a sufficient answer to the Senator's criticism, but if he thinks otherwise I have no objection to the passage of the resolution. The letter to which I refer is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 17, 1915.

DEAR SENATOR STONE: My attention has been directed to Senate resolution No. 545, introduced by Senator SMITH of Michigan on February 15, and I have procured a copy thereof. I am aware that at this writing the resolution has not been adopted, but the whole matter is so simple and clear that it is a pleasure, in advance of its adoption, to furnish anew the information. I say "anew" because the matter was widely published throughout the country months ago, and I confess to a little surprise that the author of the resolution seems not to have observed this fact.

Having before me no copy of the address from which an alleged extract is made, I do not now raise the question of the accuracy of the supposed quotation. The statement is substantially correct, whether the language be accurately quoted or not.

The implication in the paragraph at the top of page 2, to the general effect that negotiations may be pending abroad between the different departments of the Government which may disturb matters, is a wholly gratuitous one. There are no facts either in my statement or in the actual occurrence to justify it. Only one, I venture to think, desiring to imply improprieties would have suggested it in the face of the widely published facts. These are as follows:

On October 2, 1914, I received from the Secretary of State a paraphrased copy of a dispatch from Ambassador Willard under date of August 30, giving somewhat in detail the subject matter of an audience with the King of Spain concerning the development of trade between Spain and the United States. I also received a letter from the President stating that he had asked the Secretary of State to send me the copy of the dispatch and asking me if I could devise means to bring this matter in some effective way to the attention of our commercial public. This was done, and on October 9, 1914, the matter was given to the press and published in the Consular and Trade Reports for that day. A copy is attached. A copy of the paraphrased dispatch is at the service of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate if they desire it, though I presume the more usual way would be to obtain the same from the Department of State.

In like manner the Argentine ambassador to the United States brought to me on November 5, 1914, a cable message from the minister of foreign relations of the Argentine Republic to their ambassador, dated October 31, 1914. Upon my suggesting to the ambassador that the matter was one, as indeed it was intended to be, of interest to American commerce, he very courteously obtained the consent of his Government to the publication of a transcription of the dispatch. It appeared on the first page of the Daily Consular and Trade Reports for November 11, 1914, and was widely circulated throughout the press. A copy of the statement to the press follows:

"At an interview between the Argentine ambassador and the Secretary of Commerce on the evening of the 5th instant an important cable message from the Argentine Government bearing upon the commercial relations between the two countries was presented. Through the courtesy of the Argentine ambassador, and with the consent of his Government, the publicity of this dispatch is permitted. Its importance is obvious.

"It is a cablegram from the minister of foreign relations of Argentina to the ambassador of that country, dated October 31, 1914, and is as follows:

"'There is at present no congestion of merchandise in our ports. Wheat and flour are not exported at present because of the embargo established by the executive power on those products. Corn, meat, and

wool are exported without great difficulty, but we fear the scarcity of the means of transportation for our production in the near future. A very effective outlet would be the arrival of steamers from the United States with usual cargoes—that is to say, impure naphtha, wood, iron, agricultural machines and implements, petroleum, furniture, lubricating oils, etc. Those boats would return with our products—that is to say, meat, wool, hides, quebracho, live stock, etc. American manufacturers can occupy the place left vacant by European industry in all the branches that have been served by it. The present moment offers to American manufacturers very appreciable advantages for occupying positions, profiting by the present European inability. In order to get these advantages they must take the initiative themselves, sending, at least, small cargoes and also agents, and especially adapting themselves to the custom of not demanding cash payment, as has been practiced by others with very well known success.'

Mr. LIPPITT rose.

Mr. STONE. Wait just a minute.

"The Department of Commerce hopes and expects that American manufacturers will take full advantage of the opportunity thus extended them through the courtesy of the Argentine Government."

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

Mr. STONE. Will the Senator let me conclude this?

Mr. LIPPITT. Yes. I merely wanted to ask the Senator one question, but I will wait.

Mr. STONE. I shall yield as soon as I finish reading. This letter of the Secretary proceeds:

It is a pleasure to say that, pursuant to the above, our commercial attaché, Dr. C. W. A. Veditz, is now in Madrid, endeavoring to promote the cordial relations with that country for which so much hope was expressed in the dispatch from our ambassador there, communicated through the Department of State, and that our commercial attaché, Dr. Albert Hale, is now in Buenos Aires, endeavoring to further the kindly desire of the Argentine Government for closer commercial relations with that sister Republic.

I need hardly point out that in neither of these cases were any negotiations conducted with foreign powers. The facts speak for themselves.

I shall be glad to have you give the fullest publicity to this letter.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, *Secretary.*

Hon. WILLIAM J. STONE,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. LIPPITT. I only wanted to ask the Senator from Missouri if I correctly understand the circumstances as they are related there? I understand that that dispatch, to which the distinguished Secretary of Commerce refers, is a dispatch from the Government of Argentina to their ambassador in Washington, and that from their ambassador the Secretary of Commerce received a copy of that dispatch, or from some proper source he received a copy of that dispatch. That is the circumstance, I understand, which is related. I see here in the language which the Secretary of Commerce uses in his speech he says:

I have had a dispatch.

What he says in his speech is that he is in communication personally, directly, with the prime minister of a great country abroad. What he should have said, I presume, is that he had had a copy of a communication which the prime minister abroad had sent to his ambassador in this country. The two things are quite different.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, that is splitting hairs in order to make a criticism. I have read the statement of the Secretary, and it speaks for itself.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Now, let me ask the Senator from Missouri a question. Having read that statement——

Mr. STONE. I have not completed the statement.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I understand; and I am not going to interfere; but I should like to ask the Senator whether he thinks, in view of the quotation from the Secretary's letter which he has just read, the Secretary was justified in saying—

I have had a dispatch from the prime minister of a great country abroad, so frank as hardly to be publishable in its original form, almost begging—let us say strongly urging—that America take the place in his country that Europe has laid aside.

As to the statement made by the Senator as coming from the Secretary of the department, I take no exception to the manner in which he has stated it, and his intentions in that regard I take no exception to; but when he says he has a communication from the monarch of a foreign country personally, and that he has information from him which he can not publish, it looks as though there were too many departments of the American Government conducting the diplomatic correspondence of this country with foreign powers. I do not think the Senator from Missouri would like that any better than I myself like it, and an explanation will be very satisfactory. I do not seek to put the Secretary in a wrong light, but I have quoted his language. He says he did not have it before him when he wrote that letter to the Senator.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no patience to engage in hair-splitting business. The fact is, as shown by the letter, that the Secretary was absolutely correct when he said he had dispatches or was in possession of dispatches from the prime minister or minister of foreign affairs of two foreign countries. What difference does it make whether a dispatch was sent directly to Secretary Redfield or sent to an ambassador in Washington and by him turned over to Secretary Redfield, with liberty to use it in any way he pleased? When it is undertaken to draw fine ditsinctions of that kind it is manifest on its face that Senators are determined to indulge in criticisms of an unfriendly character, whether or no.

Now, Mr. President, I want to complete the statement I was making. The Secretary refers to the fact that the information conveyed in the extract from his speech quoted in the resolution had been given to the public long before the speech was made, both through the press and through consular reports. I have in my hand the Daily Consular and Trade Report of October 9, 1914, sent to me as an inclosure by the Secretary. The item to which the Secretary refers me in that report is very brief, and I will read it:

[Telegram from the American embassy, Madrid.]

SPAIN DESIRES AMERICAN CONNECTIONS.

The Spanish minister of foreign affairs states that the Bank of Spain will try to establish a branch in the United States similar to the branches which it now has in Paris and London. He added that he hoped an American financial institution might be located in Madrid.

The minister of foreign affairs also urged the advantages which would accrue from a direct American steamship line to Mediterranean ports whose ships would touch regularly at Cadiz or Vigo, promising regular and improved through railroad facilities from these points and also proper railroad communication to Madrid.

The present attitude of the Spanish Government offers a great commercial opportunity to the United States at this time and it is urged that advantage be taken of it.

That was printed in the Daily Consular and Trade Report of October 9 last and was commented upon throughout the country by the press.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, that merely indicates that that is not the dispatch which "is so frank as hardly to be publishable." That is the language the Secretary used; and if it was published in October, apart from his speech on the 4th day of February of this year, it indicates that that publication has not had very large circulation.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no time to waste in replying to criticisms of that flimsy character.

I hold in my hand also a Daily Consular and Trade Report, dated November 11, 1914, containing an article headed "Opportunity for United States trade in Argentina." The part the Secretary refers me to is too long to read; it covers three pages of this report; but it is a very interesting document relating to the increase and exploitation of our trade in the Argentine and touching also upon the matter of shipping facilities, and all that. All this matter is, in my judgment, a very excellent and forceful argument in favor of the shipping bill we are trying to enact. Now, Mr. President, I ask leave, without reading, to print these three pages of the Daily Consular and Trade Report of November 11 last in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OPPORTUNITY FOR UNITED STATES TRADE IN ARGENTINA.

The present opportunity for American exporters to secure extensive trade advantages in Argentina is set forth succintly in a cablegram from the Argentine minister of foreign relations to the Argentine ambassador to the United States, Mr. Naón. This cablegram has been transmitted to the Department of Commerce as the official summary of present conditions by the Argentine Government, and is as follows:

"There is at present no congestion of merchandise in our ports. Wheat and flour are not exported at present because of the embargo established by the executive power on those products. Corn, meat, and wool are exported without great difficulty, but we fear the scarcity of the means of transportation for our production in the near future. A very effective outlet would be the arrival of steamers from the United States with usual cargoes—that is to say, impure naphtha, wood, iron, agricultural machines and implements, petroleum, furniture, lubricating oils, etc. Those boats would return with our products—that is to say, meat, wool, hides, quebracho, live stock, etc. American manufacturers can occupy the place left vacant by European industry in all the branches that have been served by it. The present moment offers to American manufacturers very appreciable advantages for occupying positions, profiting by the present European inability. In order to get these advantages they must take the initiative themselves, sending, at least, small cargoes and also agents, and especially adapting themselves to the custom of not demanding cash payment, as has been practiced by others with very well-known success."

FUNDAMENTAL COMMERCIAL CONDITIONS IN ARGENTINA.

The opportunity for United States exporters is all the better because of the spirit of impartiality and fairness toward all foreign goods which governs fundamental commercial conditions in Argentina. This point is elaborated in a recent communication from the Argentine minister of finance, Señor Enrique Carbo, to a financial institution in the United States, which also sets forth the importance of helping the industries necessary to the development of Argentine commerce in order to reap an ultimate trade benefit. The article follows:

"I believe that commercial relations based upon the constant interchange of the products that are required by the two countries for consumption or for the development of their economic activities will necessarily strengthen the international ties between them and stimulate other relationship to the profit of this Republic and of its worthy North American sister. I do not believe that it is possible for commercial intercourse between two free nations to result in loss

to the one and profit to the other. In the development of commercial relations with our country the United States need only follow the example of European countries that have most rapidly succeeded in occupying the first place in the Argentine market. They gave the initial impulse to industries that were most necessary to the development of our commerce. They consulted our merchants regarding the tendencies and the tastes of our consumers and granted them credit facilities by founding in this country great banking institutions. Also they have established excellent lines of navigation and maintained continental traffic by means of moderate freight rates. In order to keep the transportation service going they arranged to take the greater part of our products to supply their markets and their big manufacturing concerns.

"Such a system of encouraging commerce has proved profitable to the countries that put it into practice, as is shown by the world's commercial statistics of the last 30 years. In these the United States figures as one of our best customers, precisely because of the adoption of the methods referred to.

"Neither the United States nor any other country has ever found, nor will any ever find, any obstacle in the way of the exercise of its full commercial activities in this Republic. Argentine legislation is liberal to business. Our customhouse regulations have not been modified for some 10 years. They influence imports so little that prices ruling on the markets have shown scarcely any effect on account of them. The taxes levied on goods for international consumption are the smallest possible. The same thing may be said of the Republic's fiscal burden upon our national industries, our transportation lines, and our business with the neighboring Republics that are supplied from our markets or through our ports.

TARIFF POLICY—INFORMATION AS TO POSSIBLE IMPORTS FROM UNITED STATES.

"Our tariff policy is based upon absolute international impartiality. One clause in article 74 of our customs law makes reciprocity treaties unnecessary because it authorized the Executive to reduce by one-half the duties on goods imported from countries that allow special privileges to Argentine products, and to increase by as much as half the tariff on the imports from countries that take measures which benefit the entry of merchandise of other nations to the detriment of our exports. Legislation is now pending that will create a permanent organ of the Government, whose mission will be to propose gradual modifications of duties as the necessities of our internal economy and those of our foreign commerce require. In my opinion the United States could not have a better opportunity than exists at the present moment to develop its commerce in the countries reached by the River Plate, either by increasing the quantity sold here of North American products which competed before with those of European countries now at war, or by promoting new industries that may supply such articles as are not now exported from your country.

"The department under my direction is able to supply representatives of business in the United States with lists of the principal imports which your Nation may undertake to market in Argentina, with assurance of success and of probable increase in the future.

INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES—OCEAN TRANSPORTATION.

"There is an increasing development of profitable opportunities for investments of foreign capital in this country. The people of North America can with advantage apply their own experience in studying this phase of opportunity in Argentina. The capital which has run the greatest risk has been that which was attracted by high interest rates. The rapid increase in land values has brought extraordinarily large returns within the shortest possible time. But capital invested with the productive capacity of the soil, the development of agriculture and the cattle industries, and the manufacture of our natural products taken into account can rely upon profits that come somewhat more slowly, but are undoubtedly more certain. The expansion to their present proportions of many of the largest concerns in the Republic is due to this conservative method of operation.

"Finally, I must advise you that we possess only the beginning of a mercantile marine, and this is needed for exclusive coast service between the cities and along the navigable rivers. Fortunately, the countries that have commercial relations with us have understood that the best way to develop those relations was through the establishment of great navigation lines, and the organization of companies destined exclusively for transportation in the Southern Hemisphere.

"I hope that this which I have said may be of service and that it will contribute to the impulse that will increase business relations between the Argentine Republic and the United States."

—

In this connection the following articles appearing recently in the Daily Consular and Trade Reports, which give statistical and other information bearing on the trade relations between Argentina and the United States, will be of interest:

"Commerce of northern Argentina," issue of June 19, No. 143.
"Argentina's foreign trade," July 21, No. 169.
"Argentine export changes," July 30, No. 177.
"Commercial review of Argentina," August 13, No. 189.
"Argentine grain crops and exports," September 4, No. 208.
"Growth of banking in Argentina," September 5, No. 209.
"Supplies of merchandise in Argentina," September 26, No. 226.
"Cotton goods in Argentina," October 28, No. 263.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, has the Senator finished?

Mr. STONE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Evidently, Mr. President, there is a disposition upon the part of the Secretary to set the Committee upon Foreign Relations right at least upon the criticism which has been directed against his speech of February 4. I do not desire to embarrass him in the slightest; I give him credit for being a patriotic and an upright man.

Mr. STONE. I venture to say to the Senator that this resolution and these remarks do not in the least, and can not in the least, embarrass the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not want to do so. I was going to suggest, inasmuch as he has already written the Foreign Relations Committee, that we refer the resolution to that committee, and if the committee, or any member of the committee, desires to interrogate the Secretary, it may be done. That will be quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. STONE. I have no objection to that disposition being made of the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The explanation made, as far as it goes, is undoubtedly satisfactory to the Senator. I take no exception to it; but the Secretary did not have his speech before him when he wrote the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Concluding, Mr. President, I desire to say that the effort of the Secretary of Commerce to give to our business men, manufacturers, and others the benefit of this information, showing the great desire of the Governments of Spain and Argentina to establish closer commercial and business relations with this country, is commendable in every way. I apprehend that if this information had been in the hands of some others I know of it would not have been given to the public just at this time, because there are others in this land, I regret to say, who, in my opinion, are not anxious at this moment to increase or multiply the volume of our business at home or abroad. The Secretary, nevertheless, performed a commendable public service when he gave publicity to this information.

I am content, sir, that the resolution may be referred, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Resolution No. 541, merely asking for information, is, I take it, in the same position with the one just adopted. I ask to have it presented to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a preceding day, which will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 541), introduced by Mr. BURTON on the 13th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested and directed to transmit to the Senate a statement of the balances to the credit of the respective river and harbor projects of the country now under improvement, remaining unexpended and available on January 1, 1915, or February 1, 1915, as may be most convenient.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, does that complete the morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless there is some other resolution coming over from a previous day and there is a request to take it up, morning business is closed.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask, in the first place, that H. R. 20282, a House bill which has been reported to the Senate and is identical with a Senate bill on the calendar, Order of Business No. 734, may be substituted for Order of Business No. 734, and the latter indefinitely postponed.

Mr. OVERMAN. What is it about?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that has been done once before.

Mr. FLETCHER. This is another bill, I think. It is in the same situation as a bill with reference to which the Senator from North Dakota made a similar motion.

Mr. SMOOT. May the Secretary state the request again?

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Florida requests that House bill 20282, received from the House, shall take the place on the calendar of Order of Business No. 734, Senate bill 6781, with exactly the same title.

Mr. PENROSE. What is the title?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. PENROSE. Let us have the title stated.

The SECRETARY. The title of the bill is—

A bill to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered, and without objection Senate bill 6781 is indefinitely postponed.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House amendments to Senate bill 5259.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. FLETCHER. The motion is not debatable, Mr. President.

Mr. GRONNA. I simply wanted to proceed to discuss the bill when it was taken up.

The SECRETARY. Senate bill 5259 is entitled—

A bill to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida moves to proceed to the consideration of the House amendments to the bill the title of which has just been stated by the Secretary. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. LODGE. I make the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Goff	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Gronna	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brandegee	Hollis	Overman	Stephenson
Bryan	Hughes	Page	Sterling
Burleigh	James	Penrose	Stone
Burton	Johnson	Perkins	Swanson
Catron	Jones	Pittman	Thomas
Chilton	Kern	Pomerene	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Ransdell	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Reed	Townsend
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	Vardaman
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Sherman	Walsh
Cummins	Lewis	Shields	Weeks
Dillingham	Lippitt	Shively	Williams
du Pont	McLean	Simmons	Works
Fall	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is absent on account of ill health.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Florida moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House amendments to Senate bill 5259.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. The pending bill, in its latest form, provides for the creation of a corporation which shall have the power to construct, purchase, and operate ships in the foreign trade of the United States, and the power to charter and lease vessels for the same purpose. The Government is, through a shipping board provided for in the bill, to subscribe to at least 51 per cent of the capital stock of the corporation. Although the language is by no means clear, I assume that the provision in section 1 regarding the capital stock refers to this corporation and not to the lessee corporation. If this assumption is correct, the initial capital stock of the corporation is to be $10,000,000, of which the United States is to hold at least 51 per cent; the Government may also subscribe to the remainder of the stock if it is not taken by the public. It is also provided that the capital stock may be increased, and of such increase the Government may, without first obtaining the consent of Congress, subscribe to not more than $10,000,000. Consequently, the amount which this bill will authorize the shipping board to invest in the capital stock of the corporation will aggregate $20,000,000 if the Government should be compelled to subscribe to all of the initial capital stock of the corporation, and $15,100,000 if the public takes the 49 per cent of the initial stock offered to it; and the total capital stock that the corporation might issue would, under these circumstances, be $20,000,000 if the Government were compelled to purchase all of the shares of stock, or almost $30,000,000 if the public took 49 per cent of the stock. That, of course, is only the beginning, and I do not doubt that if this bill should become a law we should soon be asked to increase the investment of the Government in the capital stock. In addition to this, authority is given to sell $30,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds, the proceeds to be used in the purchase and construction of ships for the foreign trade.

As to whether the public will subscribe for the stock thus offered, that will, I imagine, depend to some extent on what understanding the public has of the intent and liability of the Government in the matter. If the public is given to understand that dividends are to be guaranteed, and that any losses which may result from the operation of these ships are to be made good from the Public Treasury, I do not apprehend that any difficulty will be found in selling this stock. If, however, the impression prevails that profits are not in any way to be guaranteed, the distrust of the public as to the ability of the Government to conduct anything economically may render somewhat difficult the selling of this stock.

While the Government will be called upon to furnish most of the money needed in this venture, or perhaps all of it, there appears to be some doubt as to how far the control of the Government will go. The Government is to hold not less than 51 per cent of the capital stock, to be voted by the shipping board, or its representative; but there is a provision on page 2 of the bill which, it appears to me, surrenders control, in a very large measure, if not entirely, to the other stockholders. This provision reads as follows:

Such officers and trustees shall be subject to removal at any time by a vote of a majority of the stockholders at any meeting thereof.

This would give a few stockholders, perhaps holding only a few hundred dollars of the capital stock, the power at any time to remove the officers of the corporation. Is there any doubt as to who would actually control the corporation, the United States holding a majority of the stock, or the stockholders having the power to remove the officers whenever they pleased? There may be reasons for placing this provision in the bill, but I have not heard them explained. It appears that this provision nullifies the control of the corporation, which the ownership of the majority of the stock at first glance appeared to give to the Government.

While the corporation is to be authorized to construct, as well as to purchase, ships, the general expectation is that attempts would first be made to purchase them before entering into contracts for the construction of ships. It is self-evident that this would be so if this measure is to bring any relief from the conditions which its supporters say make its passage necessary at this time. Almost from the opening of the war it has been suggested in various quarters—and some of those suggestions have come from what would ordinarily be considered authoritative sources—that the ships to be purchased were the German ships interned in our ports, or, to speak more exactly, imprisoned by the fear of capture by the enemy if they should venture outside of the port. Since attention has been called to the fact that the belligerents might refuse to recognize the transfer of these vessels there has been some attempt to evade this question by stating that these are not the only vessels that can be purchased and that the passage of this bill would not necessarily mean the purchase of these ships. There has been no direct statement, however, that the purchase of these vessels is not contemplated, nor have those in charge of this bill been willing to accept any amendment which would guard against such purchases and the international complications which might result therefrom. The question of the validity of such transfers is therefore a pertinent one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHILTON in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The motion by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to amend Rule XXII of the standing rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. GRONNA. I believe it can safely be said that the courts in this country have uniformly recognized the validity of the sale of merchant vessels by belligerents to neutrals after the outbreak of hostilities where such sale was shown to be a bona fide commercial transaction, and I understand that the trend of English decisions has been in the same direction. I am not satisfied, however, that the broad statement that any such transfer after the outbreak of hostilities would be held valid, provided the purchase was made in good faith, is justified by these decisions. It appears to me that a distinction might be drawn between the case of a vessel the capture of which was certain in case it ventured from port and the case of one of whose capture there was no immediate danger, and that while the transfer of the latter might be considered a commercial transaction in the case of the former, it might be held that the transfer was made in order to evade the consequences resulting from its belligerent nationality. Without attempting to go into this phase of the question, I may say that it does not appear to me that the case of the *Baltica*, on which the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] laid some stress is a case in point, since it appears that in that case the transfer was made before the outbreak of hostilities, although in anticipation of war.

In the case of the *Benito Estenger* the Supreme Court makes the statement that "transfers of vessels flagrante bello were originally held to be invalid," but that the rule has been modified, and the court approved the statement from Hall's International Law that in the United States and in England the right to purchase vessels is admitted, but that as the opportunities for fraud are great the circumstances attending a sale will be closely scrutinized. France appears to have adhered to the old rule and to have maintained that the transfer of enemy vessels to a neutral who has knowledge of the outbreak of hostilities is void without regard to the good faith of the transaction. At least some of the other continental powers appear to have

followed France in this respect rather than the United States and England. The Russian Prize Regulations of March 27, 1895, contain the following provision, as given in Moore's International Law, section 1188:

Merchant vessels acquired from a hostile power or its subjects by persons of neutral nationality are acknowledged to be hostile vessels unless it is proven that the acquisition must be considered, according to the laws of the nation to whom the purchasers belong, as having actually taken place before the purchasers received news of the declaration of war, or that the vessels acquired in the manner mentioned, although after the receipt of such news, were acquired quite conscientiously and not for the purpose of covering hostile property.

The decisions and regulations referred to, however, were all made and formulated before the adoption of the London declaration. Article 56 of this declaration deals with the transfer of belligerent vessels to neutrals after the outbreak of hostilities. Extracts from the proceedings of the London conference, submitted by the senior Senator from New York and by the junior Senator from Montana, show that the delegates from the United States and others favored a declaration recognizing the validity of such transfers if bona fide, while delegates from other countries, especially from France, Germany, and Russia, believed that all transfers made after the outbreak of hostilities should be declared void. The article finally adopted as a compromise between these two views is as follows:

ART. 56. The transfer of an enemy vessel to a neutral flag effected after the outbreak of hostilities is void unless it is proved that such transfer was not made in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel as such is exposed.

There, however, is an absolute presumption that a transfer is void—

(1) If the transfer has been made during a voyage or in a blockaded port.

(2) If a right to repurchase or recover the vessel is reserved to the vendor.

(3) If the requirements of the municipal law governing the right to fly the flag under which the vessel is sailing have not been fulfilled.

The transfer after the outbreak of hostilities is void unless it is proved that it was not made to evade the consequences to which the enemy vessel as such is exposed. To what consequences is an enemy vessel as such exposed? On the high seas it is exposed to capture by the opposing belligerent. It is also exposed to being interned in a neutral port. If the transfer is made during a voyage or in a blockaded port, the presumption is absolute that such transfer is void, and yet the sale might be as absolute and might be made in as good faith on both sides in such a case as in any other; yet an absolute presumption is raised against its validity. The report made on this article to the London conference by its drafting committee is as follows:

The rule respecting transfers made after the outbreak of hostilities is more simple. Such a transfer is only valid if it is proved that the object was not to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel as such is exposed. The rule accepted in respect to transfers made before the outbreak of hostilities is inverted. In that case there is a presumption that the transfer is valid; in the present that it is void, provided always that proof to the contrary may be given. For instance, it might be proved that the transfer had taken place by inheritance.

Article 56 recites cases in which the presumption that the transfer is void is absolute, for reasons which can be readily understood. In the first case the connection between the transfer and the war risk run by the vessel is evident. In the second the transferee is a mere man of straw, who is treated as owner during a dangerous period, after which the vender will recover possession of his vessel. Lastly, the third case might strictly be regarded as already provided for, since a vessel which lays claim to neutral nationality must naturally prove that she has a right to it.

At one time provision was made in this article for the case of a vessel which was retained, after the transfer, in the trade in which she had previously been engaged. Such a circumstance is in the highest degree suspicious; the transfer has a fictitious appearance, inasmuch as nothing has changed in regard to the vessel's trade. This would apply, for instance, if a vessel were running on the same line before and after the transfer. It was, however, objected that to set up an absolute presumption would sometimes be too severe, and that certain kinds of vessels as, for example, tank ships could, on account of their build, engage only in a certain definite trade. To meet this objection the word "route" was then added, so that it would have been necessary that the vessel should be engaged in the same trade and on the same route; it was thought that in this way the above contention would have been satisfactorily met. However, the suppression of this case from the list being insisted on, it was agreed to eliminate it. Consequently a transfer of this character now falls within the general rule; it is certainly presumed to be void, but the presumption may be rebutted.

To me this statement appears to indicate what the drafting committee had in mind at the time of formulating this article. It has been urged that this article was merely intended to make void sales not made in good faith, and to place the burden of proving the good faith on the owner of the vessel. It appears to me, however, that transfers not made in good faith—where there was not an actual sale and purchase, but only a pretended one—would fall in one of the three classes of cases where the presumption against the validity of the sale is absolute.

The committee also state that at one time the article contained a provision that there was to be such absolute presumption in cases where the vessel was retained after the transfer in the same trade as that in which she had previously been engaged. If fictitious sales were the only ones which it was intended to make void, what reason would there be for suggesting that an absolute presumption be made in such cases? It appears to me that what the committee must have had in mind in considering that provision was that if an enemy ship were sold to a neutral and continued in the same trade there would be a practical certainty that the ship was sold for the reason that if she continued in the trade under the belligerent flag she would be liable to capture; in other words, that the transfer was made "in order to evade the consequences to which an enemy vessel, as such, is exposed."

The reason why a belligerent would object to the transfer of the merchant vessels of the enemy to a neutral flag is readily apparent. War on the seas is carried on not only against the actual combatants but also against the commerce of the enemy. The aim is not merely to capture the merchant vessels of the enemy but also to destroy so far as possible the trade of the enemy. At one time enemy goods were liable to capture regardless of the nationality of the ship on which they were found, but at length the doctrine of "free ships, free goods" prevailed, and enemy goods not contraband are now exempt from capture if carried by a neutral ship. All enemy goods carried by an enemy ship, however, are liable to capture. Consequently if a belligerent is permitted to sell its ships to neutrals its commerce in other goods than contraband might be carried on without danger of capture; and so far as its trade is concerned, it might actually be to the benefit of a belligerent to be compelled to sell its ships. The war which one belligerent carried on against the commerce of another might to a very large extent be nullified by such transfers of vessels. In addition to this the belligerent would also lose, of course, the chance to capture the ship, and the enemy would have the additional benefit of having the capital which was tied up in the ship returned to its former owner, and thus increase the financial resources of the enemy.

To attempt to destroy the commerce of the enemy of course interferes with the trade of the neutral nations with which that commerce is carried on, and while it may not seem just to us that neutral nations should suffer because of a war for which they are not in any way responsible and with which they have no concern we have to accept the law as it is. A belligerent is likely to be more impressed with his rights as such than those of a neutral, and it must not be forgotten that these cases are decided by the courts of the belligerent making the capture. If we were to purchase the interned German ships, the two nations likely to capture them after the transfer would be England and France. The latter country would have refused to recognize the validity of the transfer, even without the London declaration. I believe there is a possibility that England might formerly have recognized such a transfer as valid, but the English Government has declared its adherence to the London declaration, and its prize courts will observe it in adjudicating these cases. The English and French Governments have not left us in doubt as to how they construe the law. As early as last August, if my memory serves me right, the English and French ambassadors conveyed to our Government their views that the purchase of these German ships would not be valid transfers under the London declaration.

I shall not dwell upon the possible consequences of the seizure and condemnation of a ship belonging to our Government by one of the belligerent powers. While we usually look upon searches and seizures of ships belonging to private individuals as matters of course, leaving it to the prize courts to decide whether the seizure was justified, the state of the public mind would be far different if the people of this country were to see ship after ship purchased by the Government and paid for out of the Public Treasury, seized by English and French warships as soon as they were outside of New York Harbor.

The Senator in charge of this bill has moved to amend the motion to recommit the bill to the committee so as to instruct the committee to report the bill again to the Senate with amendments, one of which reads as follows:

Provided, That in making purchases of ships during the continuance of the present European war no purchase shall be made in a way which will disturb the present conditions of neutrality.

This amendment is presumably to satisfy those who are opposed to the bill in its present form, because they fear that it is intended to purchase the German ships and believe that the validity of such transfers will not be upheld by the prize courts. To me it does not appear that this amendment accomplishes anything. With or without such a provision in this measure, I do not presume that the shipping board would make any purchase which, in their opinion, would "disturb the present conditions of neutrality." Supporters of this bill contend that the purchase of the interned German ships would

not be in contravention of international law, and that even if the belligerents should consider it so, they would not at this time dare to seize the ships from fear of incurring our hostiltiy, and that even if they did seize the vessels, there would be no danger of international complications, and that the present conditions of neutrality would therefore not be disturbed in any event. The proposed amendment certainly offers no assurance to anyone who believes it would be an ill-advised and dangerous proceeding to buy these ships at this time. It leaves to the shipping board the question of what would disturb the present conditions of neutrality. The opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, who would be a member of the shipping board, is well known; he does not believe there is any question as to our right to purchase these ships. A person holding this view would certainly see no reason for declining to purchase the ships, even if the proposed amendment is adopted.

I do not know what the views of the other members of the board would be likely to be, but if it is possible for one of them to have these views there is a possibility that at least a majority of the board might have them, and in such an event there is absolutely nothing in this proposed amendment which would prevent them from buying the ships, no matter what others might think as to the danger of international complications resulting from such action. If a majority of this Senate believe that it would be a dangerous experiment to purchase these ships, I believe a provision should be written into it which would prohibit such action, or which would permit it only if the belligerent powers indicated that they would not consider it in contravention of international law. If there is danger that purchases might be made in such a way as to result in international complications, that danger will exist with this amendment in the bill exactly as though there were no such provision.

The reasons for passing this ship-purchase bill presented by President Wilson in his message last December were that countries which the countries now at war had formerly supplied with certain commodities would now be forced to depend on us for these supplies, and that ships were needed to carry this trade which was expected to develop. The President said:

> It is of equal consequence that the nations whom Europe has usually supplied with innumerable articles of manufacture and commerce, of which they are in constant need and without which their economic development halts and stands still, can now get only a small part of what they formerly imported and eagerly look to us to supply their all but empty markets. This is particularly true of our own neighbors—the States, great and small, of Central and South America. * * * Here are markets which we must supply, and we must find the means of action.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> How are we to carry our good to the empty markets of which I have spoken if we have not the ships? How are we to build up a great trade if we have not the certain and constant means of transportation upon which all profitable and useful commerce depends? And how are we to get the ships if we wait for the trade to develop without them?
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Hence the pending shipping bill, discussed at the last session, but as yet passed by neither House. In my judgment such legislation is imperatively needed and can not wisely be postponed. The Government must open these gates of trade, and open them wide; open them before it is altogether profitable to open them or altogether reasonable to ask private capital to open them at a venture. It is not a question of the Government monopolizing the field. It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable, and then when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital, and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.

The reason urged by the President is that we should take advantage of the opportunity offered us to increase our trade with South America now that the European countries are no longer in a position to supply them with goods. So far as the President is concerned, it is merely a means to increase our South American trade, thereby stimulating our industries to greater activity, and he proceeds on the assumption that there are now no ships which can carry our products to these markets. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has shown, however, that ships now sail regularly for South America, and that very often they are compelled to sail with only half a cargo. If the ships at present engaged in the South American trade do not always get a full cargo, how is it going to encourage the trade to put on a few more ships, even though the additional ships are owned by the Government. And, so far as the upbuilding of our merchant marine is concerned, it is not clear to me how the placing in commission of several ships owned by the Government is to have any such result.

The President speaks of "the many mistakes by which we have discouraged and all but destroyed the merchant marine of the country" and "the steps by which we have, it seems almost deliberately, withdrawn our flag from the seas," but he does not explain what those mistakes were or what is necessary in order to retrace those steps. It is evident that he refers to past legislation, but in that event it would seem necessary to repeal or amend the obnoxious laws which he holds responsible for the destruction of our merchant marine. If those laws still continue in force, it is to be expected that they will have the same effect in the future as in the past, and if the President is correct in holding them responsible for the decline in our shipping, it is not clear to me how the operation of Government-owned ships will nullify the effect of the law so far as privately owned ships are concerned.

The President did not state what laws he had in mind which had all but destroyed our merchant marine. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, appears to take a little different view of the matter. He says in his speech delivered in Chicago the 9th of January:

> Much has been said about changing our navigation laws in such manner as to make the field for private capital more attractive. It is said that our navigation laws are so unfavorable and put American shipowners at such a disadvantage that unless they are changed in numerous particulars it will be impossible ever to build up an American merchant marine. * * * It is not, however, practicable to change our navigation laws to the extent which private capital demands, because the principal change relates to the wages of the American sailor.
>
> It is stated that the wage standard for American labor makes the cost of operating American ships so much greater than the cost of operating the ships of other nations that it is impossible for the American shipowner to compete with his foreign rivals. This may be overstatement, but whether it is or not, I think it can be said with certainty that public opinion in this country will never permit the passage of any legislation that will reduce the American sailor to the standard of the Asiatic and European sailor.

If the President is right in his statement that our laws have all but destroyed our merchant marine, and if the Secretary of the Treasury is correct in stating that the principal change demanded in order that private capital may build up our merchant marine relates to the wages of the American sailor, I do not see any ground for the expectation of the President that the passage of this bill would result in attracting private capital into the shipping business. It can be stated with certainty that Congress will pass no legislation to lower the wages of American seamen, and I do not believe that it is the expectation of the supporters of this measure that the establishment of a Government-owned line of ships will result in lowering the wages. If, as shipowners maintain, the cost of operating vessels under the American flag is so much greater than under a foreign flag that it can not be done with profit, how is the fact that the Government owns a few merchant ships going to change this fact? And, on the other hand, if the shipowners are not correct in their contention, if it is possible to operate vessels under the American flag with profit and there are other reasons for our failure to build up a merchant marine, what change would the purchase or construction of a few ships by the Government make in this regard? I can see how a person might support this measure if he believes that there is a scarcity of ships to carry our products abroad which can be remedied only by purchase of ships by the Government, and I can also see how a person might support this measure believing that the only merchant marine which we can have until conditions radically change is one owned by the Government, but I do not see how it can be supported on the ground advanced by the President.

It is of interest at this point to note what the Secretary of the Treasury, S. P. Chase, said in regard to the decline in our shipping in a special report made to the Senate in 1864. He first describes the rise of American shipping:

> The United States began an extraordinarily extended and unusually successful commercial career very soon after the establishment of the Government. The condition of Europe for a long period was such that American shipping became of necessity the preferred channel for conducting far the larger share of the commerce of the world. We were not limited to the carriage of merchandise of American production abroad and the return of foreign articles required in our own consumption, but for a series of years entered at and again exported from our ports a larger aggregate of values on account of foreign nations than for the entire use of the United States.
>
> It could not, of course, be expected that with the most rapid and successful development of the United States this ascendency in general commerce would be maintained, but the facilities obtained by a preoccupation of extensive and profitable lines of trade between countries possessing no commercial marine directly, and also between these and the commercial and manufacturing States which are their permanent natural markets, should have secured to the shipping of the United States an equal division of all trade between noncommercial States and a share of the carrying trade wherever exclusion by positive legislation does not exist. Still more decidedly should the control of all carrying trade to our own markets have been retained, and the increased consumption of the products of tropical countries necessarily attending on the growth and increasing wealth of the United States might reasonably be supposed to give employment almost exclusively to American shipping. * * *
>
> The large values of foreign merchandise exported from the United States, which are given in detail in another place, necessarily imply the employment of a great amount of American tonnage, since very little of the carrying trade between neutral nations could be in the hands of any belligerent power, and nearly all Europe was long involved in war. Even after the peace of 1815 there were intervals of disturbance, and frequent occasions in which the carrying trade was largely resumed by our shipping.

He then goes on to discuss the gradual passing of the carrying trade into the hands of other nations during the period from 1821 to 1863.

During this period of 42 years there was no marked event in the history of the United States to affect the progressive advance in general trade. It is evident, however, that not only was the foreign carrying trade steadily passing from our shipping to other hands, but also the direct commerce of the United States with all other countries was steadily encroached upon, each year adding a greater number of foreign than of American vessels to the general commercial marine.

Dealing with the causes of this condition, he says:

It may be stated that the loss of the great carrying trade conducted by American shipping during the European wars has more than once received earnest public attention. Two or three European States, and particularly France, almost immediately on the establishment of peace built up a severe system of discriminations against all other shipping than their own. These discriminations were carried to a most injurious length and were the subject of earnest remonstrance. The effect of the action of France is still seen in the remarkably limited amount of our present direct trade with that country, and for other States the results are quite as striking. In a forcible memorial addressed to Congress by the Chamber of Commerce of New York in 1821, the first decisively adverse effects of the new policy of European States is thus stated:

"It is a lamentable fact that more than half the number of vessels lately arrived at this from foreign ports are dismantled, from the absolute absence of any advantageous object of commercial pursuit; and this state of commerce seems the natural and necessary result of the new order of things which has prevailed since the pacification of Europe. Every restraint that lately shackled the navigation of the principal maritime nations of Europe has been removed, whilst the general trade and navigation of those States are, at the same time, regulated with a studious regard to the interests of their own subjects, so that the United States have not only ceased to be the carriers for Europe but are deprived of the means of entering into a fair competition in the transportation to foreign countries of the principal products of their own soil."

This is a just statement of the adverse action of France, more particularly, by which the United States shipping was first seriously curtailed of its due share of foreign trade. The discriminations then made by France were not in the form of tonnage dues and port charges so much as in specific charges imposed upon American produce imported in American ships.

Regarding the action of the British Government, he says:

The action of the British Government in the same direction was even more frequent and persistent, and though interrupted or in other ways rendered nugatory previous to the peace of 1815, the purpose was frequently and distinctly declared. In January, 1791, the British Board of Trade, in a formal report on commercial relations with the United States, announced the policy of giving signal privileges in British home ports to American ships, but refusing all such equality in the ports of the colonies.

"If Congress should propose that this principle of equality should be extended to the ports of our colonies and islands, and that ships of the United States should be there treated as British ships, it should be answered that this demand can not be admitted even as a subject of negotiation.

"Many vesels now go from the ports of Great Britain carrying British manufactures to the United States; there load with lumber and provisions for the British Islands, and return with the produce of those islands to Great Britain. This whole branch of the trade may be regarded as a new acquisition, and was attained by your Majesty's orders in council before mentioned."

Various countervailing acts of the United States aided to neutralize this policy, as has been said, until after the general peace of Europe in 1815. In a commercial convention with England, concluded July 3, 1815, the United States conceded the chief point in controversy, trusting to the great development of our trade with the British colonies, and the energy with which it had been conducted, to maintain it under any circumstances. The United States agreed to the equalization of all the conditions of their commerce with the British European ports, but left the regulations controlling trade with the British West Indies and American colonies without stipulation. The consequences were soon felt. The British authorities reestablished their old colonial policy, and shut American shipping from the West Indian ports.

The Secretary also calls attention to the greater subsidies paid the British steamships, to which some importance is attached. He ascribed the decline not to any of our laws, but to the restrictions which other nations imposed on our shipping in order to encourage their own. During the years to which he refers there was not an actual decline in the tonnage of our merchant marine engaged in foreign trade—there was usually an increase every year—but each year saw a larger percentage of our commerce carried in foreign bottoms than the preceding year. The Civil War appears to have caused a loss of approximately a million tons, the tonnage engaged in foreign trade in 1861 being given by the Commissioner of Navigation as 2,496,894 and in 1864 as 1,486,749. For a number of years thereafter it appears to have been almost stationary. In the seventies there was a gradual increase, the highest figure being reached in 1878, when 2,855 vessels, with a total tonnage of 1,589,348, were registered. From that year there was a gradual decrease until 1898, when 1,084 vessels, with a tonnage of 726,213, were registered. From 1898 there has been a slow increase until in 1914 we had 2,360 vessels, with a tonnage of 1,066,288. These figures deal only with vessels engaged in the foreign trade and do not include those in the coasting trade. In 1821, 88.7 per cent of our foreign trade was carried in American bottoms; in 1861 this had declined to 65.2 per cent; it fell to 27.5 per cent in 1864; it rose to a little over 35 per cent in 1868 and again in 1870; then it declined steadily until it reached 8.2 per cent in 1901; it gradually rose again to 12.1 per cent in 1905; and since that year has again declined until in 1914 the percentage of our foreign trade carried in American vessels was 8.6. The total value of our commerce carried in American vessels in 1821 was, in round numbers, $113,000,000; this gradually increased to somewhat more than $507,000,000 in 1860; in 1865 it had decreased to $167,000,000; the value increased again to $353,000,000 in 1870 and again in 1871; it fluctuated between $300,000,000 and $350,000,000 until 1879, when it fell to $272,000,000; it gradually declined to $160,000,000 in 1899, and then slowly increased until in 1914 it was somewhat more than $368,000,000.

Just on what the President bases his hope that if this bill is passed and Government ships are put in commission, private capital will then be induced to build up our merchant marine, is not apparent to me. It is true that during the period of the decline of our merchant marine private capital in this country has been abundantly and profitably employed in opening up a large section of our country, in building our great railway systems, and in building up our other industries. This may have had some effect in retarding efforts to rehabilitate our merchant marine. That this is not the only reason, however, is evidenced by the fact that considerable American capital is invested in ships flying foreign flags. If, as has often been stated, the main reason is that cost of operation under the American flag is so much greater than under other flags that our shipowners can not for that reason compete with foreign shipowners, then the only way in which we shall ever get a foreign merchant marine will be by paying for it, in the form of subsidies or by operating Government-owned vessels at a loss or by paying higher rates on goods shipped in American vessels. The Underwood Tariff Act undertook to do this by discriminatory duties on goods shipped in foreign bottoms, but because of our treaties with other countries this provision can not be enforced. It is hardly necessary to point out that that was only an indirect subsidy. We have hitherto been content to leave the matter as it is, reflecting that if foreign Governments by the payment of subsidies make it impossible for our shipowners to compete successfully in the ocean carrying trade, we are to some extent compensated by the cheaper ocean rates.

While the President urged the passage of this bill in order to encourage trade with South America and attract private capital into the shipping trade—and I suppose this is the real reason why such a desperate attempt is made to pass it, as such attempt would not be made unless the President insisted on it—the arguments now urged are mostly that there is an absolute lack of ships to transport our goods to other countries, and that the shipowners have taken advantage of the present conditions to increase the rates. So far as the latter contention is concerned, I believe it to be a fact that the rates are at this time higher than they have been formerly. Ocean rates, however, are subject to violent fluctuations, and I understand that they are uniformly higher in the winter than in summer. While the higher rates have been severely condemned on this floor, I do not know that any attempt has been made to find out to what extent they are justified. It must be remembered that the dangers to which navigation is exposed at this time, the higher insurance rates, the reported congestion of freight at the docks in Europe, resulting in long delays in unloading, would naturally result in increasing the ocean rates. I do not mean to say that there have not been unwarranted increases in ocean rates—I do not have any data at hand which would warrant me in making a statement either way—but the mere fact that rates have increased is not in itself necessarily proof of their unreasonableness.

The war has resulted in diminishing the merchant marine of the world by practically all of the German shipping. That does not necessarily mean, however, that we are now short of carrying facilities for our commerce to the extent in which our goods were formerly carried in German ships. It must be remembered that with the industries of the great commercial countries of Europe paralyzed the commerce of the world can be carried in fewer ships than formerly. During August, the first month of the war, our exports fell off greatly, being but $110,000,000 in round numbers, as against $154,000,000 in July. They increased to $156,000,000 in September, to $194,000,000 in October, and to $205,000,000 in November; the exports in November, 1913, were of the value of $245,000,000. For December a statement given to the papers last week shows that the exports regained the figures of December a year ago, which were in round numbers of the

value of $233,000,000. I wish to insert at this point a clipping from the Washington Star containing the statement referred to:

SHOWING OF EXPORTS IN DECEMBER REPORT—DECREASE IN FINISHED PRODUCTS OFFSET BY GAINS IN MANUFACTURED FOODSTUFFS.

December, 1914, exports of manufactures regained the level shown by December of the preceding year, a decrease of 10 per cent in finished manufactures being more than offset by the gains in manufactured foodstuffs.

In certain lines of manufactures, however, the exports during the month of December, 1914, show phenomenal gains over those of December a year earlier, as, for example, in the case of commercial automobiles, the value of which advanced from $101,000 to more than $3,000,000; cotton knit goods, from $295,000 to more than $2,000,000; woolen clothing, from $183,000 to one and one-third million dollars; other woolen goods, including blankets, from $103,000 to more than $2,000,000, and rubber boots and shoes, from $84,000 to $864,000.

DEALINGS IN MANUFACTURES.

Europe is taking an unusually large proportion of the manufactures now being exported from the United States. Of the four and one-third million dollars' worth of automobiles, including both passenger and commercial vehicles, exported during the month of December, 1914, two and one-half million dollars' worth went to France and $1,000,000 worth to the United Kingdom. Those two countries also took practically all of the metal-working machinery, and England a preponderating proportion of the sole leather exported. Denmark was the chief market for the cottonseed oil cake and meal exported, and England and the Netherlands were the chief markets for the cottonseed oil which left the country during the month of December. Practically all of the 74,000,000 pounds of sugar exported during December went to France, and England and France were the chief destinations of woolen clothing, blankets, and other manufactures exported during the month to the value of more than $4,000,000.

It appears probable to me that the decrease in our exports was due to the disorganization of the industrial and commercial systems of the great countries of Europe on the sudden outbreak of the war rather than to a lack of ships to carry our trade. I think the case of Canada will illustrate this point. In September, 1913, our exports to Canada were almost $31,000,000; in September, 1914, not quite $26,000,000, or a falling off of $5,000,000. This certainly can not be attributed to a lack of ships. In October, 1913, their value was $33,000,000; in October, 1914, $23,500,000, or a falling off of nine and a half million dollars. In November, 1913, they had a value of $30,500,000; in November, 1914, $23,500,000, or a decline of more than $7,000,000. We certainly can not attribute this to a lack of ships. Our exports to Canada for the three months named were in 1913, in round numbers, $94,000,000; for the same months in 1914 they had a value of $73,000,000, or a falling off of $21,000,000. The decline of our actual trade with Canada was perhaps greater than these figures indicate, as there were great increases in such items as horses and wheat, which it is reasonable to presume were really destined for Europe. At any rate, the falling off in our trade with Canada can not be ascribed to a lack of ships, but must be due to the decrease of her industrial activities caused by the war. And as there can be no comparison between what Canada has suffered in this respect and what the European countries must have suffered, we must expect that the demand of Europe for our goods, other than foodstuffs and such material as is of use in war, will be less than it has been in former years.

While there was a decrease in our exports generally during the first part of the present fiscal year, a great increase is shown in the export of certain commodities. During the months of September, October, and November, 1914, we exported 47,308 horses as against 4,696 for the same months in 1913. During the months, September, October, November, and December, 1914, we exported 10,285,732 bushels of barley as against 1,805,862 bushels during the same months in 1913.

During the same months in 1914 we exported 9,137,702 bushels of corn, as against 2,291,716 bushels for the same months in 1913. We exported 32,402,048 bushels of oats during the same months in 1914, as against 410,859 bushels in 1913. Of wheat, we exported during the same months in 1914, 83,505,446 bushels, as against 28,983,592 bushels in 1913; almost three times as much, and yet there are plenty of ships to carry this tremendous amount of merchandise and foodstuffs. In the export of flour there does not appear to have been much change, 4,081,533 barrels during September, October, and November, 1914, and 3,774,110 during the same months the preceding year. I do not happen to have the figures for flour for December at hand. During the same three months in 1914 we also exported 4,148,392 bushels of rye and 22,980,331 pounds of rice, as against 219,105 bushels and 4,238,036 pounds, respectively, for the same months in 1913. If there is any congestion of traffic, which has been alleged but which has also been denied, at our ports, it appears to me that it might be due to the unprecedented demand for our foodstuffs. If this bill were to become a law and it should result in an addition to the shipping available for carrying our goods abroad, it is possible that when our available surplus of food products has been exported it would be found that our ships could get no cargo. For it must be expected that during the continuance of this war the demand of Europe for our goods, except foodstuffs and material useful in carrying on the war, will continue to be less than in former years. I wish to insert here a clipping from the Washington Star, showing the unusually large exports from New York at the present time:

NEW YORK TOTAL EXPORTS PAST WEEK, $23,526,602—BUSINESS TO DATE, 1915, EXCEEDS THAT OF SAME PERIOD LAST YEAR, IS REPORT.

NEW YORK, *February 10.*

Exports at this port in the week ending February 6 are officially placed at $23,526,602, compared with $26,272,091 in the week before, according to a customhouse statement made public to-day. This year's exports to date total $148,146,690, against $119,413,507 in the same period last year.

Germany's orders were larger than at any period since the European war began, shipments to that country totaling $1,670,202.

England's shipments for the week were valued at $4,486,815, and those of France aggregate $3,191,362; Italy's purchases, largely grain, totaled $2,238,834.

How completely the Mexican situation has disrupted New York's trade with Mexico is revealed in the statement that exports for the week were next to the lowest of any country reported, being only $1,380.

We needed no ships to transact business between the United States and Mexico. That decline was not due to a lack of ships.

As this statement shows, the exports from New York during January and the first week of February this year were almost $29,000,000 in excess of the exports for the same period in 1914, the totals being $148,146,690 and $119,413,507, respectively.

The industry which has suffered especially because of the war is, of course, the cotton-growing industry. According to the report of the Census Bureau, the exports of cotton during August, September, October, and November, 1914, were, in round numbers, 1,400,000 bales as against 4,200,000 bales during the same months in 1913. This was, of course, a tremendous decline—a decline of almost 300 per cent. In December, however, we exported 1,202,115 bales, and in the same month in 1913, 1,230,830 bales, only about 28,000 bales less than a year ago. I wish to insert at this point a table taken from the report of the Census Bureau showing the exports of cotton for December, 1914 and 1913, and also for the five months ending December 31, both years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Exports of domestic cotton and linters (running bales).

Country to which exported.	December.		5 months ending Dec. 31—	
	1914	1913	1914	1913
Total	1,202,115	1,230,830	2,607,164	5,437,480
United Kingdom	572,396	473,028	1,195,511	1,971,402
Germany	47,076	326,938	48,128	1,673,049
France	75,030	146,074	139,627	793,920
Italy	200,028	80,621	383,797	261,755
Other countries	307,585	204,169	840,101	737,354

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I read from a newspaper clipping, under date of February 6, the following:

BIGGEST UNITED STATES TRADE BALANCE—FOREIGN BUSINESS SHOWS RECORD WEEK IN FAVOR OF AMERICA.

Foreign trade for the week ended February 6, as reported to the Department of Commerce yesterday by the 13 principal customs ports, showed a balance of $37,134,226 in favor of the United States, the largest weekly balance on record.

Exports for the week totaled $59,581,106 and imports, $22,446,880.

Exports for the past 10 weeks totaled $519,350,295 and imports $244,006,550, making a balance of $275,343,745 in favor of the United States for that period.

Cotton exported during the week amounted to 365,733 bales, making the total for the last nine weeks 2,616,432.

It appears to me that in view of the present large exports, if there is any shortage of ships to carry our goods abroad, it is in all probability only a temporary condition, since our exports will probably decrease when we have sold our surplus foodstuffs.

Our direct trade with Germany, Austria, and Belgium, however, has practically ceased, and our direct trade with Russia has decreased very greatly. Our exports to some of their neighboring countries have greatly increased, however, and it is possible that some of these reach the countries with which we have at present almost no direct communication. For instance, comparing our exports in the months of September, October, and November, 1914, with the exports for the same months in the preceding year, to some of these countries I get the following results: To Denmark, 1913, $4,368,166; 1914, $24,459,314, an increase of $20,000,000 to that small country. To Greece, 1913, $268,340; 1914, $4,977,985. To Italy, 1913,

$21,376,699; 1914, $32,473,259. To Norway, 1913, $2,533,824; 1914, $10,846,440. To Sweden, 1913, $4,445,577; 1914, $14,925,543, an increase of more than $10,000,000 to Sweden alone. In the case of Holland our trade shows a decrease, our exports being $23,999,032 for the three months of 1913 and $19,043,606 for the same months of 1914. While it is possible that some of our goods are reaching Germany indirectly, it would seem probable that we might sell her more goods if we had a line of American ships reaching her ports directly. The same might also be true of Russia. It might be a question, however, as to whether the fact that we have at present practically no ships plying between our ports and those of Germany and Russia may not be due less to an absolute lack of ships for this trade than to other causes. The reported danger of mines in the North Sea and adjacent waters, the proclaiming by England of the North Sea and that part of the North Atlantic Ocean lying east of a line drawn from the northern point of Scotland to Iceland as a military area or war zone, the danger of the capture and detention, if not confiscation, of the goods carried, and England's avowed intention to prevent even food products from reaching Germany, would all result in deterring shipowners from engaging in this trade.

The passage of this bill is at times urged as an emergency measure, as necessary in order to secure the ships necessary to carry our goods abroad. It may be doubted, however, whether it would result in increasing the number of ships available for the foreign trade. If the German and Austrian ships at present in our ports were purchased, it would, of course, have this result; but there might follow a decrease even more sudden than the increase, since, as we have seen, these ships would be in danger of capture by the English and French. If we leave these ships out of consideration, there remain only ships which either are now engaged in the ocean-carrying trade or which, it may be presumed, would engage in the foreign trade if the anticipated profits were such as to make the venture attractive. Our coasting fleet contains vessels large enough to engage in the foreign trade, and if the profits in such trade are now as large as some would have us believe, such vessels might be expected to enter this trade even while in private ownership. Moreover, if exorbitant profits are now being enjoyed by the shipowners, they would undoubtedly ask higher prices for their vessels than the Government would be warranted in paying. Such vessels as now sail under foreign flags and are owned by Americans can now register as American ships under the act passed last summer. Merely changing the ownership of ships from private to public will neither increase the number of ships nor their capacity. And as I think it safe to say that it requires at least one year to build a ship of this kind, there could be no immediate increase of our merchant marine if the ships were to be built. And I might further add that if it were to take the President as long to name the members of the shipping board as it took him to name the members of the Federal Reserve Board, or as long as it apparently is going to take to name the members of the Federal Trade Commission, this measure could not by any stretch of imagination be called an emergency measure.

It has also been urged that the ownership of these ships by the Government will give us a number of auxiliary cruisers. If the ships to be purchased or constructed were of the type of the fast passenger steamships, this might be true, but if they are to be of the type best suited for the economical carriage of freight—which I understand to be ships with a speed of 12 to 14 knots—they would be worthless as auxiliary cruisers. I may be mistaken in this. If I am mistaken, I should like to have the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] correct me or correct the RECORD.

I have here a letter from Dr. J. E. Boyle, professor of economics and political science in the University of North Dakota, in regard to this measure, which is of interest. Those of you who were here when the reciprocity treaty was pending before the Senate of the United States under the administration of President Taft will remember that Prof. Boyle was here as a witness, advocating reciprocity. I do not want to do Prof. Boyle an injustice, but my information is that he is a free-trade Democrat. I know that he is a great admirer, as we all are admirers, of President Wilson. I want to read the letter from Prof. Boyle. This letter is addressed to me under date of January 28, 1915:

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Grand Forks, January 28, 1915.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRONNA: In regard to the ship-purchase bill, I have made a great many inquiries about the State as I have addressed farmers' clubs, and I have also talked to men on the street here and to a few advanced students who are recognized for their independent thinking. I may say that I find four classes of opinions on the subject, as follows:

First. A large class say that they are not informed at all on the subject and prefer to wait a few months or a year. They say there is no hurry; no use to do anything yet.

The second class, also a fairly good-sized class, say there is no pressing demand for ships, for there are ships enough now afloat to carry the world's trade, and if our Government should purchase ships it would merely be a "white elephant" on our hands. To purchase and operate such a fleet would be to tax all the people for the benefit of a few people.

The third class of people, who are interested especially in trade with Mexico and South America, say that other agencies must be created first before we secure ships. We must have our agents, with shops and warehouses, exhibition rooms, etc., in the various Latin-American countries, and build up an acquaintance with our goods and a demand for our goods. These critics also say the Government must extend protection to such persons and such property, and not do as the President did in the Mexican affair when trouble arose—tell them to get up and leave the country; that they would not be protected. The arguments of this class of critics, I think, are absolutely sound and impregnable.

The fourth class, who base their objections to the shipping bill on the grounds of the diplomatic complications involved. For instance, there are 8 German ships interned at Boston, 14 in Brooklyn, and others interned at other ports. This subject is now fully covered by international law. Should the United States purchase these ships, put them under the American flag, and send them out on the high seas, they would, of course, be subject to capture—and legally, too—by the British. This would undoubtedly lead to trouble, more or less, with England. I am inclined to attach considerable weight to this argument, especially in connection with the arguments mentioned above.

This rough classification, perhaps, does not include all classes of our citizens. I notice the papers, as the Herald, look at the problem largely on business grounds. If it has not paid private corporations to operate these ships, how can the Government do it successfully? It looks like a good opportunity for the Government to squander a lot of money in a field where business men keep out. It has not yet been demonstrated, so far as I know, that ships are lacking to carry all the goods that are bought and sold. The market is lacking, which must be developed through the long preparatory course mentioned above. We still lack banking and credit arrangements with these prospective customers.

And for the proposition, I may say that I fail to find anyone with convictions at the present time. Not one person that I have met has come out for the shipping bill.

Very ardent Wilson supporters have declined to take any live interest in the bill; as mentioned in case No. 1 above, they are not informed, and think they had better wait a while and not rush into something new and untried. It has points not only of economic but of political disaster as well.

This states the case very briefly but, I think, fairly accurately, as I sense it in this section of the country. I may say I have taken very keen interest in it myself, and have secured all the information I could get. Indeed, the shipping question has been one of special study with me since I first wrote a discussion of it at length in the year 1901.

Sincerely, yours,

JAMES E. BOYLE.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the words of Prof. Boyle are worthy of serious consideration.

Mr. President, the statement has been made on this floor by a member of the majority that not more than one-half of the Democratic Senators are really in favor of this measure. The statement has also been made on this floor that in the Democratic caucus on this bill it received only 35 votes. That is about one-third of the membership of the Senate. And yet the bill is to be forced through. Why? Because the President wants it. Tuesday's papers contain an account of how a very distinguished gentleman secured the adoption of the bill by the caucus of another body. Why? Because the President wants it.

Mr. President, it appears to me that we shall soon reach a condition of affairs where one Senator with President Wilson will constitute a majority of the Senate, and where one Member of the House with the President will constitute a majority of the House. I have in former years expressed my views on the President's arrogating to himself powers rightfully belonging to Congress, and my views have not changed with the changing of administrations. Some four years ago President Taft secured the passage of the Canadian reciprocity act. In the course of the debate on that measure I said:

> The Members of both Houses of Congress, as well as the people at large, have been in the habit of considering that the lawmaking power is lodged in Congress, and that the President has merely the veto power. We have assumed that when the Constitution stated this in plain words it meant just that. Now that this important measure is before us, however, a majority of the Members of the two Houses of Congress cheerfully acquiesce in the assumption of the President that he is the real lawmaking as well as the treaty-making body, and that the Congress has merely the veto power, and that even this veto power should not be exercised free from pressure by the administration. * * * The President has apparently come to the conclusion that he represents the people of this country both as Executive and Legislature, and that the two Houses of Congress are merely two bodies of men provided for by the Constitution, which he can unfortunately not get rid of, but which are to be ignored and coerced whenever he deems it necessary or expedient.

This was a criticism which I made when Mr. Taft was President of the United States.

Mr. President, these words would be mild censure if applied to the present occupant of the presidential chair. When I last read the Constitution, which the President, as well as the Members of the Senate, has taken a solemn oath to uphold and defend, it contained this provision, and the importance which the

framers of the Constitution attached to it may be judged from the fact that it is section 1 of Article I:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

It does not say that the legislative powers shall be vested in the President, who may allow Congress to ratify his acts. It does not mention the Democratic caucus, whose mandate no Democrat can disregard without being accused of party treason and disloyalty to the President. We have within the last two weeks been treated to severe denunciations of Senators who, having convictions of their own, had the courage thereof; and only last month the President, in a public speech, threatened with condign punishment any Democrats who should attempt in any way to interfere with the work of the Democratic "team," of which he considered himself captain. If it had not been the intention when the Constitution was framed to give the Senate and the House the power to frame the laws, if it had not been the intention to impose this responsibility on them, there would have been no need of these bodies. If the Congress is to do merely the clerical work in connection with legislation, if the real directing force is to be some power outside of the two Houses, if the legislative department of this Government is to do merely as the executive department directs, there is no need of a legislative department. A drafting bureau, or, at most, a small council selected by the President and liable to removal by him, would do the work as well, in less time, and with less friction. The Constitution imposes the duty of legislation on Congress, vests Congress with the power, and with the power must of necessity be the responsibility. For the way in which each Member of either House performs his duties he is answerable to the people whom he is here to represent. He is not responsible to any caucus for his words and his acts; neither is he responsible to the President or the Postmaster General for the way in which he performs his duties. A Senator may vote in accordance with the dictates of the President or with the instructions of a secret caucus; but when he comes before the bar of public opinion he will find that he individually will be held responsible for his votes and that, although he may voluntarily have surrendered the powers of legislation intrusted to him, he can not divest himself of the responsibility accompanying those powers.

Mr. President, to show that I am not the only one who maintains that legislative power is vested in the Congress I wish to read a letter from one of the foremost citizens of this country, one who only a year or so ago was a Member of this body. The letter is dated February 2, 1915, and is addressed to Hon. MILES POINDEXTER, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

FEBRUARY 2, 1915.

Hon. MILES POINDEXTER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Permit me to congratulate you as one of our consistent advocates of truly popular and representative government in your cooperation with other Republican Senators and a few independent Democrats in rebuking the President's unjustifiable efforts to dictate to Congress what legislation shall be enacted.

From a fundamental standpoint of government yesterday's vote on recommitment of the shipping bill is the most important action taken by the present Congress, for it is a declaration to the country at large of the legislative independence of Congress, the only branch of our Government directly elected by and directly accountable to the people of this country.

Before entering upon the duties of his office the President of the United States took an oath pledging himself to "preserve, protect, and defend" the Constitution of the United States. Section 1, Article I, of that Constitution declares:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

It is frequently stated that certain legislation will be enacted because it is the wish of the President, and that other legislation will not be enacted because the President is opposed to it.

The entire spirit and letter of the Constitution shows clear intention that Congress shall be free from intimidation; that it was the purpose that Congress should make the laws and that the President should execute them. Indeed section 6 of Article I declares that for any speech or debate in Congress Members shall not be questioned in any other place. While it is not permitted that Members be punished by fine or imprisonment for speech or debate in Congress, yet it has been charged that Presidents have rewarded or punished Members of Congress through the distribution of patronage.

If the legislative power vested in a Senate and House of Representatives is to be exercised honestly and intelligently, the Members of the two Houses must be free to vote in accordance with their own best judgment, being held accountable only to the people of their own State. Any interference with the free expression of the opinion of Members of Congress by their votes upon measures is a direct attack upon that section of the Constitution which declares that—

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

This quotation is a part of that Constitution which every President of the United States has taken an oath to "preserve, protect, and defend." No President can interfere with the exercise of legislative power by Congress without violating his oath of office, a violation as direct and as complete as any other unlawful act by any other officer of the Government. No individual that has ever lived or that ever will live is qualified to be despotic ruler of 100,000,000 people.

I read with much interest Mr. Samuel G. Blythe's interview with President Wilson, appearing in the Saturday Evening Post of January 9, 1915, and was particularly impressed with the following declaration made by President Wilson:

"I may be lonely because of the necessities of my place; but my vision is clearer than it would be were I surrounded by a group—any group—of well-meaning and zealous friends with interests of their own."

An analysis of this statement reveals three of Mr. Wilson's great weaknesses:

First. Accentuated egotism in the assumption that he knows it all and can learn nothing from anyone.

Second. Acknowledged timidity and lack of confidence in his own judgment and ability because he is afraid he would be influenced by others should he talk with them.

Third. A clearly expressed suspicion that his friends are less patriotic than he and more likely to be guided by self-interest.

No man with such ideas is qualified to be dictator over 100,000,000 or any other number of people.

Cordially, yours, JONATHAN BOURNE, Jr.

Mr. President, there are times when it may seem that established bureaucracy and Executive interference marks the beginning of the destruction of our democracy and the usefulness of Congress as a legislative body. But let us not forget that these positions are only temporarily held by men selected by the people as servants to carry out their will; but if that is not done, the people have a complete remedy and they will use it at the proper time. I believe, sir, that the people of this Government will not permit any individual, no matter how high a position he may hold, to override the Constitution of our country.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration——

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield for just a moment? There are a number of Senators who are absent and who did not expect to be in the Chamber until half an hour or so from this time. I merely wish to suggest the absence of a quorum, not for delay, but that they may be here.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand, but let me state my motion first. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 5259 and the amendments of the House thereto. Now the Senator can call for a quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. Now I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to laying the bill before the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the bill is before the Senate, and the Secretary will call the roll for a quorum.

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

Ashurst	Gore	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Borah	Hardwick	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Hollis	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brandegee	Hughes	Oliver	Sterling
Burleigh	James	Overman	Sutherland
Burton	Johnson	Owen	Thomas
Camden	Jones	Page	Thompson
Catron	Kern	Penrose	Tillman
Chilton	La Follette	Perkins	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Pittman	Vardaman
Culberson	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Warren
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Reed	Weeks
Dillingham	Lewis	Robinson	White
du Pont	Lippitt	Root	Williams
Fall	Lodge	Sheppard	Works
Fletcher	McCumber	Sherman	
Gallinger	McLean	Shields	
Goff	Martin, Va.	Simmons	

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent and is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I had expected at this time to address the Senate at some length in support of the House amendments to the Senate bill and the bill as it comes from the House, but in view of the fact that it seems entirely probable that the measure can now be referred without further discussion to conferees I shall not take up the time of the Senate to carry out my original purpose.

I wish, however, to put into the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury pointing out the vessels that he considers within reach of the company to be organized under the bill, and also giving the status of the War Insurance Bureau.

I wish also to add a statement of the policies issued by the War Risk Insurance Bureau, the insurance carried by it, the

premiums received, and the earned premiums up to the present time, and to add in addition a statement showing the cotton exportations from August to February 17, beginning in 1913 and 1914.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 9, 1915.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your verbal inquiry:

1. I am advised that cargo ships can be built in English shipyards at $50 per ton dead-weight capacity, and that the same ships can be built in American shipyards at $65 per ton dead-weight capacity. Eighty ships of 5,000 tons dead-weight capacity each could be built in English shipyards for $20,000,000; 61 ships, at $65 per ton dead-weight capacity, could be built in American shipyards for a little less than $20,000,000, or a total of 141 ships of 5,000 tons dead-weight capacity could be built within $40,000,000. I am advised also that probably 100,000 tons dead-weight capacity could be turned out in American shipyards within 12 months, and that probably 200,000 tons dead-weight capacity could be turned out in British shipyards within 6 months, and that probably 100,000 tons dead-weight capacity could be turned out in British shipyards within 90 days after receipt of orders. We are offered ships of various registry—English, French, Italian, Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish—the price depending largely upon their age. They are being sold, I am told, at from $30 to $50 per ton dead-weight capacity. Many ships could undoubtedly be bought, so that it would not be necessary to depend wholly upon American and foreign shipyards for vessels if the shipping bill should pass.

2. As to war-risk insurance, I send you a statement, dated February 9th, from Mr. J. Brooks B. Parker, assistant director (marked Exhibit 1), containing information which I think you will find of interest and showing that the $5,000,000 of working capital granted to the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance by Congress is a very small part of the capital invested in private corporations engaged in marine and war risk insurance business. Notwithstanding this fact, the rates made by the Government War-Risk Insurance Bureau have had a potential, if not dominating, influence upon the rates made by all companies on war-risk insurance. The Government War-Risk Insurance Bureau is the only one that will insure any ship to Germany. This has enabled us to send cotton cargoes to German ports. The Assistant Director of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau says that before the Government engaged in this business the rates charged by private corporations were almost prohibitive, running as high as from 25 to 30 per cent for risks through the North Sea, 10 per cent to South American points, and from 15 to 20 per cent to India or the Far East.

I also enclose a memorandum showing the number of policies, total amount insured, the premiums collected, and the premiums earned to February 8th, Bureau of War-Risk Insurance. From this you will see that there have been issued 798 policies; that the total amount insured was $51,396,016; total amount of premiums collected, $1,354,333; premiums actually earned to date (on expired risks), $521,791.31. The total cost of conducting the bureau since its creation has been approximately $7,000. No losses have yet been incurred.

TREASURY WAR-INSURANCE BUREAU—MEMORANDUM OF BUSINESS DONE.

Policies issued, Sept. 2, 1914–Feb. 15, 1915	872
Total amount insured	$54,100,031.00
Premiums on same	1,437,425.09
Of the above amount the earned premiums (on $23,285.16) are	584,747.34

Cotton exportations.

Months.	1914	1913
August	21,210	257,172
September	125,778	930,328
October	497,180	1,517,838
November	760,929	1,501,250
December	1,202,115	1,230,830
January	1,372,175	1,052,272
February 17	651,282	[1] 375,000
Total	[2] 4,697,611	6,864,752

[1] Approximately. [2] 68,000 linters are included in these figures.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The shipping bill which has passed the House is a substantial improvement upon any of the bills heretofore considered by the Senate. It permits the shipping corporation to handle the ships as an emergency measure during the European war and for two years thereafter. Then the ships are to be turned over to the Secretary of the Navy. Those immediately required by the Navy will be used as a part of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, can establish one or more mail lines to South America and to Europe. It is perfectly clear that the mail lines which are to be operated by the Navy Department should not use, under the plan of the bill, any large number of the vessels which are to be purchased. The balance of the vessels the Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, can lease out to individuals, firms, and corporations for use as merchant vessels.

This shipping bill deserves support for three reasons:

First. It will meet the great emergency brought about by the war which has made it difficult to obtain ships for our foreign commerce and has increased so much the cost of shipping. The importance of this commerce will be realized when we remember that for the year ending July 1, 1914, it amounted to $3,750,000,000.

Second. This bill will furnish a splendid addition to our Navy, for the vessels, even when leased for merchant shipping, are to be subject to requisition for naval and military purposes.

Third. It will stimulate the development of our merchant marine, both through the mail routes established and through the vessels leased for freight transportation. I shall defer a discussion of the subject until a later date.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I believe the pending question is the motion of the Senator from Florida to refer the pending shipping bill to conferees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on disagreeing to the House amendments.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that the motion to take up the bill has been declared carried.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bill being before the Senate, I desire to make a motion——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have the floor. I desire to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the amendment of the House as follows:

Amend section 9 of the amendment of the House as follows:
Strike out all of said section after the word "except," in line 6, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:
"All vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act shall be entitled to engage in the coastwise trade of the United States."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. BANKHEAD. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). During the temporary absence of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] I am paired with him and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). I am requested to announce the absence of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LIPPITT. I have a general pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. I presume, if present, he would vote "yea" on this question. I should also vote "yea"; but as I am not sure of that position, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. OLIVER (after having voted in the negative). I voted, not knowing that my pair was absent from the Chamber. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. As has been stated, he is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Burleigh	Kern	Pittman	Smith, Md.
Burton	Lea, Tenn.	Pomerene	Smoot
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Ransdell	Stephenson
Cummins	Lewis	Root	Stone
Fletcher	Lodge	Shafroth	Tillman
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Weeks
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Shields	White
Hughes	Myers	Shively	Williams
James	Page	Simmons	
Johnson	Penrose	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—40.

Ashurst	Crawford	La Follette	Sherman
Bankhead	Culberson	Lane	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Brady	du Pont	McLean	Sterling
Brandegee	Fall	Nelson	Sutherland
Bryan	Goff	Norris	Thomas
Camden	Gronna	O'Gorman	Townsend
Catron	Hardwick	Overman	Vardaman
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Perkins	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Robinson	Works

NOT VOTING—18.

Bristow	Jones	Poindexter	Thompson
Chamberlain	Lippitt	Reed	Thornton
Clapp	Newlands	Saulsbury	Walsh
Colt	Oliver	Smith, S. C.	
Gore	Owen	Swanson	

So the motion to lay Mr. BANKHEAD's amendment on the table was rejected.

Mr. STONE and Mr. LEA of Tennessee addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the question now before the Senate is the amendment to admit vessels purchased under the pending bill, if passed, to the coastwise trade, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I do not rise primarily to discuss the amendment, but to take advantage of the opportunity it affords me to obtain the floor that I may read an interesting item which I find in the Washington Post of this morning. It is as follows:

COL. LILLARD A SUICIDE—BOLTED DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO HELP ELECT SENATOR W. O. BRADLEY.

DANVILLE, KY., *February 17.*

Col. E. W. Lillard, who gained Nation-wide notoriety six years ago when he deserted the ranks of the Democrats and supported the late Senator W. O. Bradley, Republican, in his race for the United States Senate, committed suicide in the attic of his residence here this afternoon.

DESERTED BY OLD FRIENDS.

At the time of the famous Bradley-Beckham race for the Senate, Col. Lillard bolted with three other Democrats from Beckham to Bradley, and this action resulted in the election of Bradley to the Senate. Shortly after Col. Lillard was appointed private secretary to the late Senator. When Senator Bradley died Col. Lillard returned to his old home. Old acquaintances turned from him on account of his bolting his party. He was almost friendless.

For several weeks he had been despondent. He was 55 years old.

Two thousand years ago, in the garden of Gethsemane, Judas betrayed Christ with a kiss. Six years ago Col. Lillard, who had long been a respected citizen of Boyle County, Ky., was elected by the Democrats to the legislature. There he forgot or ignored the pledges and obligations he was under, forsook his party and aided in defeating it at an important juncture. We all know what became of Judas, and we now know what became of Lillard.

Mr. President, I call attention to this incident for the purpose of showing that there is a Nemesis that always pursues or walks by the side of men like Judas and Lillard. My chief purpose in calling attention to it is that it may serve as an impressive lesson for moralists and teachers in instructing the young who come under their tutelage and guidance as to the value and virtue of fidelity.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. STONE. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Missouri think that the Republicans who voted to elect at least two Democratic Senators to this body, and perhaps more, ought also to commit suicide?

Mr. STONE. To whom does the Senator from New Hampshire refer?

Mr. GALLINGER. I said at least two Democratic Senators to this body.

Mr. STONE. I do not know to whom the Senator refers.

Mr. JAMES. But, Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will pardon me, there is this difference between those men who were individual voters, to whom the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] refers, and Mr. Lillard. I did not care to say anything about this, and had no thought that the Senator from Missouri would do so. Mr. Lillard, when he ran for the legislature, was pledged to support Gov. Beckham. I spoke in his home town. He was present. I advocated his election as a Democratic nominee, and stated that he had authorized me to say that if he should be elected he would support Gov. Beckham as the Democratic nominee, who had been nominated in a State-wide primary for the United States Senate. Mr. Lillard himself rose in the audience and said that was true; that he would support Gov. Beckham as the nominee of the party.

Now, there is quite a difference between a Republican or a Democrat casting his own vote for whomsoever his choice may be and one who accepts a trust upon the condition that he would carry it out in good faith; and that was the situation with Mr. Lillard. He was the trustee of an express trust, which was to support Gov. Beckham.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me——

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I must decline to enter upon a political discussion. My purpose, as I have stated, is to use this significant, tragic, and impressive incident with the hope that it might be taken up and employed by the teachers of the young—

To point a moral or adorn a tale.

I did not want the incident to be lost by a passing notice in a great newspaper. So tragic a thing as this can be utilized to good advantage in impressing a very important lesson on the minds of the rising generation.

Mr. President, speaking now to the immediate matter before the Senate, I desire to say, what I have frequently said on the floor of this body, that, if I could, I would admit American ships, American registered vessels, whether made in the United States or elsewhere, if they are owned in the United States and rightly fly our flag, to the coastwise trade. The monopoly of the coastwise business is one I should like to break up; but, Mr. President, every Senator here knows that this amendment was introduced, as other like amendments can be introduced, for at least two purposes—one with the hope of embarrassing Senators on this side who think about the coastwise shipping business as I do, but, primarily and chiefly, with the hope of loading down the bill with amendments that would still further obstruct its passage.

I do not know—and therefore do not assert—whether the distinguished Senator who offered the amendment would vote for this amendment if it were separately presented to the Senate; in other words, whether seriously he favors it. I do not know as to that. I do know, as all of us do, that it is an old parliamentary trick to offer amendments with a view to embarrassing a pending measure which the Senators offering them do not seriously favor. We have seen that done time and again. I do not say that that is true in this case, for I do not know.

Mr. JAMES. Well, Mr. President, does the Senator from Missouri believe that the Senator who introduced the amendment, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], would support the pending House bill to its final passage with this amendment added to it?

Mr. STONE. I can only say as an expression of belief that the Senator from Alabama would not support the bill even with this amendment or any other amendment added to it that did not absolutely destroy its meaning and effect.

Mr. JAMES. I was going to suggest to the Senator that, in my judgment and my belief, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] would not support this bill with this amendment added to it, and the Senator——

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is not asking a question, Mr. President, and I rise to a point of order.

Mr. JAMES. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is in the Chamber and he can speak for himself. If he would support this bill with this amendment added to it, I should like to have him say so.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will remind the Chair that I was taken off the floor yesterday because of what was ruled to be an infraction of the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the recent rigid rulings of the Senate have been that an interruption can only be for a question; otherwise, the Senator yields the floor.

Mr. STONE. Very well, Mr. President, I will observe the rule; I wish it enforced, and I yield the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, referring to the historical parts of the comments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] and their application, as I understood them as he went along, and as I presume others understood them, and as he doubtless intended everyone to understand them, I want to add, in a historical way, that in January, 1891, there was a matter pending before the Senate which had been pending for nearly two months—the force bill, so called—and there was in the Senate what was designated as a "filibuster." The Republicans at that time were in the majority, and, consequently, the Democrats in the minority. After a long discussion of the question six Republican Senators voted with the Democrats to displace the measure then before the body, the force bill, and take up the reapportionment bill. In looking over the history of that contest we are reminded that of the six Democrats all of them were reelected once and some twice or more times, with the single exception of one from Minnesota, who served six years afterwards; and while five of those Senators were reelected, I and also others who stood with those of the Republican Senators who undertook to force upon an unwilling public an obnoxious measure went out of the Senate; we failed to be reelected. I simply desired to make that addition to the Senator's historical statement.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Before the vote is taken on the pending question I desire to make a statement, which will probably not exceed two or three minutes.

It is well known that on several occasions I have endeavored to open the coastwise trade to vessels wherever built. I will welcome any opportunity to accomplish that end. In addition to what my colleague has just said, and adopting what he said with reference to this particular amendment, I want to add that

the proposition to admit vessels to the coastwise trade is made by the Senator from Alabama, who has been one of the seven Democrats who have consistently and persistently refused to cooperate with the Democratic Party in passing this bill. With the help of those seven men, earnestly given, this bill could have been long since passed.

I now desire to say that if the seven Democrats who have acted with the Republicans will agree to support this bill with the pending amendment added, I shall vote for the amendment, and I think I can say that it will get unanimous Democratic support, or nearly so; and I desire to ask now if the seven, or any one of them, will rise in the Chamber and state that, with this amendment added, he will support the bill? I pause for a reply.

Mr. President, I make the further proposition, the one I just made not being accepted, that if three of the seven will rise and say they will support the bill with this amendment added, I shall vote for the amendment. I pause for a reply.

I desire to make the further proposition that if two of them will rise and say they will support the bill with this amendment added, I shall vote for the amendment. I pause for a reply.

I desire now to make this proposition, that if the Senator who offered the amendment [Mr. BANKHEAD] will rise in his seat and say that with this amendment added he will join with the rest of the Democrats to try and make this bill a law, I shall vote for his amendment.

I pause now to ascertain whether any of these distinguished Senators will give us their pledge.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. REED. In a moment. I am not making these propositions to place anyone in an unpleasant situation, but the time has arrived when we ought to know where we are standing. If this amendment is offered merely to place an additional obstacle in the way of the bill by an enemy of the bill who wants to thus defeat the bill, of course we ought to vote against it; but if it is offered in good faith to strengthen the bill and to bring it votes, if its author will stand on the floor of the Senate and say he will support the bill with that amendment added, I shall vote for it, and I think we will get enough votes for it on this side to pass it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. REED. In a moment I will. If there are five Senators on the other side of the Chamber who will agree to support this bill and join with us in passing it, I shall vote for this amendment; if there are four on the other side who will rise and say they will support this bill and stand for it and fight for it, I will agree to vote for the amendment; if there are three who will agree to stay with us and fight for this bill and stay here night and day to pass it, I will vote for this amendment. I pause for a reply.

I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I rise, Mr. President, to inquire of the Senator whether he knows of any Senator who has been supporting this bill who will vote against it, provided this amendment is adopted?

Mr. REED. I do not know. In the present situation I do not feel that it is safe to vote for the amendment, coming from the source it does. I respect the source personally, but I do not respect the source so far as his intentions toward this bill are concerned.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I interrupt for the purpose of calling attention to the manner in which the vote upon the motion to lay upon the table was taken, as it is entirely appropriate to the subject matter of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. During the roll call a great many votes upon the Republican side were recorded against laying this motion upon the table, until it was perfectly obvious that the motion would be defeated. It was then quite significant to see so many stalwart, standpat Republicans rise on the floor, obtain recognition, and announce that they had voted to table the bill, not to table the amendment, under a misapprehension, and therefore they desired to change their votes, it being evident that the motion was lost.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was one of those who changed my vote, and I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I changed it in good faith. I did vote under a misapprehension. There were a couple of other Senators who made the same statement, and I presume they were equally as honest as I was.

Now, Mr. President, just a word. I think it unfortunate that the Senator from Missouri brought into the Senate this tragic incident that occurred on yesterday. It is not a very pleasant message to send to the family of that poor man. A great many other men have committed suicide, and their action had not any relation whatever to political matters; and I apprehend that if the facts in this case were known what that man did on a certain occasion very likely had nothing to do with the act he committed. I simply rose to say that much on that point.

As to the proposed amendment, there is no concealment on my part on the question of invading the coastwise shipping of the United States. It is prosperous, and it has recently given about 40 ships, steam and sail, to the over-seas service of the country and has rendered a great service. The business of domestic shipping is at the present time very much depressed because of the industrial situation; and under the circumstances it seems to me it would be a very unwise thing to adopt the amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Alabama. For that reason I shall vote against it, and I trust the majority of the Senate will vote against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say that while I am not in the habit of negotiating with the other side, and never have in 20 years, I believe, negotiated with them, and while I am not in the habit of negotiating with those on this side who think they are wiser than the school of politics to which they belong, I cordially indorse the proposition made by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and will add my vote to his if the proposition made by him is accepted.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. BRYAN. The remarks of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] imply that Democrats who voted against the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] were acting in bad faith toward the Democratic Party or toward the Democratic caucus. No such motives moved me. I had the privilege in the Democratic caucus of moving to change the language of the shipping bill so that ships owned by the Government of the United States should have an equal right in the harbors and along the coasts with ships owned by individual citizens of the United States. This is not the bill that was in the Democratic caucus, and I felt at perfect liberty to vote upon this motion of the Senator from Alabama as I chose to vote.

It is a humiliating thing, and it will be more humiliating to the Democratic Party if this bill becomes a law, for the citizens of the United States to contemplate the proposition that a vessel of the United States can not carry merchandise between the ports of the United States built up, improved, and maintained by the United States. If this bill becomes a law, the line of vessels running from Habana to New York City, while permitted to touch at the ports along the coast, at Key West, Jacksonville, Savannah, Charleston, and Norfolk, could not take on goods destined for the port of New York. It would suit me very much better if permission to do so could have been written into this bill.

The senior Senator from Missouri is mistaken in thinking that those of us who did not vote with him upon the motion of the Senator from Alabama can be compared to a traitor. Sir, usually the two Senators from Missouri are in accord; but immediately upon the conclusion of the speech of the senior Senator from Missouri the junior Senator from Missouri rose and stated that he would vote for this amendment if enough votes could be obtained to agree to the conference report on the final vote. I ask if the senior Senator from Missouri would like to characterize his colleague in the manner he undertook to characterize other Senators?

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

Mr. BRYAN. Not just now. When the junior Senator from Missouri took his seat, the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] rose, and said that he, too, felt at liberty to vote to sustain this proposition, notwithstanding any caucus that had taken place. Now, Mr. President, it is well known that the senior Senator from Mississippi and the junior Senator from Missouri have been among the most ardent advocates of the pending bill, and the remarks of the senior Senator from Missouri would apply to them equally as they would to those of us who wanted to make it possible for a vessel of the United States to have rights at least equal to the rights of a vessel of

a citizen of the United States. But, sir, it seems to me that the junior Senator from Missouri, in the invitations he extended for the voluntary statement of the votes of Senators, demonstrated that it is not the purpose to put this bill in shape where it could be passed, but that it might be the purpose of those who would vote to adopt this amendment to embarrass the bill so that it could not get enough votes to pass.

I am sorry, sir, if that be so. For one, it was a matter of chagrin to me that the conference report on the emergency act of August last was defeated in the Senate, because the laws relating to the coastwise shipping were liberalized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a remark?

Mr. BRYAN. In just a minute I will. I think the junior Senator from Missouri has tested the matter out sufficiently to show that the purpose is not to accomplish anything; and therefore I rose to say that on the vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, unless somebody will get up and say they will give us enough votes to pass the bill in that shape, it is my purpose to vote against his amendment.

Mr. REED. I simply started to say, in the absence of my colleague [Mr. STONE], that I thought the Senator had put an entirely wrong construction on his remarks, but I see that my colleague is here now.

Mr. BRYAN. I put no construction upon the remarks of the senior Senator from Missouri. There is no room for construction.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I voted against laying upon the table the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. I should be exceedingly gratified to see the House bill passed with that amendment; but, as has just been stated by the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], it can hardly be hoped that the purpose or effect of that amendment would give any strength or bring an additional vote to the House bill. I am exceedingly anxious to see the House bill passed, and I shall not cooperate with those who are opposed to it, nor will I follow their suggestions with reference to amendments, even if I would like to see the amendments become part of the bill. I fear to load the bill down with amendments which may contribute to its defeat.

We all remember the lines from Virgil. They are applicable here:

Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I voted against the motion to lay the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama on the table for the reason that I believed in the principle which I supposed is presented. The people of the Pacific coast are suffering from high freight rates at this time. There was a shipper from the Pacific coast here two days ago who informed me that he paid higher freight rates than he would pay if he shipped around the Horn; if he ships through the Panama Canal, much higher than when he used the Panama Railway; and that of late all shipments have been refused. Through some understanding between the railroad companies and the steamship companies, he is compelled to ship by rail at a greatly increased cost.

I will vote for any amendment to this bill which will put that shipping in the hands of the Government, and I am going to say that I believe it would be more important to the people of this country and a greater benefit if the bill were confined to that single purpose, for we would be within our own waters; we would have no international complications, and we would not be purchasing ships to go through mine fields at the risk of being blown up by mines or submarines, nor would we run the risk of coming into conflict with either Germany or England in their contention. This country would be better off if this body would pass a bill forbidding the shipment of all munitions of war and food supplies to Europe until the war is ended. There are ships flying the American flag under our registry which six months ago were flying foreign flags, for the reason that it paid them to do so, and they are now scuttling across the seas ostensibly loaded with just freight and foodstuffs, while they are actually smuggling, concealed in their cargoes, or openly carrying contraband articles of war; and we are treading gingerly now in an effort to keep ourselves out of international complications.

I am in favor of the bill with or without this amendment, but more so with it, for the reason that I should like to see the Government undertake to control that very profitable industry through which the people of this country now are being mulcted in unholy and extortionate charges.

That is why I voted as I did on the motion to lay upon the table.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. I voted this evening as I voted in the Democratic caucus. I was overruled in the caucus on that bill. I always stand by the Democratic caucus. I have never failed to do so. When this discussion came up there was a discussion in the cloakroom between some of my Democratic colleagues as to whether that would apply to this particular bill. They all said they did not think so; but it seems to be considered by some of my colleagues here that under the caucuses held as to the other bill we are bound as to this House bill that came over to us. Therefore, although I am in favor of the amendment, when I see that it is going to embarrass the bill, in order to stand with my Democratic colleagues, as I always have done, I propose to vote against the amendment.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. PITTMAN. I voted to table the motion of the Senator from Alabama, not because I am not in favor of that principle, for I voted for that principle in the conference, and I regret that it did not carry; but I became satisfied that this amendment was one of the many amendments that have been offered in this body for the sole purpose of delaying and hampering legislation. I do not believe that there is any sincerity in the agreement at this time to refer the bill to a conference committee, as far as getting any action on it before Congress adjourns is concerned.

It is apparent to anyone who has watched the course of this body during the session that it has been the intention of the minority here to prevent legislation on any important matter. They have made of this body, for which they profess so much respect, a farce. For years this body has not been held in the highest opinion by the people of this country; no, not nearly so highly as some of the distinguished Senators themselves hold it. I do not believe the action of this body during the past session will change that opinion, unless it changes it for the worse.

This is not a legislative body. There is no right of determination of action in this body. It is simply a body in which we talk. It must be apparent that there can not be a legslative body wherein the right to vote is absolutely denied.

The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], in his technical way, with which he is so familiar, has attempted to show that there is a rule that absolutely prohibits this body from forcing a vote. He has done it with all of the skill that he is capable of using, but it does not make any difference whether that be the strict rule of this body or not. If the rule violates the constitutional right of the Members of this body to reach a vote, it must be void. If the inherent right of the representatives of the people of this country to vote on pending measures is denied to them, then this ceases to be a legislative body.

I know that the distinguished Senators on the other side claim that the only function of this body is to talk. That is realized by this whole country. I want to say to them that they could not pass a statute, a rule, or establish a precedent forbidding the right to vote, and yet they attempt to accomplish indirectly that which they could not accomplish by direct action.

When this Congress adjourns on March 4 every bill pending in this body that is not acted upon will die, and the right of every Senator here to vote on those bills that die will be denied, no matter whether it be denied by direct rule or by the subterfuges used by the Senators who are filibustering in this body.

There is a time coming when that question will be settled. I call the attention of the Senators to other matters that were considered beyond the will of the people of this country. I believe, just as firmly as I believe that I stand here, that the Republicans on that side and the Democrats on this side who are denying the legislation that the people of this country want will have to answer to those people at the coming elections. They will not stand the excuses and the subterfuges that are offered to this body. They will look to the facts of the matter, and these Senators will have to answer with regard to those facts.

Why, they say, "If you are not satisfied with these rules, do not violate them—amend the rules," and yet, in the same breath, they claim that they can deny the right to vote on an amendment to the rules by talking until that motion is dead. The absurdity of the thing must appear to anyone. They contend that it is impossible to change the rules, and yet under the rules it is impossible to transact business in this body. They also say that no good measures have ever been killed by a filibuster. Who is to determine that question—the minority? The minority takes the power of determining that question. Let the majority pass the bill, and if it is a bad bill the people of this country will so determine and refuse to return to power

the people who voted for such bills. But there are other things besides this shipping bill before the Senate. There are other matters besides these appropriation bills before the Senate. There are to-day on the calendar over 200 bills presented by Senators from all over this country, and they have been lying on that calendar unacted upon for three long months by reason of the filibuster that has been conducted in the Senate, by reason of the ancient privilege of denying a Senator the right to vote by talking to such an extent that a vote can not be had. We have waiting for us here the rural-credits bill, which can not be acted upon. We have before this Congress the seaman's bill, which can not be acted upon. We have the great claims bill before this body, affecting hundreds of people throughout this country, and it can not be acted upon. We have the Philippine bill before this body, and it can not be acted upon. We have reclamation acts throughout this great country of ours, and they can not be acted upon. We have bills here to protect the safety of miners—the miners working in the coal mines and working out there in the hard-rock mines of our State—and they can not be acted upon. We have hundreds of bills pending here to-day that can not be acted upon; and everyone in this country knows, or should know, the reason why they can not be acted upon. They should know that the Senators here who are pretending to defend this ancient prerogative of unlimited debate are not only killing this shipping bill but they are killing all of the legislation demanded by every section of this country. I want to say to them that that can not last and that will not stand before the people of this country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me ask the Senator from Nevada why it is that the Senate did not act on some of these bills that he has enumerated at the first session of this Congress or at the special session, when we were recessing from Monday to Thursday and from Thursday to Monday for three months, doing nothing?

Mr. PITTMAN. I want to say that nearly all of the filibustering during that time was also done by that side. I want to state that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] stood on this floor for days and days discussing the river and harbor bill, when the bill that the Senator from Ohio himself presented to this body only differed from the committee bill in a few million dollars out of the many, many millions of dollars. Was that a point of principle with him? Was it one of those great human rights that this prerogative is supposed to protect—a mere matter of whether it should be $35,000,000 or $55,000,000?

That was one of the great filibusters of the last session, and that thing has continued on throughout the whole of this session. You have tried to disguise it in one way and in another way. You have talked about the caucus at one time and you have offered amendments and subterfuges at another time; but the fact remains, and you can not deny it, that you have conspired for the purpose of preventing the passage not only of the shipping bill, but of the seaman's bill, the reclamation bills, the great conservation bill in the West, the claims bill, and all of these valuable measures that affect the people of this country.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; and you have had in mind at the same time the bill to protect the people of this country against the materials made by convict labor. Oh, no; it is not so much the shipping bill that is getting under your ribs as it is the other bills here that are hanging behind the shipping bill. That question will be known to the people of this country, and the people of this country will call to account at the next election every man that runs that has taken a part in it.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. FALL. The Senator has referred several times now to the filibuster by the minority, and I have heard that from several other Senators——

Mr. PITTMAN. I beg your pardon; I mean the majority on that side.

Mr. FALL. Well, the majority on that side—is it the idea of the Senator that the proponents of this bill have ever, at any time, had a majority in this Senate for the thing that has been brought before this body, or that they have now a majority?

Mr. PITTMAN. I want to say to the Senator that if the Senators on that side had not known that we did have a majority, the filibuster would have stopped long ago.

Mr. FALL. Have you a majority now, do you think?

Mr. PITTMAN. I am satisfied to take a vote, whether we have a majority or not. That is all we have ever asked of you—to take a vote on this bill, whether we have a majority or not.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, was the Senator satisfied to have a vote in the long week when that side was filibustering against the bill, when the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] stood up in his place and admitted that he was filibustering?

Mr. PITTMAN. I want to say to the Senator that there has never been one moment since I have been here that I have not been willing to go to a vote on this bill. I do care whether the vote goes for or against us, but it would be better that this bill should be killed instantly by a vote outright than that all the important business of this country should cease. That is the question.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada further yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PITTMAN. Certainly.

Mr. FALL. I will premise my question with the statement that I have given notice that I should make a speech to-day. I have decided not to make a speech because of the pending question, which relates to this bill. Will the Senator agree to take a vote upon the pending question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the pending question?

Mr. PITTMAN. To satisfy the Senator in this matter and waive all technicalities, I ask unanimous consent at the present time that we proceed to vote upon the Senate bill that is before this body, with the House amendments and all amendments thereto.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not before the body.

Mr. FALL. In my own time I will express my views upon that subject.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to vote without further debate upon the Senate bill, with House amendments and all amendments to it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that a request by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. PITTMAN. I make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As unanimous consent is requested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Hollis	O'Gorman	Smoot
Bryan	Hughes	Oliver	Stephenson
Burleigh	James	Overman	Sterling
Burton	Johnson	Owen	Stone
Camden	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Catron	Kenyon	Penrose	Swanson
Chilton	Kern	Perkins	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Pittman	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Pomerene	Tillman
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Townsend
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Reed	Vardaman
Cummins	Lewis	Robinson	Walsh
Dillingham	Lippitt	Root	Warren
du Pont	Lodge	Shafroth	Weeks
Fall	McCumber	Sheppard	White
Fletcher	McLean	Sherman	Williams
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Shields	Works
Goff	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Gore	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, let the unanimous-consent request be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understand that the Senator from Nevada has asked unanimous consent to proceed at once to vote upon the bill as it came from the House and all amendments thereto. Is that the request?

Mr. PITTMAN. That is the request.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is, on the bill as it came from the House yesterday?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I object.

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the statement has been made by a number of Senators, who avow themselves as being in favor of the principle of this amendment, that it is offered for the purpose of embarrassing the bill. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] paused in his remarks to ask if there was any Senator on either side of the Chamber who had heretofore opposed the bill who will vote for it with this amendment. I now desire to inquire whether there is any Senator on either side of the Chamber who has been supporting the bill who will vote against it if this amendment is adopted. I pause for a reply. No Senator answers. It therefore appears, Mr. President, that so far as this amendment is concerned it may not affect the vote on this bill.

I shall therefore vote for this amendment. While I am heartily in favor of the shipping bill, I believe that this amendment will materially improve it. I can not vote to buy or build ships at the expense of the people and deny such ships the right to engage in our own commerce.

Mr. President, the proceedings in this body during the last six weeks have caused the people of this country to doubt the capacity of the United States Senate to transact business. It is not my purpose at this time to enter into a prolonged discussion on the subject of filibustering. If the character renowned in fiction, known as Rip Van Winkle, were to appear to-day he would find his counterpart in the membership of the United States Senate. We have under our rules failed to keep pace with the progress of the times, and Rip Van Winkle would be a wide-awake, live, and up-to-date citizen compared with the membership of the United States Senate, judged by the proceedings as demonstrated during the last six weeks of the present session.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. THOMAS. Does not the Senator think that if Rip Van Winkle could be restored to life he would make a very worthy Member of this body?

Mr. ROBINSON. Rip Van Winkle slept for many years. The Senate has been asleep for a long time, and it has not yet awoke to the fact that it has lost, or is failing to retain, the confidence of the people of the United States by not keeping abreast of the times with its procedure.

As I said a moment ago, I shall vote for the Bankhead amendment without regard to the purpose which inspired its introduction here, because it has been demonstrated that this bill will lose no votes by it. Every Senator who has spoken on this amendment has declared himself in favor of it, and no Senator has risen on this floor and said that he is opposed to it. Then why not adopt the amendment and let it go to the conference?

While the proceedings on this floor have not disclosed the fact, it is well known to all of us here that an agreement has been reached by which this bill is to speedily go to conference. Let the amendment go to conference along with the amendments of the House to the Senate bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I offered this amendment in perfect good faith. I offered it believing that if it were adopted it would improve the bill. Before I offered the amendment I agreed with the distinguished Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Florida that I would not open my mouth in defense or in advocacy of the amendment. I was perfectly willing that it should be submitted to the Senate and let the Senate vote upon it. Immediately, sir, the Senator from Florida moved to table the amendment. The Senate refused to table the amendment. Now, then, the question is on the adoption of the amendment that I offered. That is the question the Senate must vote upon, and why not vote now? Why all this discussion and delay? If a majority of the Senate choose to vote the amendment down, all right, I will not complain. If the amendment goes to conference and comes back, it will not make a particle of difference to me as to how I shall vote. I have said to my colleagues here from the beginning of this controversy that I was willing and anxious to vote for this shipping bill if they would make it a temporary proposition; that if they would confine its life to two years after the conclusion of peace in Europe I would vote for it; and that was all the demand, and it was all the insistence that I have made.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question? Will the Senator vote for the bill with this amendment on it?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; if this bill comes back from conference and it contains nothing except that which authorizes this board to buy or build ships and operate them for two years, as under the provisions of the bill, and then go out of the business, I will vote for it. Will you?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes; I will vote for anything that the Democratic Party decides is good for the country. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate can not expect the Chair to rebuke the occupants of the galleries while Senators indulge in the same practice.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I was asking the Senator from Alabama in good faith if he would vote for the bill with his amendment upon it. Yes or no?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have answered that question directly. I have said that with this amendment or without it, if the bill came back from the conference with a provision that it is to be a temporary measure, that the Government should go out of the shipping business at the end of two years after the conclusion of peace, and the ships then be disposed of and the Government go out of their operation, I would vote for it, and I say so now.

That is all I have to say now and I am willing to vote. I do not propose to answer any more questions. You can vote or you can keep up this controversy to-day, and to-morrow, and the next day on the proposition whether you will vote yea or nay on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am not asking the Senator to yield. I thought he had concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Alabama has just said that if this bill was presented to him with the provision upon it that upon the restoration of normal conditions, or two years after the expiration of war in Europe the operation of the bill should expire, he would vote for it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I did not say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The proposition here is to bring the bill back with the Weeks provision on it, which puts the Government permanently into the business. Of course I would not vote for it under those circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I still think I understood the Senator from Alabama correctly and that the record will bear me out. I understood the Senator to say that with or without the amendment which he has just offered, if the bill came back with the provision upon it that two years after the expiration of the war in Europe or the restoration of peace, for they are synonymous terms, he would vote for it.

As I understand, the House amendments to the Senate bill, rather the Weeks bill, provide that within two years after the expiration of the European war these ships shall be handed over to the Navy of the United States and that the Navy shall use such of them as are suitable for naval purposes and sell, charter, or lease the balance of them. That seems to me to comply tolerably well with the requirement laid down by the Senator from Alabama. But in order to test now the sincerity of the Senator from Utah and the sincerity of other Senators upon this floor, who have been talking very recently, and only very recently asking for a vote, I now ask the unanimous consent of the Senate of the United States to immediately proceed to vote upon the Senate bill and the House amendments, and all other amendments, including this one pending thereto.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the same request I objected to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That was objected to about a minute ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Nevada to ask unanimous consent that the House bill be voted upon. This is a Senate bill, with House amendments. I therefore renew the request in proper form in order that the record may carry out the facts of the refusal upon the other side of the Chamber to consent to a vote.

Mr. GALLINGER and others. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. What was done with the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was objection made to it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to indulge me at this point for a few minutes. A great many

things have been uttered during the course of this discussion that under ordinary circumstances elsewhere would provoke reply, but I established for myself when I came upon this floor certain ideals that I intend to maintain, and I have accordingly appeared to overlook many things that probably were intended for my notice. There are better places and other times when such things can be dealt with, if anyone feels disposed to there enlarge upon some of the suggestions that have been made. So much for that.

If it was the purpose of my associates on this side of the Chamber to find out how the seven Senators who felt unable to support the bill in its present form or in any of the various forms in which it has, from time to time, appeared here stood with reference to any provision contained in it, there was an easy way readily open to them. Some of them have seen proper to postpone to this hour the making of inquiry about this provision concerning the entrance of the Government-owned ships to the coastwise trade. For myself I never assumed that I had more wisdom than all of them, nor that my sense of patriotism was better developed than theirs. I differed from them profoundly about certain matters of policy and principle concerning the operation of Government-owned ships. I determined that, in the present state of the situation to be dealt with, my views were not such that they could be taken from me by caucus action by others as the result of any implied obligation I assumed when I became a Member of the Senate through the agency of the Democratic Party.

I may be permitted to say, in passing, that I am probably one of the few men on this floor who never sought nor received a Republican vote in his life for anything, anywhere, or any time, and I have enjoyed as many honors at the hands of the Democratic Party as any citizen of his State, and many times more than I deserved. I hold certain views of public policy and principle which are just as essential a part of my nature as any part of my physical body, and I have cultivated the habit of insisting upon these respectfully and within the limits of my rights, candidly and completely recognizing the equal rights of every other person.

I do not take offense at the excessive earnestness and emphasis of Senators who deal in a more spectacular manner with political and public questions than I do. My range of observation in the world has been a wide one. I have been called upon to touch humanity at many points and to judge it from many angles. As the result of all this, I am forced to say that I find there is much of real honesty and sincerity among all classes, and much sound philosophy at the bottom of nearly all the political contentions that are made by organized groups in this good country of ours. I have therefore grown exceedingly tolerant of differences of political opinion, not only with my own party associates but with those with whom I do not affiliate in the matter of party alignment. But I did not intend to drift off on that subject. I want to address myself just for a few minutes to this particular amendment to the shipping bill.

It seems to me most monstrous at this time, of all times, when the current expenses of the Government are being paid out of an emergency tax—a war tax—levied upon the people, that $50,000,000 of their money should be taken to buy ships to meet an alleged emergency, when those very ships, by the terms of this bill, are not to be permitted to take up a pound of freight at one port in the United States and deliver it at another.

The chief contention made in proof of this alleged emergency is as to the movement of cotton. About 2,520,000 bales of cotton grown in the South go for spinning to New England ports; but this bill, intended to meet an emergency, to transport promptly and more directly than can be otherwise done by private shipowners, cotton can not be carried on these ships from the Gulf ports to the consuming ports in New England; that is to say, a shipload of cotton may not be taken from New Orleans, Galveston, Savannah, or Charleston and delivered at Fall River or any port along the New England coast under this proposed law. It seems to me that there must be some excuse, that there must be some explanation for that. The only one that I have heard preferred was by a Senator here, who said that by including a provision admitting ships purchased by the Government to the coastwise trade in the proposed law, they would encounter opposition that they did not care to reckon with, nor hope to cope with successfully. I presume he referred to the coastwise shipping monopoly, one of the most insolent and completely law-protected monopolies on this continent, and one that has oppressed the people of this country more than any other twice its magnitude, as everybody who knows anything about current affairs knows to be true. Why that particular trust should have been spared, why a contest with that particular trust should have been declined and foreclosed behind the closed doors of a Democratic caucus, is a burden of candor that rests on somebody and that must be discharged at some time. It seems that we have at least found one trust that the Democratic Party is afraid to grapple with at close quarters.

Now, a word about my refusing to vote for this bill. In August last, when the appalling consequences of this European war had not so clearly defined themselves as at the present time, I thought that it was simply a question of transportation to get the cotton that was produced in the South, and the wheat and the corn and the meat of the West, to the consuming markets of Europe, and I fell in promptly with the idea that if, for any reason, the shipping offered by private owners was not adequate to meet that demand, it would be nothing more than the Government's duty to supply it temporarily.

The matter has now been delayed until that emergency has come and gone, as I see it. Of course, I have only a surface knowledge about the facts and details of the shipping business, but this has been obtained from reliable public and private sources. But it seems to me that when wheat brings a dollar and sixty cents a bushel it is about time to keep it at home, for every time an additional million bushels is exported 10 cents a bushel goes on the price of the more than 600,000,000 bushels consumed at home.

So far as cotton is concerned, the exports during the months of December and January were in excess of those of any year since the cotton industry was first inaugurated. There has been more cotton shipped during those two months than in any two months in the history of the world. There was adequate shipping found for that even under all the difficulties of the existing situation. There may be an explanation for that, but the foundation and undisputed fact is that the shipping was found without Government participation.

It is said that the prices of shipping are excessive. That is a technical matter that has been explained by others, and I shall not detain the Senate at this time to go into it; but I want to say that it is like the answer that Mark Twain gave to the reporters who inquired as to whether or not the rumor that he was dead was true, when he said that the report was very much exaggerated. The rate from Galveston to Liverpool on cotton shipments in normal times is 85 cents a hundred; now it is a dollar and a quarter. The rate to German ports is a little more than that in normal times, while now it is $3 a hundred, or about $15 a bale. But they can not get it there at that. The rate is merely a theoretical one; it is never actually paid, because no direct shipments are ever made. If it was $150 a bale it could not be gotten there. In the case of transporting cotton to Germany it is not a question of ships, but it is a question of a free and safe sea to run them on. That is the real difficulty about shipments to Germany; it is not the want of ships, but it is the want of access. At this time the section from which I come can not receive the slightest possible benefit from the passage of this bill. I feel that I am justified in saying that the emergency has passed, not because we do not have on hand vast quantities of cotton and lumber seeking a market; and I know that the obstruction now to be reckoned with is not of a character to be removed by the purchase and operation of ships by the Government, but is one of the conditions imposed on mankind by this gigantic and ferocious war which has shocked the world from one end to the other.

As I have said, if our associates on this side had desired to ascertain our views about a form of bill that we would support, and that was the real purpose of those who differed from us, I venture to say that we would not have denied them a conference, with an inclination to surrender to a reasonable extent any differences of opinion as to mere matters of method.

If this bill had provided that the shipping board should consist of those technically informed about the shipping business in its commercial and operating branches, leaving out of it all official members—because, in my opinion, they have now duties and responsibilities enough of their own—if it had provided distinctly that no ship belonging to a belligerent should be bought, not in a shambling, double-meaning sort of way, that might ultimately, as a matter of construction, get us into trouble, but distinctly expressed in terms that everybody could understand in the same way; if then this matter of permitting these purchased ships to engage in the coastwise trade had been included, and another provision limiting it to the duration emergency which brought the plan into existence, although it is not now a matter of any great consequence to my section of the country, still I would have waived that, and voted for the bill, as it is my duty, and as it is always my pleasure, to do what I can to advance the general prosperity and interest of the whole country. I could have on that basis yielded my opinion in opposition. But I did not project myself into the discussion at all. I sat here for about four weeks, leaving my associates to con-

duct the matter to their own satisfaction, but so far as the roll calls disclosed, so far as the surface of things indicated, I was just as heartily in favor of this bill as anyone on this side of the Chamber. I have never participated to the extent of a single minute in any filibuster against it, and I do not intend to do so.

I do not know but that it is too late now to expect everybody to surrender his opinion and bring it into conformity with mine, but if it shall assume an aspect of that kind, I can only repeat—because I have not any desire to announce any new position—what I have stated several times, that I am willing to confer about that.

I do not believe that the occasion, according to my present information, justifies the passage of this bill. The maps of the world may be remade; new systems will be introduced, and new rulers inaugurated to execute them; a new and larger conception of human rights will follow this war. Then it will be time enough to learn to what extent the reorganized Governments will permit Government-owned ships to enter their ports to direct and control their commerce.

Commerce, in so far as navigation is a branch of it, involves the cooperation of other and distant countries. Their rights and selfish interests safeguarded and respected and their laws must be complied with. It is an inopportune time, in my judgment, to deal with this question; but I am not justified in entering upon any discussion of that question this afternoon, because I have said more than I intended to say in the entire discussion, and besides I am not prepared, as I should be, to do so to my own satisfaction.

I think that this amendment ought to be adopted now by those who believe in it. I do not believe that any improper influence was exerted upon a single Democrat in the caucus. I take no stock in this ward-heeler system of accusing gentlemen who are Members of the Senate by saying that they have allied themselves with this, that, or the other trust. I believe it was some question of policy, some question of the misconception of the strength of that institution and the friends that it could muster; some unfounded fear of its capacity to arouse into activity influences with which they feared to combat. Obviously it ought to be dealt with, and the people of this country are entitled to have it dealt with in the right way by the Democratic Party. Forming as it does one of our great industries, it is not to be ridden down roughshod, but it has enjoyed its exclusive and unfair privileges about long enough, and one of the new privileges that it ought not to enjoy is the privilege of keeping out of the ports of this country by law the ships that belong to the United States, and which the money of the taxpayers have supplied.

I am not particularly frightened about the proposition of the Government owning ships; but, according to my idea of things, ships are the very last utilities that the United States Government ought to take under control. It is the very essence of public control that it shall primarily contribute to internal development. There are ample opportunities for us now in connection with the telegraph, the telephone, and the remainder of the express business that will test out all of the strength that we can muster to bring those utilities under an orderly and efficient control. The shipping proposition involves the rights, interests, and cooperation of other countries. The profits of it are shared between those who load the ship at one end and those who purchase the load at the other. It is in the catalogue of utilities, I venture the opinion this afternoon, the very last that should call for Government control. I know that under existing conditions Government ownership and operation of ships will result in political management in the sense of a management directed by political influences, and these, when exerted in connection with matters of business, are always wasteful and frequently corrupt.

Our tariff laws have been so adjusted that it has been practically impossible for a ship leaving our ports to go out with a load and come back with another; but that, also, is a topic that would require to be enlarged upon, and I am not prepared to do it to my satisfaction this afternoon.

I sincerely trust that the Senate will put this particular amendment on this bill, and if the conference committee will safeguard properly the matter of neutrality and put in a provision preventing the ships belonging to the United States from transporting to the belligerents in Europe to-day arms and munitions of war to slaughter by thousands the best people on this earth, and fix the membership of the board as I have indicated, and definitely limit its duration as a temporary relief for a real or supposed emergency, I am here to tell you that I will make arrangements to vote for it without any violation of my conscience, and under the definite belief that I have done something for my day and generation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Question!

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a pair to-day with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW]. I do not know how that Senator would vote if present, and in his absence I withhold my vote, but were I at liberty to vote I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. OLIVER. On account of my pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] I withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Ashurst	Fall	Norris	Thompson
Bankhead	Gronna	O'Gorman	Tillman
Borah	Hardwick	Owen	Townsend
Brady	Hitchcock	Poindexter	Vardaman
Camden	Jones	Robinson	Williams
Catron	Kenyon	Smith, Mich.	Works
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Sterling	
Crawford	Lane	Sutherland	
Culberson	Nelson	Thomas	

NAYS—54.

Brandegee	James	Overman	Simmons
Bryan	Johnson	Page	Smith, Ariz.
Burleigh	Kern	Penrose	Smith, Ga.
Burton	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins	Smith, Md.
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Smoot
Clark, Wyo.	Lewis	Pomerene	Stephenson
Cummins	Lippitt	Ransdell	Stone
Dillingham	Lodge	Reed	Swanson
du Pont	McCumber	Root	Walsh
Fletcher	McLean	Shafroth	Warren
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Weeks
Goff	Martine, N. J.	Sherman	White
Hollis	Myers	Shields	
Hughes	Newlands	Shively	

NOT VOTING—9.

Bristow	Colt	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Gore	Saulsbury	Thornton
Clapp			

So Mr. BANKHEAD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Nebraska proposes to amend House amendment No. 3 by adding, at the end of section 16, the following:

That it shall be unlawful and treated as a breach of the neutrality laws of the United States for any person, partnership, or corporation to sell or contract to sell, or deliver or contract to deliver, during the existence of war between nations with which the United States is at peace, any arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives of any kind whatsoever to be used against a country or nation with which the United States is at peace; and during the existence of war it shall be unlawful to sell for exportation or to export arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives, except upon filing with the Secretary of Commerce satisfactory sworn proof that said arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives are not intended to be used in violation of this provision.

Any person violating this provision shall be fined not more than $100,000 and imprisoned not more than three years, and any arms, ammunition, artillery, and explosives the exportation of which is attempted in violation of this provision shall be forfeited, one-half to the use of the informer and one-half to the use of the United States.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on laying the amendment on the table.

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

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

Mr. OLIVER (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and withhold my vote. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as heretofore announced, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair with the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], I withhold my vote. Were I at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 51, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—51.

Brandegee	James	Pittman	Stephenson
Bryan	Johnson	Pomerene	Sterling
Burleigh	Kern	Ransdell	Stone
Catron	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Sutherland
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Swanson
Culberson	Lippitt	Root	Thomas
Dillingham	Lodge	Shafroth	Tillman
Fall	McLean	Shields	Walsh
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Shively	Warren
Goff	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	Weeks
Gore	Newlands	Smith, Ariz.	White
Hollis	Overman	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Hughes	Page	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—36.

Ashurst	Cummins	Lewis	Poindexter
Bankhead	Gallinger	McCumber	Sheppard
Borah	Gronna	Myers	Saerman
Brady	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Mich.
Burton	Hitchcock	Norris	Smoot
Camden	Jones	O'Gorman	Thompson
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Owen	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	La Follette	Penrose	Vardaman
Crawford	Lane	Perkins	Works

NOT VOTING—9.

Bristow	Colt	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	du Pont	Saulsbury	Thornton
Clapp			

So Mr. HITCHCOCK's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that the result of the vote has been announced, I wish to state that I voted under an entire misapprehension. I wanted to vote for the amendment, but I was called out of the Chamber at the time, and I was not aware that a motion had been made to lay the amendment on the table. I am emphatically in favor of the amendment, so I wish to change my vote on the motion to lay on the table from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS. A point of order, Mr. President. Under the rules of the Senate, nobody can change his vote after the result has been announced.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from New York moves to amend the amendment of the House as follows:

Strike out all of section 7 of the amended bill after the word "further," in line 19, page 9, down to and including the word "neutrality," in line 21, page 9, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

Without waiving any rights claimed by the United States under international law or any rights or principles hitherto asserted by the United States, no vessels shall be purchased under this act which are the property, in whole or in part, of any of the nations now at war, nor shall any vessels be purchased under this act which are the property of any of the subjects or citizens of said belligerent nations unless such purchases be made with the acquiescence or consent of all belligerent nations.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on laying on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair, I will say that if I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). Making the same announcement and transfer as heretofore, I will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—45.

Ashurst	La Follette	Pittman	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Lane	Pomerene	Stone
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Swanson
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thomas
Fletcher	Lewis	Robinson	Thompson
Gore	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Tillman
Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh
Hughes	Myers	Shields	White
James	Newlands	Shively	Williams
Johnson	Norris	Simmons	
Kenyon	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
Kern	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—43.

Bankhead	Cummins	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Dillingham	McCumber	Smoot
Brady	du Pont	McLean	Stephenson
Brandegee	Fall	Nelson	Sterling
Burleigh	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Burton	Goff	Page	Townsend
Camden	Gronna	Penrose	Vardaman
Catron	Hardwick	Perkins	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Poindexter	Weeks
Clarke, Ark.	Jones	Root	Works
Crawford	Lippitt	Sherman	

NOT VOTING—8.

Bristow	Clapp	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Colt	Saulsbury	Thornton

So Mr. O'GORMAN's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of amendment numbered 3 of the House, the Senator from Michigan proposes to insert the following:

That a commission be, and the same is hereby, created for the purpose of fully considering the entire subject of over-sea shipping and the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine, to be composed as follows: Five Senators, who shall be appointed by the Vice President; seven Representatives, who shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and five practical, experienced business men and shipowners, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States; said appointments to be bipartisan in character, and the five members last provided for, if not already in the employ of the Government, to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed the salary of a Member of Congress. The said commission is hereby authorized and empowered to conduct an inquiry into the best means of reestablishing the American merchant marine upon broad principles of international comity and practical utility, and shall consider, among other things—

(a) The question of a subsidized merchant marine, through direct appropriations of the Government;

(b) The question of discriminating tariff duties in favor of American bottoms under such regulations and with such treaty modification as may be necessary to that end; and

(c) That the purchase or construction by the Government of the United States of merchant ships which may be used in over-sea commerce and in emergencies shall constitute an auxiliary merchant fleet for the Navy.

That said commission is authorized and empowered to sit during the session or during the recess of Congress, at any place or places which in its judgment shall be necessary; that the expense of said commission shall be paid out of any unexpended balance in the Treasury of the United States upon warrants to be issued therefor by the chairman or vice chairman of said commission; that said commission is authorized to take testimony, to administer oaths, and employ such necessary assistance as may be desirable in the conduct of its investigation, which shall be concluded within six months from the date this act shall become effective.

That the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of defraying the necessary expenses incident hereto.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion by the Senator from Florida to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

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

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of my pair that I previously made. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 52, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—52.

Ashurst	Johnson	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Kenyon	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Kern	Owen	Smith, Md.
Camden	La Follette	Pittman	Stone
Chilton	Lane	Pomerene	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Thomas
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thompson
Fletcher	Lewis	Robinson	Tillman
Gore	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh
Hollis	Myers	Shields	White
Hughes	Newlands	Shively	Williams
James	Norris	Simmons	Works

NAYS—31.

Brady	Gallinger	Nelson	Smoot
Brandegee	Goff	Page	Stephenson
Burleigh	Gronna	Penrose	Sterling
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Sutherland
Catron	Lippitt	Poindexter	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Root	Warren
Dillingham	McCumber	Sherman	Weeks
du Pont	McLean	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—13.

Borah	Colt	Hitchcock	Thornton
Bristow	Crawford	Oliver	
Chamberlain	Cummins	Saulsbury	
Clapp	Fall	Smith, S. C.	

So the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was laid on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER. I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendments made by the House and ask for a conference, the Chair to appoint seven conferees as managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as a motion which has preference over the one just made by the Senator from Florida, I offer the following amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Add as a new section the following:

SEC. —. That no ship shall be purchased under the authority of this act from a belligerent nation, nor the citizens thereof, and no ship shall be operated by the United States, nor the shipping board, nor the corporation provided for herein, nor any lessee thereof, under the authority conferred by this act, to or from any port of a belligerent nation, nor to or from any European port during the continuance of the present war in Europe.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. POINDEXTER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have the floor I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator has not the floor. The Senator from Florida has the floor, and he moves to lay the amendment on the table. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

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

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

Mr. SIMMONS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of my pair that I previously made. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 48, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—48.

Ashurst	Johnson	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Kern	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	La Follette	Pittman	Smith, Md.
Camden	Lane	Pomerene	Stone
Chilton	Lea, Tenn.	Ransdell	Swanson
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thomas
Fletcher	Lewis	Robinson	Thompson
Gore	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Tillman
Harwick	Myers	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hollis	Newlands	Shields	Walsh
Hughes	Norris	Shively	White
James	O'Gorman	Simmons	Williams

NAYS—37.

Borah	du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Stephenson
Brady	Fall	Nelson	Sterling
Brandegee	Gallinger	Page	Sutherland
Burleigh	Goff	Penrose	Townsend
Burton	Gronna	Perkins	Warren
Catron	Jones	Poindexter	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Root	Works
Crawford	Lodge	Sherman	
Cummins	McCumber	Smith, Mich.	
Dillingham	McLean	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—11.

Bristow	Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Colt	Oliver	Thornton
Clapp	Hitchcock	Saulsbury	

So Mr. POINDEXTER's amendment was laid on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire to offer a further amendment, but I see the Senator from Florida is on his feet, I suppose for the purpose of making a motion to lay it on the table. So I will make some remarks upon it before offering it. I was under the impression that when a Senator obtained the floor for the purpose of offering an amendment he was entitled to keep the floor until he gave it up. However that may be, I have no intention to make an objection to the parliamentary method of proceeding.

In view of the tabling of the amendment which I offered a moment ago, it is perfectly evident that it is the intention of the supporters of this bill to do the things which that amendment which has been tabled would have prohibited, namely, to buy belligerent ships and to operate ships so bought in the ports of belligerent countries and in the ports of neutral countries in Europe which are immediately in the war zone and are involved in all the delicate international questions which have arisen within the last few days between the Government of the United States and the great European belligerents. In view of that attitude and that evident intention of the administration, Mr. President, I will not be able to vote for the motion of the Senator from Florida nor to cast any vote which is favorable to this bill.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] not long ago delivered quite an exhaustive address in the Senate upon this question of the right of a neutral to purchase the ships of a belligerent. I have read it with a great deal of interest. The Senator from Montana is undoubtedly entitled to commendation and to the appreciation of the Senate for the information which his address contains and for the research which evidently he devoted to preparing it. It was a fine shot, and I agree with the Senator from Montana that it comes near the mark. The trouble about it, Mr. President, is that he was shooting at the wrong mark, and I want to demonstrate that.

It reminds me of an occasion not long ago when some observers were down on the Potomac River for the purpose of witnessing the results of shell fire. They were stationed in a small ship about a quarter of a mile away from the target. There was one of these expert gunners of the United States Navy on the old battleship *Tallahassee*, about 10 miles away, shooting at a target with a 12-inch gun. The shot weighed about 500 pounds; and almost every shot either struck the target or missed it by a very small margin, all except one, and that shot was just as good a shot, it was a demonstration of just as good marksmanship as any other; but the trouble was he shot at us instead of the target. He came about as near hitting us in that shot as he came near hitting the target in most of the others. It was a good shot, but the wrong target. I think that can be truthfully said about the very able address of the Senator from Montana. He was discussing something which is not involved in this bill. His speech was entirely irrelevant. The Senator from Montana collected a large number of authorities upon the proposition that a private person, a citizen of a neutral, if he is acting in good faith and the transaction is complete, can buy the ships of a belligerent.

Mr. President, that question is not involved in this bill. The entire proposition on the part of a large portion of this side of the aisle is based upon the distinction between the purchase by a private citizen and the purchase by the Government. Neither the Senator from Montana, nor anyone else who has discussed the proposition on that side, has offered us any light or any authority as to the right of a neutral Government, supposed to be friendly to both the belligerents itself, in its governmental capacity to buy a belligerent ship.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. POINDEXTER. In just a moment I will yield to the Senator from Montana. I desire to complete my proposition.

Mr. WALSH. I simply desire to ask a question.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will yield for a question in a moment, but not just now.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the Senator, in view of the fact that he has stated that the objection upon the other side was founded upon the fact that the purchase was to be made by the Government, instead of by a private individual, to inform this side of the Senate by whom on that side the idea was ever advanced that there was any difference in result when the purchase was made by the Government instead of by a private individual?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am advancing it now; and I have heard it suggested by a number of Senators on this side. I think the distinction is perfectly obvious——

Mr. WALSH. Will the Senator kindly——

Mr. POINDEXTER. I decline to yield further at this moment. I will yield later on; but I should like to complete the sentence.

It ought to be perfectly obvious to all the proponents of this bill that the objection to the bill is that it involves the Government in the proposed action. It involves governmental ownership, governmental implication in the war, governmental trading in belligerent ports. It is upon the incident of Government activity that almost every Senator who has spoken in opposition to this bill has based his opposition. I might name a number of Senators who have taken that ground. I happen to notice in his seat the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MCCUMBER], who very pointedly made this distinction, and, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] suggests, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] also made it, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to-day at an earlier hour made the same point. But, Mr. President, the point is obvious to everyone, and it is the point in one form or another about which the long controversy over this bill has been raging.

I do not want to detain the Senate as it is hastening on, with its nice regard for time, to a final disposition of this bill, except to make clear the basis of the objection which I attempted

to explain in the amendment which was tabled. A private citizen of a neutral country may do a great many things in transactions with belligerents which the neutral Government can not do. A short time ago we were advised that the President of the United States, in his apparent almost universal care and watchfulness over the acts not only of the Senate but of the private business of the country—and I say this with all respect and kindness toward the President, because I feel that way toward him—objected to some private citizen making a loan of money to one of the belligerents. That attracted some attention because it was a new doctrine in international law that a private citizen of a neutral country should not be allowed to make a loan of money to a belligerent. That he has a right to do so, and that it is not a violation of international law for him to do so, I venture to say is laid down by every authoritative writer upon that branch of jurisprudence, and it is also laid down by them all that, while the private citizen may do so, it would be a breach of neutrality for a neutral Government to make a loan of money to one of the belligerents.

A private citizen of a neutral may sell contraband goods to a belligerent, if he chooses to take the risk of capture by a belligerent war vessel; and international law recognizes no offense in his shipping arms and munitions of war to one of the belligerents. It is a privilege universally exercised by merchants of all countries when the circumstances call for it, but it is also laid down by every writer upon international law that, on account of the distinction between the action of a private citizen and the action of the Government, a neutral Government is not allowed to sell contraband goods, such as ammunition and guns, to a belligerent power; and it is perfectly obvious why there should be such a distinction.

In a great digest of international law based upon the declarations of the officers of the United States Government during the entire period of its existence, a most interesting and useful compilation by Mr. John Bassett Moore, formerly counselor of the State Department, there are cited a number of authoritative rulings upon this subject. After discussing the proposition, which seems to be recognized everywhere, that private citizens of a neutral may trade in contraband with a belligerent, he says:

> In 1872 a question was raised in the United States Senate as to certain sales of "ordnance stores" which had been made by the Government of the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1870, to persons who were said to be agents of the French Government. A committee was appointed to investigate the subject.

Then he goes on and discusses that question. I will not encumber the RECORD by reading the entire discussion, but he cites Hall, and says:

> Hall, referring to the above transaction, says: "The vender of munitions of war in large quantities during the existence of hostilities knows perfectly well that the purchaser must intend them for the use of one of the belligerents, and a neutral Government is too strictly bound to hold aloof from the quarrel to be allowed to seek safety in the quibble that the precise destination of the articles bought has not been disclosed."
>
> Perels, after stating the facts, remarks that they do not require comment.
>
> Snow expressed the hope that Mr. Carpenter's report "does not express the settled law of the United States upon this subject. It confounds the rights and duties of a neutral State with those of the private citizens of a neutral State, which is a very different matter."

Now, Mr. President, I propose to offer as an amendment to this bill by way of a substitute—I am not now offering it; I will withhold it for the present, but will offer it later—the following:

> That the President is authorized and directed to expend a sum not exceeding $50,000,000 for the construction of ships in American shipyards, preference being given to navy yards, and to operate said ships on such lines of trade, coastwise or foreign, as he may select, under such terms and regulations as he may determine: *Provided*, That such ships shall be constructed, as far as practicable, so as to be adapted for service both as naval auxiliaries and as merchant ships.
>
> SEC. 2. That the President may sell the bonds of the United States authorized for the construction of the Panama Canal, not to exceed the amount of $50,000,000, for the purposes of this act.

I see no difficulty, Mr. President, in finding ample constitutional authority for the Government to own and operate ships if we should decide upon that policy. I will not discuss now the question of Government ownership. In my opinion, it is the last resort in the administration and regulation of public utilities; but the time may come when we may have to adopt the last resort. If regulation shall have failed, I shall not shrink from Government ownership. The Government has constitutional authority to own and operate ships to carry the mail; it has constitutional authority to own and operate ships as auxiliaries to its Navy; it has constitutional authority to own and operate ships in the regulation of foreign commerce. It is not engaging in a private business. It proposes to operate them as a common carrier.

But what is proposed here? Mr. President, when it is presented to those who desire for one reason or another, for the building up of our Navy, for supplying this greatest defect, the want of transports and auxiliary vessels, that there should come under the flag of the Government a great fleet of vessels adapted in time of peace to use as merchant vessels, we find that the proposition is so framed that there will not be an American vessel created; that whatever fleet may be acquired will be disposed of in a very short time. The proposition of the President—and we must assume that this matter will be directed by the President—is that we should go into this enterprise for a short time, and when it becomes profitable dispose of it. The President's proposition is not that we should operate a line of ships to meet this great emergency in Europe, of which so much has been said on the other side. Reading from the President's message, he says:

> Therefore I propose another way of providing the means of transportation which must precede, not tardily follow, the development of our trade with our neighbor States of America.

That is the proposition of the President, that temporarily, in order to develop trade in America—in South America—we should put on a line of ships with that portion of the Americas; and that when it becomes profitable, when trade has been developed so as to encourage private enterprise, the Government shall go out of the business entirely and abandon its ships.

What is the bill which has been passed by the House and which is now pending before the Senate? It provides in express terms, in consonance with the policy of the President:

> SEC. 16. That two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President, the corporation and the shipping board shall turn over and transfer all vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act to the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right, with the approval of the President, to lease or charter any of such vessels not needed for naval or military purposes to any firm, individual, or corporation for use as merchant vessels.

What is the result of that plan as applied to the existing conditions of the merchant marine of the world to-day? A few days ago one of the Senators from Missouri, in a moment of intense feeling, rather intimated that everyone who opposed this bill was influenced by the Shipping Trust. Later on, in his cooler moments, he said—which of course was the fact—that he did not intend any such thing as that. But what must be the effect of this bill and this plan if carried out according to the intentions of the President and according to the express terms of the bill as it is now framed? It must be that the Government, if it produces any ships that are not now engaged in trade, would spend the money which is appropriated by this bill—thirty million or forty million dollars, or whatever the amount may be—for the ships of the Shipping Trust. If there is a Shipping Trust that controls all of the lines of commerce upon the Atlantic Ocean, where are you going to buy ships unless you buy them from the Shipping Trust? I want to show in a few moments, in a very brief way, that there is no idle ship for sale; that there is no ship that is not now fulfilling to its utmost capacity the needs of trans-Atlantic commerce between this country and Europe, except the interned vessels of the Hamburg-American and the North German Lloyd Lines, which are the holders and the owners of the vessels which belong to this combination which the Senator to whom I referred a moment ago dominates as the Shipping Trust.

If you are going to put a new ship into the commerce with Europe, one which is not now engaged in it, you would be compelled under this bill to take the interned, rusting, or rotting vessels of the Shipping Trust, and pay them the thirty or forty million dollars to be raised by the sale of United States bonds.

Then, what is the proposition? That when the so-called emergency has passed, when we settle down to normal conditions, we shall sell the ships back again to the Shipping Trust; and if this transaction is characterized by the ordinary lack of financial acumen that characterizes Government business transactions, we will sell them for a great deal less than we paid for them. That is the proposal.

I notice in a description of these interned vessels that they are vessels which have been used in the business of bringing to American shores the great hordes of the illiterate and laboring classes of certain parts of Europe; that is the chief business of these great steamship lines. Under the fortunes of war their ships are interned; their ships are rusting; their profits from carrying the steerage passengers who have crowded their ves-

sels heretofore are cut off. The same interests which opposed the literacy test in the immigration bill are the interests which own the interned vessels and which are now desirous of selling them to the United States if this bill should pass. It is quite a coincidence—purely a coincidence, of course—that the Senators who are loudest in talking about the Shipping Trust are now advocating a bill which can have no other effect than to benefit the Shipping Trust by relieving it of its interned ships. The same Senators who employed every parliamentary expedient that it was possible for them to employ in order to defeat the effort of putting into the law a literacy test, which the Shipping Trust thought, according to the documents which have been published and circulated in this city, would interfere with their lucrative business of bringing over hordes of immigrants from Europe to compete with the laborers of the United States and to lower the standard of living in this country. I say it is quite an interesting coincidence.

A good many different reasons are given for urging this so-called emergency measure. One of them is, as I said a moment ago, that the rates on grain are so high that the poor farmers of this country are suffering by reason of it. Why, Mr. President, for a good many years the farmers of the West have been raising and selling wheat for less than it cost them. During the last season, on account of the war in Europe and other circumstances, for the first time in many years they received a good price for their wheat; and those of them who have any wheat to sell are receiving a good price for it now, and there is every prospect that they will receive a good price for it next year.

There used to be a man in New York—I think his name was Jones—who advertised that he paid the freight. He had the nerve to publish a picture of his face in almost every newspaper in the country, blowing a horn, and accompanying the picture were the words: "Jones—he pays the freight." I have no doubt that was true, that he did pay the freight upon the commodities which he had for sale; but he did not mention the additional fact that he collected it back again from his customers.

Of course we are interested in reasonable freight rates to Europe. We know that in the necessities which are arising out of war, the need of food for their people, the need of arms and munitions of war for their armies, they are willing to pay the freight, and are paying it in the greater part. When I read the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, I notice the plaintive appeal which he makes for the passage of this bill in behalf of the farmers of this country who raise grain, cotton, and other commodities; and to show what the burden imposed upon the farmers by these high ocean freight rates means, he says that the greatest increases in rates and the heaviest taxes are imposed upon the products in which the American farmer is most concerned, namely, grain and cotton.

Why, Mr. President, in view of the wealth which has lately been brought to the grain growers of the West as a due reward for the labors of many years in which they received no profits, it seems strange that the Secretary of the Treasury, the chief advocate of this bill, should ask its passage as an emergency measure, as a new departure in the policies of this Government, declining to accept any amendment which would prohibit the purchase of the ships of belligerents in order to relieve the farmers and the grain growers of the country of the situation in which they are placed. I think I can speak for the grain growers, in part at least, in some sections, and I say for them that they are not in need at this particular time of assistance or sympathy on account of the prices which they are receiving for their grain, and I say further that if they did, if they were in need, they would receive no relief from this bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, would it disturb the Senator if I asked him a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. No; I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it not a fact that on the 6th day of February, 1915, wheat sold in the market at Chicago for $1.67 a bushel, and that on that very same day it sold in London for 60 shillings a quarter, or, in other words, $1.73 a bushel, making a difference of only 6 cents a bushel?

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator states that as a fact, I accept it as such.

Mr. GRONNA. I state that. That is a fact.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, there are various reasons given for this condition of ocean freights. One of them stated is that there is a trust or combine, and another one, rather inconsistent with it, is that there is not enough ship tonnage to supply the demand. Of course if it is due to a combine, the price would be put up regardless of the amount of tonnage, and if there is a shortage of ships the rates would go up whether there is a monopoly or not. Another one, entirely inconsistent with either of the foregoing, is that it is due to the uncertainties and to the dangers of war—to high war insurance. Now let us see what is the showing which was made by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce themselves as to these conditions, as to what is the cause for these high rates.

I hear it said that we need Government ships to carry cotton to Belgium and to Germany and to carry tobacco to Italy; that there are not enough ships to carry it, and therefore that the Government must furnish them. In the supplementary report of the Secretary of the Treasury of January 27 I find certain statements, which I wish to read. I assume that the information it contains, being furnished by them, is reliable. You always construe the testimony of a party which he himself furnishes as binding upon the party who furnishes it.

I find here a letter from Mr. Justus Ruperti, of New York, of G. Amsinck & Co., addressed to the agent of the United States Government, Mr. Charles Ferguson; and what is the information which it contains and which he transmits to the Senate of the United States, as to the need of ships for carrying the supplies of the United States to these various countries? It is so astonishing, in view of the great insistence upon this measure through all sorts of conditions and times and hours of the day and night, that I want to read a portion of it. He says:

> A line to Italy does not seem necessary, as the Italian Government has sufficient steamers, if only the United States Government will stand together with the Italian to protect these steamers from constant and in many cases unnecessary interference and delay.

Now, as to the need of a line to Denmark, Norway, and Holland, he says:

> There is at present also not sufficient freight open, but there should be enough steamers of those countries—which have fleets of their own—to insure a sufficient traffic, if the United States will assist those countries also in maintaining a service which is not unnecessarily hampered and interfered with by the warring nations, as is done at present, where a great many commercial transactions for supplying those neutral countries with their requirements, and which are in no way affected by any articles of contraband of war or supplies for the fighting nations, are hampered and stopped.

That is the showing which is made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and from it it appears that there is no need of ships in the trade with Holland, Scandanavia, and Italy, but that the high rates are due to interference with the operation of these ships by the war vessels of the belligerent nations.

Mr. President, where are we going to get ships? I will submit the amendment which I desire to offer after calling attention to this. This is also evidence which is furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce in the report to which I have just referred. On page 38 of that report there is printed an article—evidently which they approve—in which the fact is clearly and emphatically stated that every available vessel than can be operated in this trade is engaged in it at present, and that every shipyard which is capable of constructing ships is busy constructing ships.

> In every direction it will be seen that huge profits are to be made in the shipping industry. Nor are shipowners the only ones to feel the boom. The prosperity has created a demand for more ships. The price of steamers is rising daily, and shipbuilders are booking so many orders that their yards will be full for some years to come. Many shipowners also are selling off their old tonnage at prices which they never dreamed of before the outbreak of war.
>
> Investigation goes to show that the present boom has been of a much greater nature than during other wars. After the Franco-Prussian War, for instance, the boom did not set in until some 12 months after the declaration of peace. By this time the nations had time to turn around, and finance was readjusted. And then the rise in freights was more gradual. It was not until 1882 that the top of the rise appeared.
>
> It is interesting to note that the only rate approximating to present figures was paid to the *Ben Nevis*, a steamer with a carrying capacity of 7,500 quarters, or about 1,500 tons, which obtained 8s. 3d. per quarter from New Orleans to Rouen.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The shipment of wheat commences from the end of December, however, and already many vessels have been chartered, the rates of freight for steamers which will be ready to load in January and early February rising within the last month or two from 20s. per ton to 37s. 6d.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The beginning of the season has not seen a large number of steamers chartered to Italy, but it is now stated that, in addition to the enormous quantities which are being imported from North America, the Italian Government has purchased some 400,000 tons of wheat and oats from the Argentine Republic for shipment from the River Plata.

I read that for the purpose of demonstrating, by the testimony of the proponents of this bill themselves, that every available ship is engaged in this trade, and that even if the

Government can purchase them, they can not carry any more freight than they are carrying now; and as for the relief which could be experienced in freight rates by the operation of the small number of ships which the Government would acquire under this bill, even if it operates them in the European trade, it would be impossible for them to take care of more than a small portion of the enormous shipments which these reports indicate are now being made to Europe, and would have but a negligible effect upon rates.

The only remedy aside from building ships, Mr. President, is the purchase of these interned vessels. The result of that would be that vessels which have suffered the penalty of the superior navy of their adversaries and have been practically interned, which are forbidden from the sea, would be released; money would be spent in a foreign country for replacing them with other vessels, and the United States for its investment of thirty or forty million dollars would have a number of vessels rapidly growing obsolete, which it would be impossible for it to operate profitably in competition with more modern vessels equipped with new kinds of engines, Diesel engines, submerged flame combustion—internal combustion, as it is called—and all the improvements in the way of marine engines which are now being placed in vessels being constructed at the present time.

Mr. President, if we spend the amount of money provided in this bill it ought to be spent in this country. There never was a time in the history of the country when something that would afford occupation to the idle workmen of this country would be more opportune. Instead of undertaking to release the bound-up ships of a belligerent nation a bill should be passed, if we decide to embark upon this policy, which would restore the hum of industry to American shipyards and give some occupation to the navy yards of the United States, now being maintained at a great expense without any corresponding results.

However desirous we might be that the Government of the United States should build up an auxiliary fleet or should engage in the shipping business, I submit that it would be folly to undertake, as is proposed here, and insistently proposed, when we acquire the ships, to operate them in the midst of a flagrant war, when everybody knows that the destruction of one of them, even though covered by the thin subterfuge of a private corporation which is owned by the Government, would create a feeling in this country that would bring us perilously near the declaration of hostilities, either by our own or by some foreign Government.

I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, in amendment No. 3, the following:

That the President is authorized and directed to expend a sum not exceeding $50,000,000 for the construction of ships in American shipyards, preference being given to navy yards, and to operate said ships on such lines of trade, coastwise or foreign, as he may select, under such terms and regulations as he may determine: *Provided*, That such ships shall be constructed, as far as practicable, so as to be adapted for service both as naval auxiliaries and as merchant ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon laying on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to disagree to the amendments of the House and ask for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANSDELL, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I simply desire to give notice that in the morning, immediately after the completion of the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 19, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 18, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, for the enthusiasm which fills the breast of the man of convictions and impels to action because he feels down deep in his heart that he is in consonance with the eternal laws which Thou hast ordained. To him we owe a debt of gratitude which can not be expunged. Science, literature, art, government, religion are his contributions to the world. Give to us, we pray Thee, convictions, that we may be lifted out of self by enthusiasm into the higher realms of thought and action, exemplified in the life, character, and precepts of the Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

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

CORRECTION.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, on page 4441, roll call No. 80, I am recorded as not having answered to my name. I was present and answered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF A PENSION BILL.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday morning the House agreed to a conference report on pension bill H. R. 20562. The Clerk overlooked amendment 36, and it was not included in the conference report. I ask unanimous consent that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 36 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment 36 to the bill H. R. 20562 and agree to the same. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WEBB was recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the pension appropriation bill, which it is necessary to pass. I ask the Chair to recognize me for that purpose.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that the Chair had recognized me before the parliamentary inquiry by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. But I was on my feet and looking at the Speaker——

The SPEAKER. Well, a good many people look at the Speaker.

Mr. BARTLETT. Trying to catch the Speaker's eye.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had already recognized the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to lay before the House the bill H. R. 17869, now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. If this is going to take any considerable length of time, the Chair will ask the gentleman to withhold it for the present.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that it will take some time.

Mr. MANN. It will take considerable time.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, under Rule XXIV is it not in order and have we not the right to have the Chair lay before the House bills on the Speaker's table?

The SPEAKER. There is no doubt about that, but the Chair has a supervisory power over the proceedings of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to save time I will raise the question of consideration on the bill called up by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina can call his bill up to-morrow morning.

Mr. WEBB. Can I not call it up this afternoon immediately after the passage of the pension bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can call it up as soon as we get through with the pension bill.

Mr. WEBB. Then I withdraw my request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 19545. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 19376. An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARTLETT. 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 pension 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. CLINE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the pension appropriation bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the consumption of time in general debate, how much has been used on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has had 1 hour and 15 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois has occupied 35 minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration carries appropriations to meet our obligations growing out of the administration of the pension laws which have been enacted on account of services rendered in the Army and the Navy in the defense of our country, and I know of no appropriation made by Congress to which the people give a more cheerful assent.

I recall with pride that my first effort on the floor of this Chamber was in support of the passage of the Sherwood pension bill which as amended and finally enacted by Congress carried an increase of pensions to more than 400,000 Civil War veterans. I was among the first of those to advocate eliminating from the original Sherwood bill those provisions which excluded from its benefits veteran inmates of soldiers' homes and those veterans who were recipients of an annual income of a thousand dollars or more. The increases carried by this bill were in no instance unreasonable, and in the amount they no more than equaled the increase in cost of living since the passage of the dependent bill of 1890 and the subsequent old-age pension bill.

Since the Sherwood law has been passed more than 100,000 Civil War veterans have died. The grim reaper is fast depleting their ranks, and of the 35,000 who die annually thousands of them leave widows who under the existing laws are entitled to draw a $12 monthly stipend. Many other thousands have been found to be so necessitous and with claims so meritorious that they have been granted pensions by special acts of Congress. But there are other thousands who are just as necessitous, whose claims are as meritorious, who are heartlessly refused any relief by this great Government.

On the 7th day of last December I introduced into this House a bill to remove from existing law that limitation which excludes widows whose marriages to the old soldiers date subsequent to June 27, 1890. Since I introduced that bill I have learned that on the 23d of May last the Senate Committee on Pensions recommended for passage and reported out the Spanish-American War widows' bill, which was passed by this House more than a year ago, with an amendment eliminating the limitation to which I have just referred, and to bring the bar down to a date which will correspond to the time of the passage of the proposed amendatory legislation. Anyone who has made a casual investigation of our pension laws will readily concede the justice of the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Pensions. I have been informed that if it is allowed to be brought to a vote at this session of Congress it will pass the Senate by an overwhelming majority; but will it be allowed to come to a vote? The Department of the Interior has estimated that the passage of the proposed legislation to which I have just referred will necessitate an annual increase of appropriations for the next few years of $7,500,000, two million and a half of which will be needed on account of the deceased Spanish-American War veterans and $5,000,000 on account of the deceased Civil War veterans. Twenty-four years after the close of the Civil War, at a time when we numbered only about 63,000,000 people, when our estimated wealth was only about $62,000,000,000, Congress, recognizing the great hardships imposed upon widows to be compelled to prove that the death of the old soldier was caused by some disease or injury contracted or incurred in the service and desiring to treat them more liberally, inserted in the dependent act of 1890 a provision giving a pension of $8 a month regardless of the cause of death. The amount has since been increased to $12 per month.

In order to remove the incentive to marry an old soldier, sick and decrepit, whose time on earth in all probability would be short, for the purpose of securing a widow's pension, the Congress included among its beneficiaries only those widows who married the soldier prior to June 27, 1890. Twenty-four more years have now rolled around, and it seems to me to be unjust, and it certainly is unjust, that the widow who married the old soldier a few days or a few months or a few years prior to June 27, 1890, should now be entitled to a pension, while the widow who married the old soldier a few days subsequent to that time has no pensionable status under the law. One was as much the wife of the soldier as the other; one is as much the widow of the soldier as the other and just as much entitled to a pension as the other. It seems to me that 24 years is too long a time to allow such a gross inequality to remain in any pension law, especially a pension law for a great Nation like this, comprised of 100,000,000 people, whose wealth to-day is estimated at twice what it was at the time of the passage of the dependent act in 1890.

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

Mr. SWITZER. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman will find, if he was here the other day, when we passed——

Mr. SWITZER. I can not yield for a speech.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will give the gentleman the additional time. If the gentleman was here the other day, he will remember that the Pension Committee reported out at least a half dozen bills where the widow had married the soldier some time after that time and a pension was granted. I call attention to that fact because one of the very few cases I have was one of those, and I had not been able to get it considered.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I think I have just stated that Congress found many cases of old widows who were not entitled to a pension under the general law whose cases were so necessitous and meritorious that they have been given pensions by special act of Congress; but there are other thousands that are unprovided for, and it will be an utter impossibility to grant special acts for all of them.

There are thousands of widows who are to-day drawing pensions who lived with old soldiers as their wives a much shorter time than thousands of those who married the soldier since 1890. Can anybody give any valid reason why this outrageous discrimination should continue against the widow who lived as the wife of the old soldier for 5, 10, 15, or 20 years since 1890? I know that many will say that this is an inopportune time to press legislation which will necessitate an increase of appropriations to some extent for the next few years; but, with a deficit confronting us in our national revenues, this Congress has enacted a war tax to help build railroads in Alaska, and only yesterday this House voted to issue and sell millions of dollars of bonds to enable the Government to go into the shipping business—to go, you might say, buccaneering upon the high seas in quest of foreign trade—to make conquest of the marts of the world.

If we must contribute to a war-tax fund, I submit that the widows and the dependents of those who have defended the country in time of war ought to be allowed to share in the benefits of that fund, and I think that seven and a half millions of dollars is a reasonable demand for such purpose out of $100,000,000 of war-tax revenue. Of course, we have been told that this matter ought to go over until next winter, but we are

informed through the newspapers that this administration proposes to follow "the watchful-waiting policy" in looking after and caring for the deficit which now confronts us, and with an $80,000,000 deficit on top of a war tax next December, and with $35,000,000 of sugar revenue disappearing May 1 following on account of the automatic workings of the iniquitous Underwood tariff law, the same argument that is advanced to-day for postponing this legislation will again be advanced, and it will be accentuated one-hundredfold on account of the conditions to which I have just alluded.

Mr. Chairman, are we to go to the country at the close of this Congress with the proposition that there is no hope during this administration for any legislative relief for the unfortunate widows to whom I have just alluded? It will not do to say that there is no sentiment in this country for this legislation. The Civil War veterans throughout the whole Nation demand it. The Spanish-American War veterans demand it, and the Senate in the closing hours of the last Congress passed a bill, practically the same bill that the Senate committee reported out on the 23d day of May last. The President prevailed upon this House a day or two ago to pass a shipping bill for the moral effect it might have on the legislative body at the other end of the Capitol. It seems to me that it would be wisdom for the Committee on Invalid Pensions to consider my bill and report it out, or some similar measure, and secure its passage through this House in order to wake up the slumbering bill which the Senate committee reported out last spring.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. I desire to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with what changes or amendments were made in the Senate with regard to the bill they have just reported out with reference to Spanish-American War widows?

Mr. SWITZER. I do not know that I can accurately answer the gentleman; but I think they reported out practically the same bill that was passed by the House. The only difference is that they have recommended an amendment to that bill which takes care of the trouble of which I have just been complaining by giving pensions to widows of Civil War veterans who married soldiers since June 27, 1890, and bringing the bar down to date of the passage of this proposed legislation.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think I agree with the gentleman in the main, but I question whether we would want to bring it down quite as far as that. Perhaps, in common justice, if we should bring it down 10 years it would be about right; say 1900, as many needy and deserving widows of veterans of the Civil War who married the soldier after 1890 are entitled to this recognition.

Mr. SWITZER. There is an honest difference of opinion upon that proposition, but I think at least it ought to be brought down to 1910. I feel confident that the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House favors some relief of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will yield the gentleman five minutes, having occupied a portion of his time.

Mr. SWITZER. I will take just a moment more. Of course there is great pressure brought upon the members of the Invalid Pensions Committee by the leaders of the majority to practice rigid economy at this time. They hesitate to act, but we know and the people of this country know that appropriations are being made every day which the revenues of the next fiscal year will be unable to meet, and they know we propose some time in the future to either correct the blunders and mistakes made in the recent revision of the tariff laws or increase some of the existing rates of taxation or develop and enact some new tax machinery to take care of these appropriations and these deficits that we are making at this time. It seems to me it would be the part of patriotism, that it is our duty, to include that small increase of appropriation of seven and a half million dollars, although to some extent enlarging the deficits we know will be on hand at the convening of the next session of Congress. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

[Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND addressed the committee. His remarks will appear hereafter.]

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] 10 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has just given an illustration of unfair competition in business—the use of child labor by some manufacturers when other manufacturers, more scrupulous, will not resort to such methods. Unfair competition is the greatest curse to American business to-day. It means the law of the jungle, under which the strong and cunning and unscrupulous always overpower the weak. Because of that fact, unfair competition carried to its logical end advances concentration of wealth, control by the few, and monopoly.

One of the most dangerous methods of unfair competition is the price cutting of standard, trade-marked goods, which have in them the reputation of the maker and his purpose to make them products which will secure and retain the confidence of the buying public.

I am in favor of the doctrine that a manufacturer who has distinctly identified his product and fixed its value in the public mind should have the right to protect the sale of his merchandise, the good will of his trade, and the good name of his product by fixing the retail selling price of that product. I contend that the maintenance of the retail price is a necessary and legitimate business principle, that it means benefit to all and works injury to none.

This right of price maintenance for specialties and branded articles was recognized as a legal one until a few years ago. Recently, however, successive decisions of the United States Supreme Court have taken that right from the manufacturer, and an entirely new situation confronts business as a result of these judicial decisions.

For many years the decisions of the Supreme Court held to the general principle that a manufacturer could sell or refuse to sell his goods, as he saw fit. Then the tenor changed, and now the court has practically reversed its decisions and takes the opposite view.

The first case that ended in a decision questioning the right of the manufacturer to fix the resale price was that of the Bobbs-Merrill Publishing Co. against the R. H. Macy Co. of New York.

The Bobbs-Merrill Co. published a copyrighted book which was marked to sell at $1. The Macy company cut the price, and the publishing company brought suit for an infringement of copyright, on the ground that it had the right to fix the selling price.

The Supreme Court held that as Macy & Co. had made no express contract to sell the book for $1, it was not bound to maintain the price. The case was decided upon the facts, and thus did not touch on the question of previous agreement or the rights of manufacturers of patented articles. It was important, however, in that it showed the trend of mind of the court, which was followed out in later decisions.

The next case was that of the Miles Medical Co., which sought to maintain the retail prices of its proprietary medicines. The court decided that when a manufacturer sold his goods he parted with all his property rights and could not control the resale price. It was further held that such fixation of price was in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Still this case did not touch the question of patented articles, but the rights of the patentee was the question at issue in the next case, that of Henry versus the A. D. Dick Co.

The court upheld the agreement in this case, but Justice White dissented in a minority opinion—and this minority opinion became the majority opinion in the next case decided. This was the case familiarly known as the Sanatogen case, and the decision in it held the opposite view from that in the Dick case. The change of a single vote in the Supreme Court made the doctrine of price maintenance and contracts for price maintenance illegal and in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

The Waltham Watch Co. case followed, and the court repeated its decision that the patentee, while he might create selling agencies to control the price, could not fix the price after outright sale to the dealer.

This was the last case decided and finished the series of decisions in which the Supreme Court has completely changed its former attitude, and now holds that contracts for the maintenance of the price of copyrighted or patented articles are illegal, contrary to public policy, and void under the antitrust law.

The court makes three exceptions in its decisions, and declares that manufacturers can maintain prices, first, by establishing selling agencies dealing directly with the ultimate consumer; second, by reserving a substantial royalty from the retail price; third, by selling direct from the plant through personal application or mail orders.

That is the situation as it stands at present. Because of this judge-made law, made in some instances by one man only, manufacturers face entirely new and wholly unjust conditions in the transaction of business. Uncle Sam makes it a crime for anyone to sell a postage stamp at less than its face value. Price cutting on his brands is prohibited, but price-cutting dealers

are permitted and encouraged to depreciate the value of the goods of independent manufacturers without let or hindrance.

To remedy the injustices involved in this situation, an act of Congress is necessary, and such a measure, known as the Stevens bill, is pending in this Congress. It provides that maintenance of price shall be legal, provided that the producer does not have a monopoly of a general class of merchandise and is not a party to a combination for the purpose of securing such a monopoly. It provides that the price must be printed on a notice affixed to each article and that the producer must file with the Bureau of Corporations a statement giving the brand, trade-mark, and so forth, and the uniform price to wholesalers, retailers, and consumers. Articles may be sold for less than the uniform price when a dealer retires from business or becomes bankrupt, or if the goods are damaged or soiled. In such cases, however, the dealer must offer the manufacturer or vendor the opportunity of purchasing the articles at the price paid for them.

I submit that this measure should be passed. I believe that the right to fix the retail prices of standard brands of merchandise of fixed quality is a benefit to the manufacturer, dealer, and consumer.

It will protect the manufacturer from unfair competition, and will prevent trade pirates from ruining his business.

The manufacturer produces a standard article and gives it a trade-mark or trade name. He spends his money to make that name mean quality to the public mind. He has a right to be protected after he has made that individual trade name valuable, for it is his property, and his alone. Under the law today he may collect damages from those who steal it from him and use it for themselves.

But the value of his trade-mark is not alone in the name or in its form or color or shape. It is more than a certain kind of box or label. It is a symbol to the public of a certain quality of goods and the character of the concern that makes them. Any practice, therefore, that injures the article in the public mind and damages the reputation of the firm is as unfair as the theft of a trade-mark itself. It should be equal ground for a suit for damages.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. WEBB. Does the bill to which you refer apply only to trade-mark goods?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It refers to all standard identified goods which are not monopolized, and its purposes is clearly expressed in the bill itself.

Mr. WEBB. That is, all goods that have been well advertised?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. All goods that have been identified by the manufacturer until they have a certain value in the public mind.

Mr. WEBB. Who is to decide that question?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The decision must be made, under this bill, by the manufacturer when he gives his trade-mark to the Bureau of Corporations, together with his uniform price to the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer.

The manufacturer of such an article must put real value into his goods and he must make the public want his article. He individualizes it and gives it a name to be known by. He must establish a general market and advertise constantly the merits of his goods. He advertises the price, for he must convince the public that it is worth the price asked and persuade the people to go to a store and pay that price.

This is the manufacturer's most valuable asset, and upon it depends his business. But after he has made his article mean a certain value and quality and has created a demand from the public the price cutter begins his attack. In fact, it is because of this value and this demand for a particular article that leads the price cutter to select it. The public knows the value of the article and may be fooled through a low price on it into buying articles of which they do not know the value. The manufacturer is penalized for having made a uniform, individualized, known value, and known quality product.

The price cutter takes this widely known article and reduces its price below cost. He does this, not for the purpose of selling more of them, for the fewer he sells the better he is satisfied and the less he loses. He wishes to attract customers on the strength of this bargain price so that he may sell other goods at a greater profit than that on the standard goods. He seeks to create the impression that all his goods are sold at prices proportionately as low as that on the article whose value is well known to the public.

Now, it is obvious that other dealers must meet this cut price if they are to continue on an equal plane with this competitor. They cut the price to an equal or lower figure, but at the same time they lose all desire to sell the article on which they are forced to lose money. That strikes a fatal blow at the manufacturer, for his market is destroyed and he is helpless to prevent it. Cheaper substitutes are sold instead of his article and dealers in time refuse to carry his goods at all. His advertising and his efforts in every way to make his trade-mark mean a certain price and a certain value are rendered useless through the practices of price-cutting trade pirates.

I consider that such unfair competition is as bad as outright theft of trade-marks and brands and should be as severely frowned upon by the law. It is a case of stealing a man's good name, which, as Shakespeare said, is worse than stealing his purse. The manufacturer's name must mean value or he can not build a permanently paying business. That value is an asset as valuable as his plant and merchandise. I contend that he has a right to ask and to receive protection from those who would rob him of this value. That protection can only come through the right to maintain a uniform selling price to the buyers of his product.

I believe in the referendum, in submitting matters of public welfare to the people and abiding by their decision. When a manufacturer refers his case directly to the people and gets a favorable vote from the people in their demand for his product, I believe he should have the benefit. If he does not get a favorable decision he goes out of business, and I am opposed to putting him out of business because he does get a favorable decision. And that is exactly what price cutting means to the manufacturer who has made a standard article and created a public demand for it.

But I go further than the manufacturer and contend that uniform selling prices of standard branded goods will benefit the retailer also.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have only 10 minutes, but I will yield.

Mr. NORTON. Has the gentleman received very many demands from his constituents, outside of retailers, for this bill?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have had demands from manufacturers, retailers, and consumers.

Mr. NORTON. Very many of them?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have received demands from a number of consumers, and I will take that phase up in a moment. I believe it is as fair to the consumer as to the retailer and manufacturer. If it were against their interests I would not be for the proposition.

Mr. WEBB. Does the gentleman indorse the principles enunciated in the Dick against Henry case? Do you believe that the patentee ought to go as far as that decision said he had a right to go?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I believe the patent question can be decided on another line entirely. If a manufacturer has a monopoly, this bill provides that the strong arm of the Government shall break the monopoly, for private monopoly and liberty can not live together. The argument that the gentleman refers to, and that is in his mind, is that this bill is favorable to monopoly. It is not a help to monopoly. It is a means of breaking monopoly, because price cutting, not price maintenance, leads to concentration of power, and power in the hands of a few, and monopoly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the bill define a monopoly?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The bill goes to the Sherman antitrust law for the definition of monopoly, as I understand it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How is it to be ascertained as to how the goods shall go on the market under the monopoly clause of the bill?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Whenever a manufacturer or a combination of manufacturers has a substantial monopoly of a certain general class of merchandise, then of course that does not come within the scope of this bill, and the antitrust laws operate. But let me return to the retailer. Cutthroat competition never did and never will help the business of the average dealer.

I will admit that this may not hold good as regards mail-order houses, department stores, and so forth, because their interests seem to lie in the direction of putting the little merchant out of business and taking his trade. I am not anxious to help them do that and I am willing to let them take care of themselves, and without doubt they are perfectly able to do it. I take my stand on the side of the little corner store against the great combinations that threaten to wipe it out of existence. I stand with Littlefellow & Co. against the Soak-em-good mail-order houses. I consider the neighborhood store a necessity

and I want it to have a fair chance, no more and no less, to grow greater and finer.

The large semimonopolistic retail establishments want the right to enforce cutthroat competition because they know that in such a jungle warfare the strong and cunning always triumph. Mr. Straus, of Macy & Co., when testifying before a congressional committee last year, was asked what would happen to the retailer of small financial ability if the consumers are led by cut prices to patronize large department stores and mail-order houses. He replied that the little retailer would either "wake up or go to sleep." He was right in the last phrase, for the little retailer would go to sleep permanently. He would be a victim of the knock-out drops of unfair competition. If he is not rich enough and powerful enough to compete on such an unfair basis with these gigantic combinations he must go out of business, and Mr. Straus and the others are in favor of putting him out and seeing that he never comes back.

Under fair conditions, however, the little retailer can compete with and outdistance the big mail-order houses. He can not do it on cut prices on standard goods, for the big establishments can lose money on a few articles and make it up on others in their large and varied stocks. They make it up, rest assured of that, for it costs them far more to do business than the little dealer, and the large dividends paid by the great mail-order houses show how profitable their dealings are in the aggregate.

It has been proven by sworn testimony that the big mail-order houses and department stores do business at a much greater cost than the small retailer. They have higher expenses and must make greater margins on goods sold. It follows that they can not afford to cut the cost of any article, and if they do they are compelled to make more than a fair profit on other goods sold. They use certain standard articles as "pullers-in" in order to tempt the people to buy unfamiliar and unnamed goods at unjust prices.

Prof. Neystrom, professor of economics in the University of Wisconsin, before the Judiciary Committee of the House on March 19, 1914, showed that the average cost of doing business to the small retailer is between 15 and 18 per cent; to the large mail-order houses it is from 27 to 30 per cent; and to large department stores 30 per cent and more.

These immense establishments must make a greater average profit than the small retailer, but they are able to destroy the market for the small dealer on every standard, trade-marked article on which they cut prices.

The history of the United Cigar Stores shows the effect of price cutting. In 1912, 1,252 cigar manufacturers went out of business, and in 1913, 716 cigar manufacturers went to the wall. All over the country, in every town and city invaded by these stores the retail tobacco dealer was ruined. In New York City 90 per cent of the retail dealers have been forced out of business by this combination. The small dealer must handle standard brands in order to satisfy his customers, but he can not afford to cut them below cost as do the United Cigar Stores. He can not carry the large stock of unknown brands on which to recoup his losses.

The same situation obtains in the drug business, the grocery business, and other lines. Half of the business of the smaller stores in these lines is in standard, trade-marked goods. If the market is destroyed by reckless price cutting, the little merchant must go out of business. He is between the devil and the deep sea. He can not meet the figures of the price cutter, and if he does not, he loses his customers.

Systematic price cutting was an invention of the Oil and Tobacco Trusts, which sold their products below cost in certain localities in order to crush competition. It is now being used by great mail-order houses and department stores to crush the small dealer. Public policy and the common good demand that this power be taken from them. It can only be done through the right of price maintenance, which will prevent the use of their unfair methods of competition.

Price maintenance does not mean less competition between retailers, it means less unfair competition. There is a competition in the quality of goods and in service just as much as in price. Retailers who sell the same goods from the same factories should not compete in prices. The competition should be between goods of the same class made in other factories.

That puts the competition on a fair basis, on price, quality, and service instead of solely on ability to stand losses until a competitor is driven out of business. It gives the retailer the reward of enterprise, efficiency, and honesty, instead of forcing him to descend to the level of trickery of trade pirates or go out of business.

The Stevens measure permits the retailer in case of clearance sales, retirement from business, bankruptcy, and so forth, to sell below the uniform price, provided he offers the goods to the manufacturer at the price paid for them. This permits the sale of damaged, soiled, or shopworn goods and protects both the manufacturer and the retailer at the same time.

But there is a still more important phase of this question. The maintenance of prices means benefit to the consumer. If it benefited the manufacturer and the dealer at the expense of the buyer, I should be opposed to it. The greatest good of the greatest number should be the sole purpose of legislation, and every American citizen is a consumer, while but a comparatively few are manufacturers and merchants.

But price cutting of standard articles, while ruinous to the maker and seller, never has been and never will be of permanent advantage to the buyer. In the end it adds to the cost of living and injures the entire body politic. It is a bad thing for America to have its labor or any part of its labor paid less than a fair wage. It is just as bad for America to have its business or any part of its business conducted at less than a fair profit.

When a purchaser goes into a store for goods, he desires to get the most value for his money with the expenditure of the least time and effort. The cut-price system is based on the old doctrine, "Let the buyer beware." It is a return to the old days when the purchaser was forced to make the rounds of the stores, compare the goods and the prices, and then, after finding the articles desired, haggle with the merchant until a price was agreed upon between them. That meant that the chances were all in favor of the consumer being cheated. He was dealing with a man who knew more than he did. The buyer could not possibly have the knowledge necessary to compare all kinds of unmarked merchandise and fix their value, and, as a result, swindling him was easy. Price tags meant nothing, and the entire matter of shopping was a lottery, pure and simple.

The introduction of standard, trade-marked articles, advertised and proven, changed the system of "Let the buyer beware" into one of "Protect the buyer."

When A. T. Stewart, three generations ago, revolutionized retail business by his one-price-in-plain-figures system, he took the first great step in that direction. With one stroke he abolished the system of haggling in his own store. He cut down the time required for shopping in his store and reduced the number of salesmen required, for the customers could see the prices for themselves. In this way he cheapened the cost of selling, reduced the price of goods, and made a tremendous success of his business.

But that only applied in one store. The system of standard, trade-marked goods sold in all stores at one price was a still greater step toward fairer and better merchandising. Under it the customer can go into any store at any time and be sure of securing exactly what he wants and at the same price always.

All fair-minded observers must admit that the practice of selling unnamed goods from bulk packages gives unnumbered opportunities for cheating customers. A committee investigating conditions in New York City found cheating rampant among stores selling goods to the poorer class of customers. They found that the same coffee from the same sack was sold at 25 and 37 cents a pound, and that the same tea from the same chest sold at from 35 to 70 cents a pound. This system may be carried on by dishonest dealers without fear of detection, for there is no way for the buyer to distinguish the goods from one day of purchase to the other.

Miss Laura A. Cauble, a social worker in New York, testifying before the Judiciary Committee of the House as to her work in connection with the distribution of a fund donated by a wealthy New York woman for the relief of some 8,000 families of New York poor, said:

> The committee having the distribution of this fund found that it was spending an abnormal amount of money for the amount of nourishment the food we purchased contained, and an investigation was begun to determine how we could increase the purchasing efficiency of the money at our disposal.
>
> I obtained samples of staple supplies at both small corner grocery stores and "chain stores" with a view to having them analyzed and obtaining bids on this basis from dealers.
>
> We found three grades of tea—one at 40 cents, one at 60 cents, and one at 90 cents. Analysis demonstrated that all this tea came from the same chest, and the bid we received on this grade of tea was 22 cents a pound. Coffee, we found, was sold in the same way, and in the "chain stores" we found an average of 10.8 per cent short weight.
>
> The larger stores, too, were cutting prices on standard goods, but their other supplies showed a general inferiority.
>
> On the same blocks with these larger stores the small stores were being forced to cut on standard goods.
>
> I investigated 526 small shops in one year, and during that time price cutting in the larger establishments either forced the sale or the failure of 116 of these smaller stores.

The consumer is protected by the system of standard, trade-marked, one-price, one-value goods. He tries the article and finds it to be satisfactory at the price asked. That gives him a standard with which to judge other articles in the same class, and he can be less easily cheated in the future.

He finds that he can go into any store and purchase the article without loss of time and be sure that he is getting exactly what he desires for his money. He finds that he can even telephone or send a child to the store and be sure that he will not be overcharged or get something different from what he desires.

If we were to go back to the old system of unidentified, unmarked goods, where every purchase is a gamble with the shopkeeper, the consumer would be hurt worst of all by such return.

Price cutting on standard articles means exactly that return in the last analysis. It means making a nation of deceitful bargainers, putting a premium on cheating practices, and placing a handicap on the honest dealer, while injuring the buyer from every angle. It forces the lowering of quality in all articles and the substitution of articles of a poorer grade for the standard articles driven from the market. The retailer must make a profit to stay in business; if he can not make it on some articles, he must increase his profits on others. The consumer must pay more for other articles when he purchases certain goods below cost. The Supreme Court of Washington stated that clearly, in a decision upholding price maintenance, when it said:

> It is a fallacy to assume that the price cutter pockets this loss. The public makes it up on other purchases.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take up the thought of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], who seems to infer, judging by his questions, that this bill would give a monopoly privilege. Now, if that were true, we could not defend a bill like this; but it is not true.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there, just to make the question plain?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. I cite the Dick case, where a man had a patent on an inking machine. It was contended that he could not use other ink, not patented, on that machine. I do not think the American people will stand for that sort of thing, because there you not only give a man a monopoly that his patent gives him, but require something that amounts to a monopoly that his patent does not give him.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is what I had in mind. The fact that a manufacturer may have a patent monopoly is entirely aside from this proposition, because if there is a monopoly the law against restraint of trade applies and is clearly intended by this measure.

If price maintenance meant monopoly I should oppose it with every power I possess, for nothing harms the public like private monopoly, and the sooner its power to control markets and exploit the people through unbridled power is curbed the better it will be for the Nation.

But it is price cutting that means concentration of power and restraint of trade. It is more than that—it is a destroyer of trade. It gives the big combinations the power to drive small competitors out of business, and when they are destroyed the big establishments have the public at their mercy. Price cutting is the weapon of the seekers of monopoly in the retail trade of the country just as it was the weapon of the Oil and Tobacco Trusts in their efforts to crush out all competition.

Price maintenance will prevent unreasonable prices instead of making them more probable. Fair and honest competition between manufacturers of similar goods prevents any one of them from fixing and securing an unreasonable price. If he does fix an unreasonable price his competitor steps in and takes the business. Give us fair competition and we can safely allow the independent manufacturer to fix what price he will. There is all the difference in the world between controlling the market on all safety razors, for instance, and controlling the market on a single razor. If all the makers of razors should combine for the purpose of monopolizing the entire market they then should be dealt with by the strong arm of the Government, for no private monopoly can be tolerated safely in a free country.

But price maintenance has for its very purpose the prevention of restraints of trade and the practices which suppress competition and make monopoly possible. It is directly in line with the spirit of the Sherman antitrust law.

The trusts which do fix prices do not injure the public because they can fix prices, but because they have the power of monopoly to fix the price at an unjust figure. I am eternally opposed to the combinations of capital which are able to monopolize the market and fix the price they choose for their products; but I contend that the fixing of the retail price by independent manufacturers will prevent monopolies and chains of stores controlling ever wider fields of action.

The monopolist is not interested in a measure for price maintenance. The public needs his product and must come to him, and the merchant can go nowhere else. The manufacturer of unlimited capital is not interested in this measure, for he can establish a chain of stores across the country to handle his own goods and have the approval of the Government.

It is the independent manufacturer without a monopoly, without unlimited capital, but who has originality and enterprise and ability, who asks a square deal in business, and I believe he has a right not only to ask for it but to receive it.

The fight on this measure is clear-cut and distinct. The contending forces are price cutting and substitution on one side and on the other standard merchandise and the one-price system.

It is the same fight as was witnessed years ago over railroad rates. In the days of unfair and unrestricted competition in the railroad business there was a riot of dishonesty and carnival of corruption. Rebates, free passes, cut rates, and special privileges were the weapons used, and they built up a few monopolies on one hand while they crushed countless honest dealers and manufacturers on the other. Then the American Government stepped in and said that the rates should be the same to all, and fixed on a fair basis. No one to-day would wish to see a return to those piratical, jungle days of cut-throat competition, although there was bitter opposition at the time from the railroads, who were being ruined by the conditions.

I am for the one-price, square-deal-to-everybody system in merchandising. Not many decades ago a man could not sell his good will in business and agree to retire for a certain period. A famous English judge once declared that a certain man who sold his good will and agreed to stay out of business for six months was guilty of a restraint of trade and would be fined if brought into court.

To-day it is recognized that a man can sell his good will and that it is a recognized asset in his business. We will soon recognize, too, that there is such a thing as character in goods, expressed through an individual mark or brand, which means a certain value in the public mind. Justice demands that makers of these goods be given protection from unscrupulous trade pirates.

Fair play means fair trade. The fixed, uniform, and fair price to all is for the best interests of the buying public, the independent dealer, and the independent manufacturer. Congress should make every effort to end this unfair competition and assure a square deal to every party concerned in a merchandising transaction.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I can use some time on my side.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I can use some here. I yield 30 minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill on December 31 I took occasion to discuss national finances and the growing deficit in the Treasury and to admonish the Democrats to cease from attributing the deficit to the European war. At that time I had before me the October summary of foreign commerce issued by the Department of Commerce, which gave the figures for the first 10 months of the calendar year 1914. I used unofficial figures for November and estimates for December in computing the imports and customs revenues for the year. I then pointed out that the falling off in customs revenue was in the main due to lower tariff and not to decrease of imports.

That was the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama in the closing debate on the conference report on the bill. That statement was based on the Treasury figures and the statement which he printed in the RECORD. So it was no guess. The Underwood law was intended to produce $249,000,000 a year, or from $70,000,000 to $80,000,000 less than the old tariff act which it superseded. It is also pointed out that it came within about $6,000,000 of doing so. In my former remarks I said that, estimating the imports for December at the same as they were in November, the total imports for 1914 would exceed by a few dollars the imports for the previous year. But the official figures now show that the falling off for December was more than was estimated, and that the total imports for 1914 were $3,320,479 less than for the previous year.

In 1913 there were nine months of time under the Payne law and three months under the Underwood rates, so that we did not get the full benefit of the rates of the Payne law for the whole year, but we collected in 1913 $310,551,961 in customs revenues, while in 1914, under the Underwood rates, we collected $241,384,619, a falling off of $69,167,342.

Now, I want you to note this particularly. In my former remarks I said that the actual receipts would fall but five or six million dollars below the $249,000,000 estimated by Mr. UNDERWOOD for the fiscal year 1915. They actually fell off $7,000,000, so that I was not far out of the way, because, as I have shown here, they were $241,384,619. But the whole falling off in customs receipts between the two years was more than $69,000,000, whereas the falling off in the total imports was only $3,000,000. It is plain that you could not lose $69,000,000 in customs receipts from a falling off in total imports of $3,000,000. So that it stands absolutely established by the official figures that it is the lower rate of duty under the Underwood law and not the smaller imports that is the cause of the smaller income.

I read from this summary, which shows that in December the average ad valorem rate of duty based on total imports was 11.06 per cent. During 1912, the last year in which the Payne rates were in full force, we collected on the average on total imports 18.14 per cent. During 1914, the calendar year that is just passed, we collected, according to this official statement, 13.62 per cent. Now, how can anyone contend that we could collect as much money when we collected 13 per cent as when we collected 18 per cent? The making of such a claim passes comprehension. It must be plain to any fair-minded person who wants to think that they have attributed the falling off in customs revenues to the wrong cause.

The President, in his address to Congress asking for the war tax, as he called it, referred to August, 1913, and said that the falling off in revenue was ten and one-half million dollars. He made a mistake of about a million dollars, but, as it was against his own side of the contention, I presume it was purely accidental, but it shows carelessness. Now, the total imports for August, 1913, were $137,651,553, and for August, 1914, they were $129,767,890; mark you, only a decrease of $7,883,663.

Upon that falling off in the total amount of imports—that is, the decrease of imports of $7,000,000—the President asked us to believe that we lost $11,500,000 of revenue. On that theory he must have proposed to put a duty on the goods that we did not get of about 150 per cent. Of course no Democrat would propose such duties as that. In other words, the amount of imports for August, 1914, were $7,883,660 short of August, 1913, but assuming there had been no decrease, that the imports for the two months had been the same, we would have collected 13.62 per cent on the $7,883,660, or $1,073,754. Give the war credit for the whole decrease in imports that month and you account for $1,073,754 falling off in customs receipts due to war, and the other $10,429,835 of the August shortage must be due to the lower rate. In other words, the decrease of imports (war) explains the loss of one million customs revenue in August last, and the low rate of the Underwood law explains the loss of ten millions. The war was a minor factor, and the low rate and large free list was the main factor.

This disposes of the contention that the war was either the sole or the main cause of the reduced customs revenue. I do not think that now, after the campaign excitement is over, that even the President, strong though he may be, would repeat the assertion in his address, to wit:

> I need not tell you to what this falling off is due. It is due in chief part, not to the reductions recently made in the customs duties, but to the great decrease in importations; and that is due to the extraordinary extent of the industrial area affected by the present war in Europe.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question only.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman please give us the total income for the fiscal year 1913–14?

Mr. STEENERSON. The total income?

Mr. FOWLER. The total revenue.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am not talking about total income. I am talking about customs revenues, which is what the President referred to in his address. That would be another speech. I have got one, but I am not delivering that speech now.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I will not yield further. These figures are quite complicated, and I desire to finish the argument. I said that it would not be fair to the Democrats to say that the war did not have some effect upon customs receipts, but what are they? How much has the reduced importations reduced the revenues? I have figured out the difference between the imports for each month, August, September, October, November, and December, 1914, according to the official figures, and I find that during those five months since the beginning of the European war the value of the total imports decreased $134,936,427. But supposing that those imports had come in and that we had collected on them the same rate that we collected on what actually came in? Then you gentlemen who supported the Underwood tariff law ought to be satisfied. If there was no falling off in imports, then the war could not be the reason, for you say the war stops imports. Now, if there had been no falling off, and we had actually collected 13.62 per cent, the duty that we actually collected on what came in, then whatever falling off there was in customs receipts was due to the lower tariff rates. That was the test the President made, the difference between the total imports for August, 1914, as compared with 1913. If we apply the same test to the five months since the war up to the beginning of this year and give the war credit for the whole decrease we find this result. The total decrease for those five months in the value of imports was $134,936,427. But if those goods had come in, the duty at 13.62 per cent would have amounted to $17,892,570. That is every cent that you can honestly claim to have been the deficit caused by the European war in the falling off of imports last year as compared with 1913. But what does $17,000,000 amount to in this deficit? Why, I have here the Treasury statement for February 15. It shows that where you started out with nearly $150,000,000 balance in the general fund, there was on February 15 a net balance of $45,433,746.06. And over on this page I find net excess of all disbursements this day over receipts, $1,231,376; and for the first 15 days of this month of February, 1915, the excess of expenditures over receipts was $11,586,843. In the corresponding month of 1914 the excess was $6,686,571. For the fiscal year 1914 to this date the excess of expenditures over receipts, $100,757,386.75. You have in six and a half months spent more than $100,000,000 in excess of the receipts of the Government. That is only for the first seven and a half months of this fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1914 you spent $45,793,482 more than the receipts. At this rate you will exhaust the forty-five million in the general fund inside of four months.

Now, assuming in fairness, as I say, that you lost $17,000,000 in customs revenue the last five months of 1914 by reason of the decrease of imports, it would not help you out very much on a deficit of $100,000,000. But, as I have shown already, take it for the whole calendar year, the decrease of imports is only $3,000,000, and if it was not for the lower rates and your larger free list you would hardly have lost anything in the customs revenue as compared with the year before.

Now we come to another cause. I do not know how true it is, but the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] the other day, in the debate oi the naval bill, said that in addition to the deficit in ordinary expenditures there will be a deficit in the Post Office Department, due to the falling off of postal rates, of at least $14,000,000 unless conditions change very much. That condition, he said, had been brought about to a large extent by reason of the war in Europe.

Here is the same scapegoat, that you have been working for lo! these many months, coming into the postal affairs. You have all read the Scripture of how they used to put the sins of the people on the poor goat and send him out into the wilderness. You have been using the European war as that kind of a goat, and this is the last attempt.

The gentleman from Alabama said:

> In addition to that—the deficit in ordinary expenditures—there will be a deficit in the Post Office Department, due to a falling off of postal receipts, of at least $14,000,000, unless conditions change very much. Of course, that condition has been brought about to a large extent by reason of the war in Europe. Our foreign mail service is not paying the revenues to the Government that it has paid in the past, which is natural, and the cost of the service is practically the same. So that as this condition faces the country and the House, unless you are willing to retrench in expenditures, or unless, when the next Congress meets, you are willing to increase the taxation, you are going to face a deficit in the Treasury of something like $35,000,000.

Now, here is the majority leader by main strength bringing in an imaginary postal deficit and attributing that to the war. He was not satisfied with the former record in laying the general deficit to the European war, but he says there is a great profit in the foreign mail and the foreign mail is decreasing.

What are the facts? I have here before me the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, and this story about a great profit in the foreign mail is an old one, so old that its whiskers reach clear to the floor. [Laughter.] It used to be put forward in Republican administrations as an argument for a subsidy to steamship companies, because they said that we made so much money on the foreign mails that we could afford to spend a few million dollars for subsidies. I am sorry now that we did not do so, for it might have avoided the present demand to tax the people for $40,000,000 to aid a merchant marine.

Mr. MADDEN. There has been a balance against it for several years, has there not?

Mr. STEENERSON. That depends on how you figure the matter. The Postmaster General in his report says that the net cost of the Foreign Mail Service was $3,565,323.89; and then, on another page, he says the amount collected as postage prepaid by the sender and as deficit postage collected of the addressees in this country amounted to $11,872,074.98. But he says the amount of mail to Canada and Mexico is estimated at so much, and of course that did not go by foreign steamship. That leaves $8,222,000. Of course that would leave a profit of about four and a half million dollars. But remember that under this calculation there is no account taken whatever of the shore expenses.

Under the International Postal Union rule every country collects all the postage upon articles mailed within its boundary and keeps it, and if there is any short postage on incoming mail they collect that and keep it. Each country pays the transportation for the outgoing mail—not only the inland cost, but the ocean cost—and they do not charge anything for the transportation of the incoming mail. The report shows that there were 25,000,000 pounds of foreign mail. Now, if we estimate the incoming mail at 20,000,000 pounds—and that is conservative—we would have 45,000,000 pounds of mail transported from the ocean inland and distributed to the addressees, and we would have collected on mail going to foreign countries, holding that, too, without any charge for it. If you charge at the rate of 8 cents a pound, which Postmaster General Hitchcock estimated it would cost to handle second-class matter, we would have $3,600,000 to be charged to foreign mail, which, deducted from the alleged profit, leaves just about $1,000,000 actual profit. If the volume of foreign mail has decreased one-fifth, the loss would only be $200,000. But it is not correct to say that if there was a falling off it would be all loss, because the expenses would be less if it fell off.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not a fact that the postal receipts have fallen off largely since the 1st of August, and that there is a deficit from the 1st of August up to the present time?

Mr. STEENERSON. No, sir; I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken. I telephoned to the Post Office Department yesterday, to the office of the Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Dockery, and they said that the report for the quarter ending September had not been received, and that there were no official figures whatever to be obtained.

Mr. LLOYD. You may not be able to obtain official figures, but there can be no question of the fact that there has been a positive reduction in receipts since the 1st of August.

Mr. STEENERSON. That may be, but it is not due to falling off in the foreign mail. It is due to the depression of business which is general throughout the country, due to a Democratic administration. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no better index to the business of the country than the volume of the first-class mail. You can find that in the administrations all the way down from Lincoln to the present time. During the time of protection there has been prosperity and a large volume of mail, and it is the best index. Whenever the shadow of free trade has come upon the country under Democratic administrations the postal receipts have fallen off. [Applause on the Republican side.] I expect they will fall off, but this story of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that it is due to the falling off of the foreign mail is 99 per cent moonshine. I telephoned to the steamship office, the American Line——

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

Mr. STEENERSON. In a minute—and they said their load had greatly increased in the trans-Atlantic mail. I have a letter here from the officials to show that the decrease in the foreign mail is but a bagatelle. I will print it. But suppose it was all wiped out, it would not account for a $14,000,000 deficit or a $4,000,000 deficit or a $2,000,000 deficit or a $1,000,000 deficit in the postal receipts.

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

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to grant me more time.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that during the last fiscal year the postal receipts largely increased?

Mr. STEENERSON. I believe they did increase some, but not very much.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that it resulted in a surplus?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, that surplus is another fictitious thing. That surplus is not a genuine surplus. The volume of postal business increased because you increased the weight of the mail by lifting the amount to be carried by parcels post up to 50 pounds. Of course, if you are going to do business at a loss, you can increase the receipts, but you increase the expenditures twice as fast as you do the receipts. [Applause on Republican side.] That is not the way we do in the Republican administrations. When we have prosperity and lots of first-class mail, upon which we make a large profit, we show large postal receipts as compared with previous years.

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

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true——

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, the gentleman is taking up my time, and I decline to yield. Well, I will take that back. I will yield that he may ask me a question.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that the parcels post results in a profit to the Government?

Mr. STEENERSON. There may be a small profit on some of it, but on the most of it there is a loss. You know very well that is what is the matter with the Post Office Department today. The Postmaster General knows that his orders increasing the weight of mail has so overburdened the transportation companies that if he pays the present rate there will be a deficit. That is what is the matter with him.

Mr. LLOYD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon——

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman knows very well. He was on the commission that investigated it, and he knows very well that the fear of this administration is that they can not continue to pay the transportation rates under the old weights of four years ago; that very soon there will be new weighings after the volume has been increased by large packages in the parcel post, and that as a result of that the gentleman's commission and the department have proposed to pay by space instead of by weight. That is the secret of that proposition. I voted for it because I wanted to help the Government as much as I could if it might be severe on the transportation companies.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman certainly wishes to be fair to the Post Office Department?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do.

Mr. LLOYD. And the Post Office Department unquestionably gives out the information that the parcel post has resulted in a profit to the Government.

Mr. STEENERSON. How can they give such information out when they have not got it? [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] They tell me that they have not got it. I telephoned them yesterday and they said that Gov. Dockery was absent, but they said also that they could not give any such information because the reports had not been received.

Of course, if they give Democrats their confidence and give them information that other members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads can not obtain, I can not help it. I have to go according to the light that I have, and not according to any such information as the gentleman may have

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, it is unfair to Gov. Dockery, the Third Assistant Postmaster General, to charge him now with failing to give out information.

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not charge that, because they tell me that they do not have it.

Mr. LLOYD. Because he at this date is home on account of the death of one of his friends.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I think the world of Gov. Dockery. He is a friend of mine, and I admire and I love him, but he can not give information that he does not possess.

Mr. LLOYD. He has the information that the parcel post is a success.

Mr. STEENERSON. The Post Office Department proposes to reduce the rural carrier service, and they propose to refuse all new star routes and rural routes, and they propose to economize at the expense of efficiency. They propose to get out of the odium by saying that it is all due to the war, which we can not help; but we will show that it is due to blundering Democratic legislation, which we can help and which we will help in the near future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, in connection with the parcel-post proposition, whether or not since the Postmaster General has increased the size of the parcels any steps have been taken to pay the railroad companies of the country for the increased expense of carrying that increased weight?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I believe Congress, on the estimate of the department, made an appropriation of 5 per cent.

Mr. McKENZIE. I mean since the order has been made increasing the size of the parcel.

Mr. STEENERSON. I could not state just now, but I believe that there is great complaint on the part of the railroad companies. How justifiable it is I do not know.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that no steps have been taken to pay the railroad companies, or they have not been paid for the carrying of this matter?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think there is a provision in the pending appropriation bill to pay them by an extra appropriation, and that should be taken out of the fund that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] claims is a surplus, because they have not paid for the services rendered in the last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the Postmaster General made arbitrary ruling in increasing the size of the parcels and compelling the railroad companies to carry those parcels, it would naturally result in an increase of business?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. From which the department is going to profit. Now, if they are not paying the railroads for the service in carrying all this, is it not an unfair proposition to credit the department with an increase while they are compelling the railroads to render service for nothing?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is exactly true. That was the reason why I stated, in answer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], that the alleged surplus of last year is largely fictitious, because they had not paid their debts. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. LLOYD. There have been two weighings since the parcel-post law went into effect, and under the law now one-half of the country is receiving its full compensation for every pound of parcel-post matter that is carried.

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I do not see how that can possibly be correct, because it is not four years since the order increased the weight of the parcel post.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman is aware of the fact the country is divided into four sections——

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. One of the four to be weighed each year, so that at the present time the law carries full compensation for two years.

Mr. STEENERSON. How long ago was it since the last increase of weight?

Mr. LLOYD. Let me finish this. It is also true in the last appropriation bill last year we provided for an increase of 5 per cent on account of the parcel-post matter that——

Mr. STEENERSON. But how long ago was it since the last increase in the size of the package was made?

Mr. LLOYD. That was made nearly a year ago.

Mr. STEENERSON. Nearly a year ago. How, then, can there have been two weighings since that time, when you say they are quadrennial weighings, with one weighing in each section each year, and therefore it will take two years before you could get two sections weighed?

Mr. LLOYD. There has been one weighing since the increase to 20 pounds; there have been two weighings since the increase to 11 pounds.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Let me finish this. It is a bigger jump from 11 pounds to 50 than from 4 to 11, and consequently the weight of the mail has enormously increased by the latter change, which is not accounted for by the weighing; and I do not believe any living man—not even the experts—can tell anything approximately as to the increased volume of the weight of mail, which necessarily involves an increased pay to the railroads, because they are paid by the pound per mile.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STEENERSON. I want to finish my sentence, if the gentleman will permit. They receive as much pay for carrying a pound of goods, whether it is flour or cheap merchandise, as letters. I was told the other day by an official of the Government that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to save appropriations made for his bureau, had shipped flour in 48-pound sacks to the Indian reservations in different parts of the country by parcel post.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not want to be understood as saying they receive the same compensation to-day for carrying a parcel as they do for carrying a letter. The gentleman has evidently made a mistake.

Mr. STEENERSON. I certainly mean to say that the railway-mail pay is based on the per ton per mile or the per pound per mile, and it does not make any difference whether that pound is made up of letters or flour.

Mr. LLOYD. That is the railroad companies.

Mr. STEENERSON. The railroad companies—that is what I am talking about. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LLOYD. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has gone astray. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, when you increase that kind of matter upon which the revenue, the postage, is very small, you do not increase the income of the Government but very little, but you increase enormously the expenditure of the Government, because you have got to pay the old rate, the same per pound per mile rate you always have paid. Now, you have hitherto been unable to change the railway-mail pay; of course, I am not going to enter into that discussion, but if you are going to make the Post Office Department show anything near a self-sustaining basis, you will have to change it or discontinue that heavy traffic——

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON (continuing). Because they can not continue to lay the blame on the European war. Yes; I will now yield to the gentleman—for a question.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Well, I am asking a question. Does not the gentleman know that we are paying for the movement of parcels at the rate of 10 cents per ton per mile to the railroads when the express companies are paying at the rate of 5 cents per ton per mile or less on the average? That wherever we pay we have to pay twice as much as the express companies.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no doubt. I will take the gentleman's word for it, and that shows why we are doing an unprofitable business when we are shipping flour and bread around the country by mail.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Another question.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman will please excuse me. That shows why there is such anxiety on the part of this administration to change the basis of railway mail pay, because they know they are getting into a hole, and they come up here through the leader of the majority and threaten us with a $14,000,000 deficit because of the foreign mail, when, as a matter of fact, the foreign mail has fallen off but very slightly.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Is it not a fact that the parcel-post rates are made upon bases which include full payment for railways and all the expenses of the service, besides a margin of over 10 per cent for profit? Is not that a fact?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not know anything about it. The gentleman is supposed to be the legal adviser in parcel-post matters, and there has been some blunderer at work or we would not be in the boat we are. So I am willing to give him credit for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have no doubt some theorists have been at work, and in order to get out of the trouble they will again bring up that awful goat with long beard and lay all their sins upon it. But I want the American people to understand that you can not play that game twice in the same evening. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I insert the letter of the Second Assistant Postmaster General as to the falling off in volume of transatlantic mail. Also an editorial from this morning's Washington Post, and an editorial sent to me commenting on my former speech from the Portland Oregonian, one of the ablest papers in the country.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, February 18, 1915.

Hon. HALVOR STEENERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request of yesterday by telephone, I have the honor to inform you that it is estimated that the weight of all mail matter included in the regular mails from the United States for trans-Atlantic destinations dispatched during the months of July to December, 1913, inclusive, was 6,663,624 pounds, and for the same months of 1914, 5,186,480 pounds.

Yours, very truly,

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Editorial in the Portland Oregonian of January 24, 1915, commenting upon the speech of Representative STEENERSON, of Minnesota, in the House of Representatives on December 31, 1914:

DEFICIT DUE TO BLUNDERS.

In a plain recital of facts Representative STEENERSON disposed of the fiction that the war is responsible for the decrease in revenue and in the Treasury balance. He showed that the cause has been Democratic blunders in overestimating income and in underestimating expenses.

In his final speech on the tariff bill on September 30, 1913, Representative UNDERWOOD estimated customs revenue for the fiscal year 1915 at $249,000,000, revenue from the income and corporation tax at $122,000,000, and total revenue at $1,026,000,000, while he estimated expenditures for that year at $1,008,000,000, leaving a surplus of $18,000,000.

President Wilson has attributed the deficit in revenue to a falling off in imports and, consequently, in customs revenue due to the war, but Mr. STEENERSON showed that the actual revenue from that source for 11 months of 1914, with an estimate for December added, fell short of Mr. UNDERWOOD'S estimate by only between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000. Had Mr. UNDERWOOD'S other estimates proved correct, there would still have been a surplus of more than $12,000,000, and no deficit taxes would have been necessary. But revenue from income and corporation taxes fell short of the Underwood estimate $51,000,000, while appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 reached a total of $1,094,168,102 instead of $1,008,000,000.

Thus total revenue fell short of the estimate by more than $57,000,000, and total expenditures exceeded the estimate by more than $86,000,000. This explains the decrease in the Treasury balance from $144,000,000 to a little more than $66,000,000. Had the much maligned Payne tariff remained in operation, it would have produced more than enough additional revenue to offset the deficiency from income and corporation tax, for it produced in excess of $311,000,000 in the fiscal year 1912, or $68,000,000 more than the Underwood tariff produced in the calendar year 1914.

Indisputable figures prove that the Democrats fall short $57,000,000 of making the tariff produce enough revenue to meet the expenses of the Government under what they term Republican extravagance. They fall short $125,000,000 of meeting expenses under Democratic extravagance. They always promise a tariff for revenue only, but their tariffs never produce enough revenue. They always promise economy, but they always practice extravagance.

SOUNDING THE CALL.

Almost coincident with the official announcement that the administration does not recognize any harm done by the tariff to business, and that there will be no tariff relief so long as the present administration remains in power, there comes a call for action from New York and Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania House of Representatives has just passed a resolution calling upon Congress to repeal the present Democratic tariff act, and attributing to this legislation the business and industrial hardships which have thrown hundreds of thousands of men and women out of employment. It is proposed that the legislatures of other industrial States shall take similar action.

In New York the Republican Club, which is one of the largest political organizations, has adopted the following resolution:

"We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection, and we protest against its destruction by the existing tariff law. This law serves the interests of foreign nations; we support the interests of the United States of America. We accept the issue thus made and we confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be restored and maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests. We denounce the existing law as destructive to general business, to labor, and to the farming interests of the country. We heartily indorse the patriotic efforts of Republican United States Senators and Representatives in Congress looking toward a repeal of the existing low tariff law and the enactment of a protective tariff that shall restore to American labor and industry their full rights in the American market."

By standing pat on the existing tariff law the Democrats have made the tariff issue inevitable in the next campaign. While it is true that the stoppage of some of the imports, due to the European war, has been equivalent to a protective tariff, except in the raising of revenue, the greater danger of the present low tariff will be encountered after the present war is over.

If industries have been harmed by the tariff under present conditions, what may be expected when the war ends and millions of workers now on the field of battle return to the mills and factories to work at wages that will be lower than ever before in the history of Europe? They will be willing to work for anything. The United States, under the present tariff, would have no protection against cheap labor competition.

No wonder the call to arms is being sounded by the Republicans. The tariff battle is beginning early, but this is because the tariff has become an issue which even the man in the street understands.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LINTHICUM having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7515. An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes; and

S. 7188. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Garden City, Kans.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. SWITZER, and Mr. BRYAN were granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER].

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in some remarks I placed in the RECORD on February 15 I called attention to the fact that four firms, which constitute the War Trust in this country, have drawn down $175,000,000 worth of contracts from the Government for munitions of war, and that Army and Navy officers have permitted these four concerns to outrageously overcharge the Government for these supplies. I called attention to the fact that Gen. Crozier, the present Chief of Ordnance, who does the buying of these supplies for the Ordnance Department of the Army, was formerly in partnership with the Bethlehem Steel Co.; that he was in partnership with them on the day that he was made Chief of Ordnance; and that ever since he has been Chief of Ordnance he has been awarding that concern contracts running into the millions of dollars annually and has been paying that concern from 20 to 60 per cent more than those millions of dollars worth of supplies could have been manufactured for in the Government arsenals.

My attention has been directed to an answer by Gen. Crozier to the charges which I have made, and in fairness to Gen. Crozier and in order that his views may be in the RECORD, as mine have been placed in the RECORD, and since he states that he is contemplating asking for an investigation, I send the following clipping from the Chicago Tribune to the Clerk and ask that it be read in my time. My only purpose in rising was to put his answer in the RECORD so that it may be compared with the specific statements that I put in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the article.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Wednesday, February 17, 1915.]

GRAFT CHARGES STIR UP CROZIER—ORDNANCE CHIEF ASKS INVESTIGATION OF ACCUSATION MADE BY TAVENNER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 16.*

[Special.]—Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, contemplates demanding an investigation, either by the Secretary of War or by Congress, of the charges involving his reputation which were made in the House yesterday by Representative TAVENNER of Illinois.

Mr. TAVENNER charged that a ring of war-munitions manufacturers is raking off $7,000,000 in exorbitant and illegitimate profits, and that Gen. Crozier, Gen. Humphreys, and other Army and Navy officers are closely connected with these concerns.

Friends of Gen. Crozier in the House are preparing to present his defense, either in a reply to TAVENNER or in a demand for a congressional investigation.

ROORBACK, REPLY TO TAVENNER.

It will be alleged that TAVENNER is disgruntled because of the action of Gen. Crozier in introducing some of the Taylor-system methods into the Rock Island (Ill.) Arsenal, which is situated in the TAVENNER district.

On behalf of Gen. Crozier it is asserted that he never has allowed his former relations with the Bethlehem Iron (now steel) Co. to influence him in passing on questions affecting war-munitions contracts awarded to this or any allied concern. He had a half interest in the patent on the Crozier disappearing gun carriage, which was sold to the Bethlehem company for $10,000 and royalties on foreign orders. He relinquished his interest after he was appointed Chief of Ordnance and never realized from the patent more than $5,000, inasmuch as no foreign orders were received.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. I do not yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. MOORE. I ask whether the gentleman will yield or whether he insists on this alleged statement of Gen. Crozier being read at this time in full. It is not a statement of Gen. Crozier——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor, and he declines to yield. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FORCES CUT IN MUNITIONS.

That there was any impropriety in selling the carriage to foreign Governments is denied on the ground that any engineer could duplicate it from the existing photographs. Gen. Crozier also had a patent on a wire gun, which he relinquished to the United States Government voluntarily without compensation.

Gen. Crozier admits that the manufacturers of war munitions have extorted unreasonable prices from the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield time enough to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], in order that the Clerk may read the balance of the article.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. COOPER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Time enough for the Clerk to read the balance of the article.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know how much time that is.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. What is the motion before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. What is the motion before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no motion before the House.

Mr. MOORE. Under what rule are we proceeding?

The CHAIRMAN. We are proceeding under the agreement for general debate.

Mr. MOORE. I ask if there will be an opportunity for anyone to make a statement with regard to this publication?

The CHAIRMAN. Not unless you get time from gentlemen who have control of the time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I insist that the gentleman can not stop debate.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can not make a parliamentary inquiry while the gentleman from Illinois has the floor without his consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just announced that the time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have control of the time, and I have yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MOORE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Chair has announced that the time of the gentleman has expired. I make the point that the gentleman from Illinois has no time——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has yielded to the gentleman from Illinois sufficient time in which to finish the reading of the article. The Clerk will continue the reading of the article.

The Clerk read as follows:

He contends, however, that he has introduced Government manufacture of many classes of arms into the arsenals and by that competition forced the private manufacturers to reduce their prices.

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. COOPER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MOORE. Would it be in order at the present time to ask unanimous consent?

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman has no right to interrupt the regular order.

Mr. MOORE. I have made a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is not in order in doing it.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] is setting up a man of straw. He is attacking a man who is not here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gen. Crozier is represented here and so is the Steel Trust.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is representing what is not true. The gentleman is setting up a bugaboo.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has no right to make that parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOORE. I ask if I was called to order; if I was violating the rules of the House?

Mr. GORDON. Of course you were. You have no brief from Crozier, have you?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. BORLAND. I am entitled to the floor, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order.

Mr. MOORE. I am very glad to be called to order, because I am acting in the cause of justice and fair play. But go ahead and gag. That is the way to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. If the genteman wants to defend the Steel Trust, let him take his time.

Mr. MOORE. You have the power. You put things in the RECORD. Go ahead and encourage the gag. Do it brutally. Go ahead; I defy you.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. MOORE. I am willing to be called to order.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is violating all orderly rules of parliamentary conduct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] will proceed.

Mr. GORDON. Are you Crozier's attorney? Why are you acting in this way?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. GORDON. I think that is outrageous on the part of a man who has been a Member of this House as long as the gentleman. It is an insult to the House.

Mr. MOORE. That is an insult to an individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be seated.

Mr. MOORE. Very well; I respect the Chair and will take my seat.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, when I rose I was about to remark that I would yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to make a request for unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD——

Mr. MOORE. I do not care to do that. The time to do that is right now.

Mr. BORLAND. But I soon saw that the gentleman did not want to do that, but wanted to inject into the RECORD something that the rules of the House would not permit him to put into the RECORD, and at that point I withdrew or abandoned my intention to yield to the gentleman. When the proper time comes, he can defend the Steel Trust or anybody else.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BORLAND. No. The gentleman can reply in his own time.

Mr. MOORE. I do not care to.

Mr. BORLAND. Now I want to discuss two phases of this pension appropriation bill, which is supposed to be under debate in this House. It is always a matter of surprise to the American people to learn the amount that is paid out by this Government for pensions 50 years after the close of the Civil War. But there are more surprises than that in the pension law. I find that there is scarcely an American citizen anywhere who understands that the Government is to-day paying more than a million dollars to nonresident foreigners under the operation of the present pension laws.

Away back in 1893 an attempt was made to correct this evil, and a report at that time shows that about 3,000 foreigners were drawing pensions under the Federal pension laws, and that the amount paid them was between $350,000 and $400,000. To-day more than 5,000 persons who are nonresident foreigners are drawing pensions, and the amount paid them is over a million dollars.

Now, the only justification that ever was given for this payment of foreign pensions was that a few men might have come to this country from foreign countries and lost their lives here and left dependent widows or children or mothers in the old country. But if any men lost their lives 50 years ago under the American flag and left dependent widows or mothers in the old country, the number of such dependents would decrease rapidly in the generation following the Civil War. The explanation of the fact that the amount has increased rapidly and steadily is that men who are drawing pensions have expatriated themselves and have become citizens or subjects of other countries.

Now, in fact, that is the case. We are sending abroad to-day a million dollars of American money, and we are doing what no other nation ever did, and, I undertake to say, what no other nation ever will do, namely, continuing the payment of pensions to men who are no longer citizens of the country they served. Twenty-six hundred of these men live in Canada; about 500 of them live in Germany; some 900 of them live in the British Isles. This country could not become involved in a war with any country on earth without seeing its own money and sometimes the men who draw its own money opposing it in that contest. No nation ever did that.

I purpose and reserve the right to offer to this pension appropriation bill when it reaches the amendment stage an amendment forbidding the payment of pensions to nonresident foreigners, except for disabilities contracted in the service. Gentlemen will recognize that we have a dual system of pensions in this country, which differs from the pension systems of other countries. All countries pay pensions. All countries pay pensions on the basis of disabilities contracted in the service, and that is the true basis for pensions. Any man who entered the service of his country and suffered a permanent disability thereby has a claim upon the gratitude of his fellow citizens as long as he or those dependent upon him live. But we entered upon a much wider field than that. We entered upon what no nation has ever done—an old-age pension, limited to those who appeared upon certain muster rolls, and under that old-age pension system the number of foreigners drawing pensions has almost doubled.

Now, if we are going to pay old-age pensions, I do not see any legitimate reason why we should not pay them to the man

who served his country by pushing the plow and to the man who served his country by laying brick and to the man who served his country by driving an engine in an engine cab and who has done it efficiently and honestly for 40 or 50 years. I do not see why an old-age pension is not coming to the man who builds up his country in time of peace, if it is purely a question of old-age pensions. But we have limited these old-age pensions to a certain class of our citizens, and, under that system, the most liberal proposition that any nation ever advanced, we still continue to extend an old-age pension to men who are not citizens of the United States.

It was objected when this matter was up in the Sixty-second Congress that the old soldier must have some advocates on this floor; in other words, politics—partisan politics—demanded that no possible reduction or correction be made, even of the most flagrant evils in the pension laws, for fear that the sensibilities of the old soldiers might be hurt.

Now, let us consider what the old soldiers themselves think about this thing. You will not find an old soldier in your district who will justify the payment of pensions to men who have renounced and abandoned the flag under which they fought. The man who is to-day the Commissioner of Pensions of this Government is an old soldier, and a good one, and he recommends that the payment of pensions to nonresident foreigners cease. Here is what he says about it:

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask a formal question, and I do not ask the commissioner to answer it if he does not desire to do so: In your judgment, Mr. Commissioner, is it proper for a man who rendered service in the Civil War or any other military service for the United States Government, and who because of that service was placed upon the pension roll, to be deprived of that pension because of the fact that subsequently he declared his allegiance to some other country than the United States? In your opinion, Mr. Commissioner, should or should not that fact bar him from receiving the pension that he obtained as a service pension because of his service to the United States? You need not answer that question if you prefer not to do so.

Mr. SALTZGABER. I have an opinion on the subject, and it is this: I am so thoroughly American that I believe that a man who abjures his allegiance to this country ought not to receive any reward from it.

Mr. DONOHOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. DONOHOE. The gentleman of course knows that it does not follow that because a man has decided to reside abroad he has renounced his allegiance to the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. This does not affect him, then?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman will see very readily that this would not affect Americans temporarily abroad for business, or official positions, or anything else. It is confined to men who are not Americans and possibly never were.

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

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Has the gentleman any information as to how many of these 5,000 men have renounced their allegiance to this Government? To that extent I agree with him. No pensioner who has expatriated himself and is not crippled or in bad health from service origin should be carried on the rolls.

Mr. BORLAND. The greater part of the 5,000 have renounced their allegiance. The commissioner said in answer to a question in a former hearing that those who were abroad for business or pleasure or as foreign representatives of American houses, or as American consular representatives were a very trifling number.

Mr. BARTLETT. About 30.

Mr. GOULDEN. How many are living in Canada? Of course the gentleman knows that a large number of our citizens have gone to Canada, and I want to know if they have renounced their citizenship.

Mr. BORLAND. The greater part of them have become Canadian citizens.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I suggest that most of those who came to this country from Canada at the time of the war and fought in the Federal Army have gone back to Canada and taken up lands there.

Mr. BORLAND. Under the homestead laws of Canada they had to renounce their allegiance to this Government.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I propose to support the gentleman's amendment. I think it is on the right line. Heretofore that amendment has not included men who were disabled in the service. The gentleman's amendment does. So there can be no possible injustice to any pensioner—any soldier who served during the war. Now, I understand that a great majority of the Canadian soldiers who were with us in 1861–1865 have sworn allegiance to the British Government. Those men are drawing pensions. In case of a war with Great Britain we would have men fighting against us who were pensioners under the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. I am very glad to have this statement from Gen. SHERWOOD, the man who occupies the honored position in this House of being the only general officer on the Union side in that great struggle who is now a Member of Congress and who represents as thoroughly as any man can the feelings and sentiments and patriotic views of the American soldier. He says that this amendment so limited is an absolute justice to the American pensioner.

Mr. DONOHOE. How would the gentleman feel toward a man who rendered military service here, became a citizen, resided here for 8 or 10 years after the close of the war, went back to Germany, and has never renounced his American citizenship?

Mr. BORLAND. He would not be affected by this.

Now, there is another matter I want to speak of in the brief time I intend to hold the attention of the House, which has always seemed to me to be a gross evil in the pension laws, but which has never seemed to other gentlemen to be as clear an injustice as it has seemed to me. I purpose to offer another amendment providing that no part of the pension appropriation shall be paid to any person who is drawing salary or emoluments of any kind from the Federal Government in excess of $1,000. [Applause.] I place the amount at $1,000 because I believe a man who is drawing $1,000 or over from the Federal Government is doing it on the theory that he is performing a man's full work and that his disabilities, if any, contracted in the service have not decreased his earning power. If a man who was in that great struggle is to-day alive and able to hold a full-salaried position, he is fortunate beyond the average run of mankind.

But the worst evil is simply this: The men who are the beneficiaries of this system do not want any investigation made as to how many men are drawing emoluments from this Government. I know a case—I will not call the name because I do not care to be invidious in a public speech—where a man is drawing a pension as an officer of the Federal Army and is drawing $6,000 a year from the Federal Government as a retired United States judge and $7,500 as a Member of the great legislative body of the Nation. He is drawing three separate salaries or emoluments from the Federal Government. I know of another case where a man is drawing $6,000 a year as a retired Federal judge, $50 a month as a pension, and is engaged in the practice of law, representing large railroad and corporate interests. Those are the men who will resist with all the force of which they are capable, even the proposition to investigate into this thing. I believe that there are approximately 3,000 to 5,000 men, at least 3,000, upon the pay rolls of the Federal Government under one guise or another, many of them as retired Federal judges and other officials of that kind, who are drawing pensions. These men have enjoyed, to a large extent, the rewards and profits of their military service and their military renown, and they are drawing pensions which are needed in many cases by many men who have been less fortunate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman make any distinction between a soldier who is drawing a pension for a disability incurred in the service and one who is drawing a pension merely on account of age and service?

Mr. BORLAND. The distinction could be made easily. The surprising thing about the American people is this: We are spending to-day nearly twice as much for the pension roll as we are for the maintenance of a standing army in a nation of 100,000,000 people. That is 50 years after the close of the war. The people are going to demand that we spend a little more for national protection and a little less for partisan politics. Gentlemen will not dodge that issue when the people begin to wonder where their money has gone that has been spent under the guise of military armament when they find that we have not the national protection for the money expended.

To-day, 50 years after the war, nearly twice as much is spent for pensions as is spent for military purposes. If the pensions we are paying would guarantee the safety of the Nation, we would be the best-protected Nation under the sun; but nobody believe that it does. It has dwindled down into an old-age pension, possibly deserved in most cases; but I would like to have it expended in all cases for those who deserve it, and to cut out men who are getting $6,000 as retired Federal judges, and cut off the men that have renounced and abandoned the country that pays them the pension. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering the annual appropriation bill, making appropriations to pay the pension roll to the extent of $165,000,000. That does not cover all of the actual pensions that the Federal Government pays; it does not cover $43,500 that is spent down in the Arkansas national forests in the way of pensions under the pretense of salaries for men engaged in conservation.

In that connection I want to call attention to a letter published in the Danville Democrat, Danville, Ark., an excellent newspaper, which was received by me this morning. The editor of the paper refers to the writer of the letter as follows:

The writer of the above article is a college man, a young man, and with his wife and babies lives on a homestead in Yell County, and knows the conditions of which he writes.

In other words, this is a letter from a college-bred man, of a man who has gone into that country, entered a homestead on the identical lands which certain gentlemen claim are not fit for agricultural purposes, has made him a good home, and who knows something about the conditions that exist there, and certainly has the knowledge and ability to discuss the things considered in that letter. I shall not take time to read the letter at length, but I will ask unanimous consent to print the newspaper clipping in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the matter indicated in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to above is as follows:

FOREST RESERVE SHOULD BE ABOLISHED—A HOMESTEADER 30 MILES FROM THE RAILROAD IN YELL COUNTY SAYS ALL OF THE GOVERNMENT LAND COULD BE MADE A GOOD HOME FOR SETTLERS—READ HIS LETTER.

BLUFFTON, ARK., *January 29, 1915.*

Mr. T. L. POUND,
Danville, Ark.

MY DEAR SIR: Facts and figures proven by carefully kept books on my homestead for the past three years show that even the roughest land is worth taking, and a very little capital is necessary to keep a farmer going here till his land properly handled will.

Let us compare the tenant farmer and homesteader. The tenant gives one-third to one-fourth of his profitable time to his landlord. He is busy producing, harvesting, and marketing his crop but about three-fourths of his time, and he is fortunate, indeed, if he makes expenses during the rest of the time. Therefore the tenant farmer gives away or loses at least 5½ months or 143 working days each year and wonders why he does not get anything ahead. But if a man in any other business lost 143 days annually from office or shop, how soon would he be bankrupt? Is it any wonder "landlordism and the tenant farmer "ruined Ireland, caused the Mexican revolution, and is the greatest problem before the United States to-day?

Now for the homesteader on a hilly, rocky tract of land "away back in the sticks." His cash investment is practically nothing, and in this is the only likeness to the tenant farmer, for the average 40 acres here has 200,000 feet in pine alone, enough for house, barn, and fence. The same 40 acres produces enough grass for a team of horses and several cows, enough mast-bearing trees to produce 1,000 pounds of pork three years out of five, enough berries and wild fruit for an ordinary family, and has enough table-land with a clay subsoil so that two or more 5 to 10 acre fields can be tilled. Now, let the homesteader give 143 days each year to clearing land, building, hauling rock, filling low places with brush and rock, hauling leaves and wash to the hilltops where the soil is light, and in a few years he has a valuable farm, and has produced a good living also if he has planted the crops to supply his table and feed his stock and the big cotton raiser in the bottom lands.

This is no idle dream but a fact proven by my books and the experience of other farmers here.

But our homestead land is practically all taken. Yes! but our national forest is made up of exactly the same kind of land my neighbors and I have been fortunate enough to get. Room for thousands of farms; for good, industrious, homeless families who, wasting 143 days each annually instead of using this time to improve their part of our great State and Nation, is being held in idleness, and why? Not because a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people wish to conserve our resources instead of developing them, but because the organization controlling our national forest is such that political jobs are in the balance and the question is not conserve or develop, but of keep or lose the job, and the forester is human like you and I, and like you and I, has a family to support; and, like you and I, if he does not look out for his business nobody will. As an example, take the following incident to which I can and will if necessary make oath. My friend Mr. X, wishing to homestead a very good agricultural tract in the national forest, made application for same. His case was referred to the local forest ranger, Mr. Y, also my personal friend. Mr. Y spent perhaps two hours in his investigation in which he never saw the land Mr. X wanted, and reported that he had failed to find level land enough for a building site. Consequently, Mr. X and his large family lost no less than 400 valuable days last year, will lose as much or more this year, and the land which should now be a good farm producing a good living for X and his family is being carefully conserved as a national reserve by the forest organization, because Mr. Y knew if Mr. X made a success in a part of the forest Mr. Z would in another part, and so on, till soon Mr. Y would have no forest to supply him a job, and do you blame Mr. Y? I do not, but Mr. Y should not be the man to decide whether Mr. X could make a living on a certain piece of land or not, only Mr. X can do that, and he should have the chance.

Our national forest with all its land and timber is now producing nothing.

Only a few men are benefited by it, and they are paid from other sources, while similar country in France and Germany is producing more than our richest communities. The home is the real basis of a country's wealth, and not the hoarded millions of a few.

Each tenant farmer is losing 143 days annually, which if properly used would in a few years put the territory now held as national forest in Arkansas in a class with the hill country of Virginia, Pennsylvania, or New York State, so far as productiveness goes, and the tenant be glad to use the time he is now wasting to develop the resources of our forest if he was permitted to homestead it. If he is not permitted to homestead this land, what will be done with it? If the Government sells it to individuals or corporations, no matter what amount of cash the Government might get it would lose in the end. Our tenant problem would be increased instead of diminished, because the lumberman would become a landlord and more tenant farmers and farming would be the result.

Then why delay? As a State and Nation we are not producing too much—not producing enough. When we consider that almost half the producers of our land are losing 143 days annually, the move to lessen this terrible waste of time, to lessen the tenant problem, to produce more homes, to raise men's efficiency as producers and citizens, is the move that will produce more and lasting profits for a Government of, for, and by the people than any other, no matter what the cash in the transaction might be. And opening the forest to the homesteader is this one great move.

H. C. SHORT.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KIRKPATRICK].

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, as one of the survivors of the Civil War between the States I simply ask leave to extend my remarks on the subject of the payment of pensions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my earnest protest against the proposed national child-labor legislation. The bill proposes to prevent the employment of children under 14 and 16 years of age in mines, quarries, mills, canneries, manufactories, workshops, factories, and mills of all kinds of enterprises. It further proposes to limit the hours of labor per day. Heretofore no one has seriously contended that this question should be taken by the Federal Government from State jurisdiction. I rise for the purpose of requesting the membership of this House to send for the so-called child-labor bill and some time at their leisure read it and study it carefully. This bill was taken up and considered under suspension of rules, which prevented the usual discussion. Only 40 minutes were given to the consideration under a rule, and therefore the membership of the House had no opportunity to give this bill proper consideration. I never heard of this bill until it was up for action. Those opposing the bill had no opportunity to present views in opposition to it on account of the limit of time, and we resorted to the only method we had, and that was to filibuster against the passage of the bill. I have no apologies to make for the part I took in trying to prevent the passage of the bill by filibuster tactics. I consider the bill the most flagrant violation of constitutional rights of any bill that has passed this House since I have been here. It absolutely absorbs all State rights guaranteed by the Constitution and turns over to Federal authorities complete jurisdiction to direct the internal affairs of the States.

Those of you who have been to sawmills and to rock quarries and have heard the familiar call, "water boy," if this bill becomes a law, will hear that call no more. It will be for "water man." Under the provisions of the bill a boy under 16 years of age can not give water to a mule or ox used at a rock quarry or mine. No boy or girl can be employed in any capacity, in any kind of work where peaches, tomatoes, beans, or any agricultural product is being prepared for interstate shipment, because if children are so employed the man who ships the goods produced where the boy who gave water to mule or worked in the cannery will be indicted by the Federal Government. In my State agriculture is being promoted very rapidly through the Agricultural Department, and one of the greatest means of promotion is the canning club.

The school-teachers are organizing associations in every county, and you can read in the agricultural bulletins where little girls 12 and 13 years of age have had tomato patches and have canned their tomatoes in association with others and have shipped them to the State of New York and other places and have received enormous profits, and this method has encouraged others to raise tomatoes. I do not think there is any question but that this bill will prevent little girls or boys under the age of 14 years from associating themselves together with a teacher or any other person for the purpose of raising tomatoes and canning them and shipping them out of the State, because one of the provisions of the bill is about canneries. The definition in the bill says that a dealer is an individual. A little girl is an individual within the meaning of the bill if she is raising tomatoes. It also uses the phrase "unincorporated association," and these people who are associated together for the purpose of raising and canning tomatoes, peaches, beans, or anything else are an "unincorporated association" of people brought together for the purpose of promoting this industry.

The bill reads as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any producer, manufacturer, or dealer to ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the products of any mine or quarry which have been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 16 years, or the products of any

mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment which have been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years, or by the labor of children between the age of 14 years and 16 years.

* * * * * * *

The word "dealer" as used in this act shall be construed to include any individual or corporation or the members of any partnership or other unincorporated association.

This bill not only proposes to regulate cotton mills, knitting mills, and all kinds of factories by Federal statute, but it reaches out and takes in farming and mining institutions. The conditions in the New England States are entirely different from conditions in the South. The work done by children of reasonable age in mills, saw mills, cotton gins, canneries, and the various other enterprises of the South should not be prohibited by Federal laws inspired by philanthropists knowing nothing about healthful and honorable employment in the South. It is a very embarrassing situation in which the Democratic Party finds itself advocating this kind of legislation. It has always contended for State rights, and now pretends to believe in State rights. Now the Republican Party can say, "Oh you Democratic Party, what have you done with your States rights Jeffersonian doctrine?"

If this bill becomes a law, the next move will be to prevent the interstate shipping of cotton when children under 16 years of age participate in making or picking the cotton. Those good philanthropists will be here in a few years demanding that the farmer be prevented from employing on his farm boys under 16, and they will tell this Congress about the illiteracy of children that should be in school. Then this so-called humanitarian legislation will be enacted by the Federal Government compelling education of all races and restricting child labor on the farm to 16 years of age. The negro matures rapidly and makes a good farm laborer at 12 years of age. At 15 they are strong men. The whites mature early in the South, and many boys perform a man's labor on the farm before they are 16 years of age, working on the farm and attending school during the school periods.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also launches the eight-hour day law, to be applied by the Federal Government to agricultural enterprises. I knew that agriculture would some day be confronted with the Federal Government fixing the hours of labor and making it a criminal offense to labor over eight hours each day even on the farm, but I did not expect the question to come up so soon. There are seasons when the farmer must work or gather his crops or he will almost lose it. I hope I will never see Congress enact laws prohibiting the shipping of cotton from my State unless the farmer complies with eight or seven hour day regulation of labor, and yet that principle is in this bill. Should a cannery, quarry, mill, factory, saw mill, cotton gin, or any kind of mill enterprise violate the child-labor restrictions or work them over eight hours any day the products of such an enterprise can not be sold out of the State. A severe Federal penalty is provided for both the seller and the purchaser.

Some gentlemen were disposed to criticize me for filibustering against this bill. Permit me to assure you that as long as the people of Georgia keep me here to represent my State and district I shall speak, filibuster, and use all legitimate means to prevent legislation giving the National Government the power of exercising the prerogative of the States in the restriction of labor.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, do you propose to exclude the orphan on the humanitarian appeal from honest work and doing honest labor in the industrial pursuits of the farming districts, that they may live honestly and independently?

I thoroughly agree with gentlemen that there should be restriction of child labor in factories. The restriction should be reasonable and humane. What is reasonable and humane is a question for the respective States to solve. There are no doubt abuses; but, Mr. Speaker, we should not trample upon the Constitution to reach abuses the States should correct. Besides, there are some provisions in this bill I can not espouse, even by State enactment.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield further time to the gentleman.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I think that the States only have a right to legislate on this question. It is a question for each State to settle; it is not a Federal question. The States can better solve these industrial questions. I am willing to abide the action of the State of Georgia on these and all other questions delegated to the State by the Constitution, and I think other Members should be willing to abide the action of their States. Several times I have defended the laws of my State on this floor, and no man can assail the laws of my State on this floor unchallenged; and like Ruth said to Naomi, I stand here to-day and say in regard to Georgia, "Whither thou goest I will go; where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people and thy God my God." [Applause.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Georgia to yield me five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not the time, I am sorry to say to the gentleman.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] has just been yielded time in which to make an attack on a bill which was passed in this House two or three days ago.

Mr. TRIBBLE. But the gentleman did not give me any chance to oppose it when it was passed.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman did not use all of the time he had.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not the time.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect, of course, to discuss the child-labor question to-day. I did not expect that anybody who was opposed to the bill and who failed to use all of the time which was allotted to those in opposition to the bill when it came up a couple of days ago would find it necessary——

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

Mr. PALMER. Not now—would find it necessary after the bill had passed by a vote of about 6 to 1 discuss the bill and complain of the action of the House. It is true that it was not discussed at any great length in the House, but I doubt if any bill which has been before the House during this session has received more attention from the country, and I doubt if Members have received more communications and information about any bill which has been before the House this session than they have about this child-labor bill. When it came into the House the Members all knew what the bill was. They knew that extensive hearings had been held before the Committee on Labor, that there had been a unanimous report of that committee in favor of the bill, and that the standard fixed by the bill was the same in many respects as had already been adopted in nearly 40 of the States in the Union with which Members here were all very familiar. It is a significant and interesting fact that the only objection to the bill, voiced upon the floor in speech and by vote upon the roll call, came from three or four States in the South which are notoriously lax in child-labor laws, States which have been exploiting the little children for years in order to swell the profits of the manufacturers and employers of labor there. In the other States of the Union, where attention has been given to the matter, Members were familiar with the standard employed, and, in sympathy with the feeling of the people in those States, were unanimously for the bill. I did not consider it necessary that there should be any fuller discussion about a measure on which the feeling of the House is so overwhelmingly in its favor as this child-labor legislation.

Now, the gentleman says it is not fair to a State like Georgia to enforce this kind of a law, and the arguments which he presents are, in fact, a just ground for Federal legislation. It is absolutely necessary in the interest of fairness, because the friends of child-labor legislation have discovered that in every State where they plead for laws which will protect the little children they are met with this answer from the employer of labor, that it is not fair to put us in competition with a producer of other States where a less rigid standard is enforced. There is force in that argument, and it shows that interstate commerce is at the very root of this question of child labor. I grant that 30, 40, or 50 years ago, when transportation facilities were not so adequate, when business between the States was not so common, it might have offended my own sense of the rights of the several States to have urged this kind of legislation. But times have changed and we must change with them. The days of railways, of rapid express freight trains from one end of the country to the other, have come and commerce between the States is as common as commerce within the States, and in fairness to those who produce in one State and send their products into the commerce of the other States, the same standard of labor ought to be employed everywhere. Now, the gentleman's objection that this would prevent a boy or a girl from canning tomatoes in company with a half dozen other children is all bosh, as the gentleman must know——

Mr. TRIBBLE. Read your bill.

Mr. PALMER. I have read the bill; I know all about the bill.

Mr. TRIBBLE. So do I, since I have studied it.

Mr. PALMER. It provides against labor of that kind in workshops, canneries, manufacturing establishments, and factories, and the gentleman will not say that the circumstances to which he refers could make a factory or a workshop or a

cannery. It will not interfere with work upon the farm, it will not interfere with work in the household, it will not interfere except in places where labor is employed somewhat en masse—in factories, canneries, and workshops, and places of that character—and there I submit that the law ought to lay its hand in order to prevent employers of labor in every State from grinding down the little children against the interest of future generations of American men and women. [Applause.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, about a half an hour ago the eloquent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], speaking to this bill, made the statement that there was no possibility of our Government going into war. I hope that that statement is true. There is no one in the United States who desires such a fatality as war. I want to speak just briefly of what seems to me a very dangerous parallel with the days preceding the War of 1812. I seize upon this time to do it because to-day is the day that the German order, announced February 4, blockading the island of Great Britain takes effect. I should like to recall to the House some of the diplomatic orders prior to the second war of independence. It was early in 1806 that Great Britain blockaded portions of the French border and declared the mouths of four rivers in a state of blockade against all neutral territory. Those rivers were the Ems, the Elbe, the Weiser, and the Trave. That decree of Great Britain was followed by Napoleon on the 11th of November of the same year by the famous Berlin decree which blockaded the island of Great Britain against all neutral vessels. That was in November, as I have said. Then, in January, 1807—to be specific, January 6—there was a retaliation on the part of Great Britain in her famous orders in council, and this was to blockade all of France by forbidding neutral vessels from trading between ports of France or her allies. Then, in November following Great Britain issued a second order in council more sweeping, which included the obligation to blockade all the possessions of France and all her allies. It forbade trade with the ports of France or her allies, or even with any port of Europe from which the British flag was excluded without a clearance obtained from a British port. This was followed by the most sweeping order of blockade in our history. It was the second order of Napoleon in the famous blockade of Milan. The decree in November, 1807, went thus far: It declared that all vessels submitting to English search or consenting to a voyage to England or to the payment of any English tax, as well as every vessel that should sail to or from a port of Great Britain or her possessions, or in any country occupied by British troops, would be deemed a lawful prize.

These four decrees, or rather five, if the first partial order is included, on the part of Great Britain and France literally swept the commerce of neutral countries from the sea. Our own country suffered most. While the measures were aimed at others, they hit us hardest. It was at this time that President Jefferson finally resorted to the famous embargo act which was nicknamed "O-grab-me act." He believed that if the embargo act could have been made effective by receiving support from this country it would have prevented the war of 1812; but it was so unpopular, especially in certain sections of the country in which commerce was almost totally destroyed, that a revulsion of public opinion was worked against the administration, and in 1808, when Madison was a candidate for election to succeed Jefferson, an issue was made before the country against the embargo act. However, Madison won upon a promise that relief would be granted. This was attempted when he modified the act by the famous nonintercourse act of 1809, two years after the embargo act. The nonintercourse act had the effect to limit the shipping of goods from this country to the belligerent countries, or to those at war, instead of to all the countries then involved in the former decree, the embargo. Finally war came. It came in obedience to a declaration on the 18th of June, 1812. Jefferson feared it and did what he could to prevent it. He but deferred it. Madison had opposed war to the point where the people said, "Madison can not be kicked into a war." This statement was employed as a slogan by those unfriendly to the administration. Finally public opinion became so strong that he literally was forced into the struggle. It did not require any overt act to induce it—no sinking of a vessel—but only an employment of such maritime rights as England claimed as hers. This produced war in 1812. McKinley in 1898 tried to prevent war and was successful up to a certain point, but at the cost of the most abusive language, and he ultimately went into war as a response to the demands of the people of the country which he could no longer restrain. In obedience to what was done then and in the light of 1812 and 1898, I wish that the membership of the House, especially that portion of it which believes sincerely that there will not be war, hoping at least that the President can prevent war—for nobody would think for a moment that the President would do anything knowingly that would precipitate it; everybody agrees to that—I wish that the membership of the House would notice the events that have taken place since the 1st of August last, with special reference to the possibilities confronting us as a Nation at this hour.

On November 4 Great Britain pronounced the North Sea in a blockade, to take effect on November 5, the day after. On February 4 Germany pronounced the blockade about the British Isles, including not only the water surrounding the isles but also reaching out to all vessels that would sail the sea destined to England. While it does not so specify, it really means that. That order was to take effect not the day after, but on the 18th, which is to-day. I do not believe that anyone would question England's right to make such an order, however hurtful it must be to neutral commerce. I do not believe that many will seriously question Germany's right, so far as international law will go, to do what she proposes to take effect to-day, however hazardous it may be for neutrals.

On the 26th of last December our President sent a note to England through the State Department which, to say the least, was simply to the effect of "Come, let us reason about this matter." It was not in a spirit of jingoism, but it, in a friendly spirit, called attention of England to the disturbance that her exercise of power on the sea over neutrals was placing our commerce. Over this England seemed, in a sense, to be surprised. But while everyone will admit that Great Britain has the right to stop our vessels for the time and to search for contraband of war, we have rights which must be respected, which can not be violated on mere suspicion. Notice the question of conditional contraband and the hauling into port of our vessels upon mere suspicion. This has seriously harmed our rights upon the seas. Conditional contraband can be so expanded by mere suspicion to cover all foodstuffs. When food goes to Germany in a vessel like the *Wilhelmina*, it will be held up in order to see whether it has conditional contraband. Although it is not to be used by combatants, it is held as though it were so destined. Germany declares that all food that goes to Germany must be held in her possession. In other words, the German Government will take possession, but has assured our Government it will be turned over to noncombatants. Great Britain feels her right to forbid the food to go to Germany because of that order, for the conditional contraband in this case, according to her interpretation, would become absolute contraband. Note the situation as it increases in complication. These decrees, passing as they are, and with Great Britain running up our flag over an English sailing vessel, are indicative to me and to you that events are traveling fearfully, rapidly toward what I fear may be a brink where the unexpected may take place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I simply want to call the attention of the House to this dangerous parallel. Compare the decrees of France and England prior to 1812 with the following decrees:

WAR ZONES COMPARED.

A comparison of the British and German war-zone orders disclosed these striking facts:

First. The British Government on November 4 notified the United States Government that its war zone would be effective from November 5—one day's notice.

Second. The German Government issued its war-zone proclamation on February 4 and communicated it to Ambassador Gerard on the same day, announcing that the German war zone around the British Isles would be effective after February 18—15 days' notice.

Third. The British war zone covers the whole of the North Sea.

Fourth. The German war zone covers the entire English Channel and all the territorial and high sea waters around the British Isles.

Fifth. The British war-zone order sought to close the north of Scotland route around the British Isles to Norway, the Baltic, Denmark, and Holland.

Sixth. The German war zone seeks to close the southern or English Channel route around the British Isles to Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the Baltic.

Seventh. The British war-zone decree drew an arbitrary line from the Hebrides Islands, along the Scottish coast, to Iceland, and warned neutral shipping that it would cross this line at its risk, but that ships of neutral nations might go to Holland and other neutral nations along the eastern littoral of the North Sea by taking the English Channel and Strait of Dover route.

Eighth. The German war zone declares that neutral vessels will be exposed to danger in the English Channel, but routes of navigation around the north of Scotland islands in the eastern part of the North

Sea and in a strip 30 miles wide along the Dutch coast are not open to the danger zone.

Ninth. The Germans make the southern channel route dangerous and declare the north of Scotland route safe, while the British declare the north of Scotland route dangerous and the English Channel route safe, the effect of this being that neither the northern nor the southern routes around England will be safe for neutral vessels.

Tenth. The British war-zone order was based on the discovery of mines in the North Sea, while the German decree is based on England's attitude toward contraband, the *Wilhelmina* case, and England's establishment of a war zone.

While we all hope that there will be power enough to maintain a peaceful basis against what may take place in a few days to prevent this Nation going into trouble, yet no Member of this House can close his eyes to what took place prior to 1812, and to what might take place here in our own country. Suppose one of our vessels flying the American flag goes into the neutral waters which they are forbidden to enter by this decree, and suppose that vessel should be sunk, what will be our attitude? Suppose some of our citizens are on such a vessel, what will be our attitude?

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Why not let the vessel for the time being stay out of this war zone?

Mr. FESS. That would be my advice. However, the Nation has not agreed to lay an embargo; it is loudly demanded by some citizens. And I want to clinch what I am saying by this statement. I opposed the ship-purchase bill generally on the ground of the danger that we are courting. The following is a statement from the London Times, to which I wish to call your attention. I simply want to warn our people.

> The possibilities of international trouble which it contains are at least as clear. Questions of contraband, and of search for contraband, are difficult and delicate enough between belligerents and neutrals, when the neutral ships are in private ownership. It is manifest that they would be very gravely complicated were the neutral ships themselves the property of a neutral State. The acquisition of a number of interned belligerent vessels for the purpose of employing them in the service of a neutral State would certainly afford ground for controversies which it must be the wish and the interest of real neutrals to avoid.

When you say the President can prevent war, you are putting a good deal of obligation upon him if something might happen in this country. [Applause.]

It will not do to pride ourselves upon professions of peace and talk and vote for war-making measures. It is the crassest ignorance to depend on the head of the Nation for peace. The Executive is not the war-making body of this Nation. Let some overt act of war take place and note what will happen in this country. Wilson could no more hold this people at bay than could Madison in 1812 or McKinley in 1898. The Democrats here would be among the first to demand action.

This is no time to multiply opportunities for international disputes, for when our honor is at stake not all the powers of President or Congress could stay the sword of the Nation. Hence the importance of our keeping our balance at this juncture.

Before we abdicate our rights as Members of this body to carry out the capricious wish of a Cabinet member, or even the head of the Nation, we should weigh the consequences of our acts and measure the forces now at play upon the sea, which can not be overlooked from the standpoint of our national welfare. Our international situation is strained by our Mexican situation, largely due to a lack of policy.

The open-door policy in China is seriously threatened by Japan's aggression, and, as it appears, with the permission of her ally. The situation with Europe, in view of the counter-decrees of the belligerents, ought surely to open our eyes to the necessity of the most careful guarding of the rights of this House.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

[Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH addressed the committee. His remarks appear elsewhere in to-day's RECORD.]

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time that I may have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the remarks which some days ago I delivered on the subject of rural credits, and I wish to put into the RECORD some statements touching this subject.

There are 12,000,000 farmers in these United States. Their aggregate wealth, including all property, is $41,000,000,000. They owe $6,000,000,000. Their farms are mortgaged for $3,000,000,000 of this sum. Annually they pay interest amounting to $510,000,000, an average interest rate of 8½ per cent. Statistics show they can pay only 5½ per cent and prosper. They should pay, therefore, if they are to prosper, instead of $510,000,000 annually for interest, only $330,000,000 on their borrowed money. In other words, there is wrung from the farmers an annual interest charge of $180,000,000 in excess of what they can afford to pay. Industrial 5 per cent bonds now sell at par. Panama 3 per cent bonds are quoted at 99. The farmer, notwithstanding he produces all the wealth, and in the last analysis possesses it, pays 8½ per cent interest. This he can not afford to do, and under just economic laws would not be required to do. For that reason they demand of us, their Representatives in the American Congress, and have the right to demand of us, the enactment of a law to right this wrong. I myself am glad to acknowledge this obligation, and here and now pledge myself to that service. When we shall have dealt justly with the farmers of this country they will have had their interest rate for agricultural enterprises reduced from 8½ per cent, the present rate, to not to exceed 3½ per cent, and thereby retain for themselves and their families $300,000,000 annually, which they now unjustly are compelled to pay as excess interest on this borrowed money. This is the sum they now pay to a system which is not adapted to their needs and which the enactment of a just rural credit law would avoid.

Rural credits, as the name applies, is a system of credits devised to meet the needs of agriculture. No other subject is of such importance, not only to the people directly affected, but to all the American people, the producers and consumers of farm products that now pay tribute to commercial banking. On the 23d day of January I made a short speech in this Chamber briefly calling attention to a bill I had introduced on the 12th day of January of this year, proposing a rural credits system for this country. In the short time then available a full explanation of its provisions was impossible, although the bill itself is extremely brief and simple. Since that time, I am pleased to say, the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Union met in the city of Washington and indorsed this bill and made it the concrete demand of the farmers' union of the United States for rural credits. Inasmuch as the system is designed primarily for the farmers, they should be consulted with reference to the provisions of any proposed legislation. Since the success or failure of the system would more directly affect farmers than any other class of people no legislation touching this subject should be enacted that does not meet with their entire approval. To deny them the right to have enacted a law the provisions of which they approve is to arrogate to ourselves a superior intelligence or to deny to the farmers the intelligence to understand and comprehend their own needs. None of us, I am sure, is willing to assume that attitude, and therefore let me hope all who are sincerely desirous of the enactment of a just and adequate rural credits bill will join in the advocacy of this measure. I have in it no pride of authorship. Embodied in this plan are the ideas and ideals of the National Farmers' Union, the organization that has done as much or more than any other for the advancement of farmers. In its provisions are crystallized the labors of the best years and most devoted efforts of such men as the Hon. Charles S. Barrett, the president of the national association, and men of his cabinet, as well as others, and I am happy in being authorized by them to say its provisions meet with their approval and the approval of those for whom they speak, and that its enactment would free the farmers from bondage to a system from which they have long suffered. To show in what complete accord its provisions are with the demands of farmers as expressed through their organizations upon this subject, I wish to have inserted in the RECORD the remarks delivered before a committee of Congress some months ago of H. S. Mobley, State president of the Farmers' Union of Arkansas, and in passing I wish to pay him a deserved tribute. No man more accurately and sympathetically reflects the hopes and aspirations of the people for whom he speaks or expresses those views in more clear and forceful language.

This bill seeks to accomplish four things, or rather to accomplish one thing directly, and indirectly three others. The first object sought, of course, is to procure for farmers long-time loans at a rate of interest so low that agriculture can afford to pay that rate and prosper. The second object, and not less important, is to make it unprofitable, and therefore improbable, that large landed estates should be acquired, certainly a most important result, for no country has ever prospered as it should where the lands are held by a few and the great mass of the people are tenants, not that tenants are not good men, but the very condition under which they labor prevents them from developing the best there is within them, or from giving to the State all it should receive.

A third object sought is to enable the farmers to receive the benefits of this act without at the same time disturbing local interest rates and thereby destroying local banking and commercial business, the importance of which is so obvious that no explanation is needed.

The fourth is by permitting a loan of 25 per cent of the value of the improvements on the land to encourage those residing upon the land to erect adequate buildings and other improvements thereon.

Section 2 of this act provides that there shall be created in the Department of the Treasury a commission to be known as a rural credits commission to be comprised of five men. Three of them are to be farmers who have no other occupations, and two to be men of large affairs. The entire system, its development and operation, is intrusted to their wisdom and discretion. Plenary powers are given them to make such rules and regulations as will best conserve the objects sought to be obtained. Three farmers are named on this board, because it is necessary, in my judgment, to have men whose sympathies are altogether with the farmer, and whose experiences have made them wholly acquainted with all of his conditions, and by that means keep ever in view the object for which this act is proposed; that is, the betterment of the farmers of this country. The minority members are to be men of large affairs, because expert training and knowledge that goes with the handling of large business interests will enable them at all times to promote the sale of these securities, and to direct the investments of the amortization fund so the best results from this fund can be obtained.

Section 3 fixes their tenure of office at five years, the object being to make it impossible that this commission shall be swept out of power at each change of administration. It is hoped that this commission shall always be preserved from partisan politics, and that fitness for the duties to be performed shall be the sole reason for making these appointments. The salary is $6,000 each per year, and is to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Section 5 gives the commission the power to select its agents and to employ all necessary assistance. No reference is made in the section to civil service, because it would doubtless happen that men most qualified to deal with problems confronting the farmer would be less able to pass a technical examination. We all know that it frequently happens that the ability to spell correctly and to recite dry facts of history are indicative not of executive capacity, but are merely the acquirements of one who has no inclination to labor and no ability to rise.

Section 6 makes postmasters throughout this country the agents of the Government for performing whatever services may be required of them touching this measure without additional compensation. The reason for selecting these men is that they are already in the employ of the Government; they are men of ability and honor; they are selected from the people, and are familiar with the conditions in the locality where they serve. No additional compensation is granted them, because the duties are light and involve more of honor than labor, and for the further reason that the expense attendant upon a loan should be made as light and as little burdensome as possible to the borrower. All of us owe a duty to the public and should be willing to render some services without direct compensation, and I know that great body of patriotic men will be willing to perform whatever duties may be required of them by this commission without additional recompense.

Section 7 defines a "farmer" as one who actually resides upon a farm and is engaged in the business of producing agricultural products. The benefits of this act are extended to everyone of that class and denied to all others. It also fixes periods for which loans may be made at 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 years, and provides, further, that a farmer may pay his loan at any time after the expiration of five years, or may pay $100 or any multiple thereof after that period at any interest-paying period, and upon any sum so paid the interest thereon shall cease. Section 7 further provides that any farmer who is entitled to a loan at all under the provisions of this bill, shall, if he desires, receive a loan of not less than 50 per cent of the value of his lands and not less than 25 per cent of the value of the improvements thereon. This provision is arbitrary as to the amount the farmer shall be entitled to receive, if entitled to receive anything, only so far as it fixes the minimum that he may be entitled to borrow. If he is entitled to more, the commission may extend it. It leaves within the power of the borrower to determine the number of years which his loan should extend. However, it is not to be less than 5 years nor more than 30 years, but at any time within that period he may terminate it at his pleasure. The object in fixing a loan value upon his improvements is obvious. While 40 acres of land, or any other number, will produce as much corn or as many bushels of wheat or pounds of cotton with a shed in which a family may exist and without any shelter for live stock, yet it does not meet the requirements nor the deserts of the producers of America's wealth. Therefore, not only to encourage the erection of comfortable homes and adequate outbuildings, but to make possible these improvements a loan value for that purpose is provided in this measure.

Section 8 provides that deeds of trust or mortgages shall name the chairman of the commission as trustee for the use and benefit of the United States of America. This instrument shall name the amount sought to be borrowed, the number of years the loan is to run, but leaves the interest rate blank. This provision is for the purpose of permitting these evidences of indebtedness to be sold at par to the one who is willing to pay par therefor and accept the lowest rate of interest procurable. This section further provides the manner in which the borrower shall furnish evidences of his title. An abstract of some recognized agency shall be furnished, but examined by officers appointed by the commission, and without expense to the borrower. This provision, in my judgment, is necessary in order to make it possible for small borrowers to acquire a loan without having the expense incident thereto made prohibitive. The section further provides that in those States where the Torrens system of registration of land titles shall have been adopted, the certificate of the State shall be evidence of title. This would rid the farmer of the necessity of procuring an abstract, and the costs incident thereto would be eliminated. Of course, this will arouse the antagonism of those who are commercially engaged in preparing abstracts of title or of attorneys who pass upon titles, but it will hasten the day when that system of registering land titles shall be adopted in every State of this Union.

Section 9 provides the method by which the applicant for a loan puts into motion the machinery to accomplish that purpose. He shall first apply to his local postmaster and procure the necessary blanks. He shall execute these blanks under oath, setting forth the amount of the loan he seeks, the security he has to offer, and the purposes for which he seeks the loan, the number of years he desires it to run, and all additional information that the commission may desire and direct. Upon receipt of this application the postmaster shall appoint two committees, of three men each, and the first named of each shall act as chairman of his committee. The first committee shall consist of three farmers, who reside in the immediate vicinity of the land upon which the loan is sought and who are familiar with it as a farming proposition. They shall make a secret appraisement of both the lands and the improvements, but separate. This appraisement shall be made under oath and filed with the postmaster. The second committee shall consist of men of affairs who are familiar not only with the value of the lands but are acquainted with the farmer applying for the loan, and who shall know the general conditions in the community at large, whether land values are advancing or depreciating, and other things necessary to be known by the commission to determine the hazard of the loan. This appraisement shall be made in secret and under oath and filed with the postmaster. Upon receipt of the two appraisements the postmaster, together with the chairmen of the two committees, shall open the two appraisements and shall revise and make out a just and fair appraisement of the lands, and also the improvements, which shall be forwarded to the commission at Washington, together with any additional information the commission may desire. The commission at Washington, upon receipt of this appraisement, shall determine the amount, if any, of the loan to which the applicant is entitled and return to the postmaster the necessary deeds of trust to be executed by the applicant. This shall name the time for which the loan is to run and the amount, but leave blank the interest rate, because the interest is to be determined by the sale of the security. This deed of trust shall name the chairman of the commission as trustee for the use and benefit of the United States of America. Upon receipt of this deed of trust, duly executed, the commission shall sell at private or public sale this evidence of indebtedness at par within the city of Washington or elsewhere, as in its judgment the most advantageous terms for the borrower may be procured, and at the lowest rate of interest procurable. The borrower shall pay the rate of interest for which his security is sold and at the times specified therein, and, in addition thereto, shall pay whatever per cent as an amortization fund the commission in its judgment may fix.

Section 10 provides that this amortization fund shall be a common fund; that is, it is the fund from which the interest due upon any loan, when due, shall be paid, and also from which shall be paid the principal of any maturing obligation. The object of making it a common fund is obvious. It will enable the commission at any time to pay any interest payments

when due, or any loan upon its maturity, and therefore will make the security more desirable, and the interest rate the same in every State in this Union, because the lender can have no interest in the location of the lands or to whom the money he loans shall be paid. He merely files his voucher with any postmaster of the first, second, or third class, or any national bank, and the same will be cashed, and in the same manner his loan at its maturity will be paid. Thus no one will hesitate to loan money to one who applies through this system, and the failure of crops, the death of the borrower, or any other misfortune or disaster can not delay the payment of the interest or the cancellation of the loan itself at its maturity.

Section 11 provides the manner of foreclosing a mortgage when the borrower shall have failed to meet his interest payments or the payment of his obligation upon its maturity. The land shall be seized through a foreclosure procedure had in the district court for the district wherein the lands are situated. All officers of said court are made the agents of this commission, and to serve without additional pay. Any time during the pending of the suit the borrower may pay his arrears, and the suit will be dismissed, or if he fails to do so, and his lands are sold, he has one year from date of sale in which to redeem the same. The sale, under the provisions of this bill, is not a sale in the sense that the obligation shall be paid in its entirety, but only its arrears, so that the tenure of the loan upon the land for a period of years shall not be disturbed. The purchaser at said sale shall merely pay the sum in arrears, together with what costs, if any, may be accrued to this amortization fund and assume the obligations of the original borrower. Whatever in addition to this that he may bid for the land shall be paid to the holder of the equity therein.

Section 12, in my judgment, is the most important section in the bill, and one against which the most bitter opposition will be waged. In this section the Government guarantees the payment of these loans, interest and principal. In this section of the bill the Government does for rural credits what it did for commercial banking in the Federal reserve act; that is, guarantees the observance of all its contracts and the redemption of all its obligations. This will make a farmer's loan as much to be desired by the investing public as a bond of these United States, and in many respects more to be desired, because in addition to the credit of these United States he has the real estate of the borrower, which is the best security that can be offered, and in this country, where values are constantly on the increase, this security will be more valuable as the years go by. If section 12 is permitted to remain in the bill—and without it the bill should not pass—there is no reason to believe that the rate of interest which a farmer will be compelled to pay will ever be in excess of 3½ per cent. Industrial securities, such as the bonds of the Pennsylvania Railway system, are now selling at par at that rate, and the obligations of this Government have sold at par, with an interest rate below that, and, therefore, in my judgment, the maximum interest rate would not exceed this, and might be considerably lower. When agriculture shall enjoy the benefits of this provision and procure its money with which to operate on long-time loans at not exceeding that rate, not only will the farmers of this country prosper, but all the people who consume the products of the farm, and that means all the people within the boundary of our great Republic shall, to an equal extent, reap the benefits of this act.

Section 13 limits the amount of a loan to any one person at $5,000. The object sought by the limitation is to make it impossible for one to build up or maintain large landed estates under the favorable conditions provided for borrowers under the provisions of this act. Were there no limitations it would be not only possible but profitable for men taking advantage of the low rate of interest guaranteed in this bill to acquire large landed estates and thereby defeat the very object of the bill, which is to make the men who till the soil the owners thereof. It provides that where lands upon which a loan has been procured shall pass into the hands of some one not a bona fide farmer, under the provisions of this bill said loan shall become due and payable. If this were not true, it would be possible by use of dummies for one to acquire loans under the provisions of this act, while in fact he was not entitled thereto. It further provides that where anyone shall acquire lands on which mortgages in excess of $5,000 procured under the provisions of this act rest the excess of $5,000 shall become due and payable. This is also a provision to prevent accumulation in the hands of one man large estates purchased with money secured under the advantages of the low rate of interest made possible by the provisions of this bill.

The entire intention of the bill is that it shall assist farmers to become the owners of their own homes; that those who till the soil shall own it. It is as necessary to protect farmers from the greed of land speculators as from the exactions of commercial banks. The country rests, and must rest, for its security and preservation upon the farmers of this country, and conditions must be made possible whereby every man who farms shall own the lands he tills. When this bill shall have become a law that condition will have been created and that result will follow. Therefore this bill should receive the unqualified support of all who have at heart the interests and the desire to protect from unjust conditions that class that founded and must preserve this Government and the free institutions we all enjoy.

A bill (H. R. 20841) to provide for a low rate of interest and long-time loans in aid of agriculture, and for other purposes.

Whereas experience has demonstrated that a banking system suitable and adequate for the transaction of commercial banking is unsuited and inadequate for agriculture; and

Whereas the rate of interest that prevails in commercial transactions is in excess of that agriculture can pay; and

Whereas it is desired to establish a system whereby those bona fide engaged in agriculture may obtain a loan at a low rate of interest and long-time payment; and

Whereas it is not desired to disturb local banking conditions; and

Whereas it is in the interest of agriculture and good citizenship that large landed estates be not acquired; and

Whereas those who actually reside upon the land and till the soil should be the owners thereof: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the short title of this act shall be "A rural credits act."

SEC. 2. That there is hereby created in the Department of the Treasury at Washington, D. C., a commission to be known as a rural credits commission, said commission to be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. These commissioners shall be selected from the various sections of the United States, and three of whom shall be actual bona fide farmers, who reside upon their farms and have no other occupations. Two shall be men of business affairs and recognized financial ability. The said rural credits commission shall herein be referred to as the commission. They shall elect one of their members chairman.

SEC. 3. That at first said commissioners shall be appointed for one, two, three, four, and five years, respectively, and after that their terms of office shall be for five years each unless removed by the President for cause. The salary shall be $6,000 each, payable quarterly.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall assign them rooms for the conduct of their business, and they shall have power to appoint clerks and employ assistants that may be necessary for the transaction of the business of the department.

SEC. 5. That said commission shall have power to prescribe all rules and regulations necessary for carrying into effect the provisions of this act and for the conduct of the business of the department.

SEC. 6. That all postmasters throughout the United States and Territories thereof and the District of Columbia, for the purpose of carrying this act into effect and for the proper conduct of its business, shall be the agents of the commission and perform whatever services may be required of them without pay.

SEC. 7. That the purpose of this act shall be to enable farmers to procure long-time loans at low rate of interest to purchase farms or to develop and extend their agricultural productiveness. The word "farmer" as herein used shall mean one who actually resides upon his farm and is engaged in the business of farming, and the benefits of this bill shall be applicable to farmers residing in any State or Territory of the United States of America or the District of Columbia. The loans herein contemplated shall run in series of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 years, at the option of the borrower, interest to be payable annually. The terms of such loan shall provide that at any interest-paying date beyond five years the borrower shall have the option to pay the principal, or to make payment of $100, or any multiple thereof, and upon such payment being made the interest on the amount so paid shall cease. Payment may be made at any post office or national bank. No person shall be entitled to a loan unless he actually resides upon his farm, or shall use the loan in payment of lands upon which he shall immediately fix his home. The amount of the loan shall be determined by the commission herein created, except anyone applying who is entitled to the loan shall, if he desires, receive as a loan as much as 50 per cent of the actual value of his lands and 25 per cent of the actual value of the improvements thereon, and as much more as may in the judgment of the commission be safe and prudent to extend him.

SEC. 8. That all securities or deeds of trust executed by anyone to secure a loan hereunder shall be made payable to the chairman of the commission as the trustee for the United States of America. Said instrument shall recite the amount of the loan and date of maturity, but shall not name the rate of interest to be paid thereon. Said instrument must be executed by the borrower according to forms of the State or Territory in which the lands are situated and in conformity with the rules and regulations prescribed by the commission. In addition to executing the said instrument herein referred to the borrower shall execute notes with coupons attached for interest periods named in said deed of trust and in the form that may be prescribed by the commission. These coupons are redeemable or payable at any national bank or any post office of the first, second, or third class. These notes, securities, coupons, and obligations and funds shall not be subject to taxation, municipal, State, or national. The title to said lands shall be shown by a suitable abstract, which shall be forwarded with the application for the loan, except in those States where the Torrens system may prevail, and in those States the certificate of the State shall be sufficient evidence of title. There shall be proper officers appointed for the examination of titles, for which services no fee shall be charged.

SEC. 9. That a farmer desiring to avail himself of the provisions of this act shall file with the local postmaster a written application under oath, setting forth the security he has to offer, the amount of the loan he desires, and the purposes for which he desires it, and such other facts as may be required by the commission. Whereupon the postmaster shall appoint two committees, consisting of three members each; the first named of each shall act as chairman of his committee. The first committee shall consist of three farmers residing in the immediate vicinity of the farm upon which the loan is desired, and who shall be familiar with its value, and they shall make an appraisement of the value of the lands and the improvements thereon separately. Said appraisements shall be under oath and secret, and shall be filed with the postmaster appointing said committee. The second committee

shall consist of three men of affairs who are familiar with the land and improvements upon which the loan is sought and with the general conditions in that vicinity, as to whether values of real estate are advancing or declining, and whether the applicant is a progressive farmer or otherwise. They shall likewise appraise the farm and improvements and give whatever other information may be necessary to determine the hazard of the loan. These appraisements shall likewise be secret and made under oath and filed with the postmaster appointing said committees. When these appraisements are received by the postmaster, the postmaster and the chairmen of the two committees shall proceed to open the appraisements and to make therefrom a just and accurate appraisement of the property, both lands and improvements, and transmit the same to the chairman of the said commission at Washington, together with whatever other information may be necessary with reference to the applicant in the loan sought, to enable the commission to determine the amount to be loaned, if any. When the application is received and approved by the said commission, it shall cause to be forwarded to the postmaster from whom it was received the necessary notes and instruments to be executed by the borrower, who shall execute them in the manner prescribed by the commission and return to said commission. Thereupon said notes and instruments for the loan shall be sold in the open market for par at the lowest rate of interest procurable. The proceeds of said sale shall be transmitted to the borrower. The borrower shall not only pay the rate of interest agreed upon in said sale, but shall pay whatever per cent may be necessary for the amortization of said loan at maturity thereof. The per cent for amortization shall be fixed by the commission.

SEC. 10. That the moneys paid in under amortization herein provided for shall be a trust fund available for the payment of any interest or principal that may be due and unpaid on any loan made under the provisions of this act, and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States or put out at interest, as may be determined by said commission.

SEC. 11. That if any borrower shall make default in the payment of principal or interest under the provisions of his loan, then, under such rules and regulations as the commission may prescribe, his lands shall be seized and sold subject to the terms of the loan, and for the purpose of said seizure and sale suit may be brought in the name of the commission, and all district attorneys are hereby authorized and commanded to prosecute said suits without fee. Said suits shall be in the United States district court for the district in which the lands are situated. From the proceeds of said sale all costs shall be first paid, and accrued interest and principal, if due, and the residue, if any, shall be paid to the borrower. Real estate sold under the provisions of this act may be redeemed from said sale by anyone holding the equity therein within one year from the date of sale.

SEC. 12. That the United States of America shall guarantee the payment of all interest and principal of loans procured under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 13. That no loan shall be in excess of $5,000. If the premises mortgaged under the provisions of this act shall pass into the ownership of anyone who is not a bona fide farmer, the indebtedness shall at once become due and payable. If anyone shall acquire lands upon which there is a loan under the provisions of this act in excess of $5,000, the excess of $5,000 shall at once become due and payable.

SEC. 14. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

The remarks of H. S. Mobley are as follows:

In my argument before your committee at various times I have outlined the idea which we farmers have of the reasons why a rural-credit system separate from the commercial banking system is necessary. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to go into that at this time. The plan which we propose for rural credits is different from anything which has been presented to the committee; that is, that I have knowledge of.

One objection to all the plans which have been presented to you is that they propose, in some measure at least, that the source of the credit to be extended to the farmer is to be derived from money which is payable on demand. Not one of them, so far as I am aware, proposes to bring, in an available way, in reach of the borrowing farmer real investment money. Another general objection to these plans is that, almost without exception, they would bind the farmer to the necessity of paying for his investment loans the rate of commercial interest prevailing in the State where the borrower resides. And, gentlemen, these two things are fundamentally wrong, and we are prepared to say that a rural-credit plan providing for long-time loans, whose source is demand capital and charging commercial interest, instead of being a help to the farmer, would be a detriment; and if this is the only kind of rural credits which your committee or the Congress and Senate of the United States will enact on behalf of the farmer, we believe it would be better to drop the whole matter and leave things as they are.

Our plan, in the concrete, is about as follows:

Any actual farmer to be permitted to approach some officer of the Federal Government in his immediate locality—possibly the postmaster—and on prepared blanks make application for a loan on his land for either part payment on his farm or to discharge a previous lien, the Federal officer to have authority to appoint two sets of appraisers, of three men each, each set to operate independently of the other and to be appointed by the Federal officer at separate times, so that one set of appraisers will not be officially in existence at the time the other set makes its appraisement; no member of the two sets of appraisers to be related to the proposed borrower nor connected with him by business relations or otherwise; the first set to be three actual farmers who have had a personal knowledge of the land offered as security and the one asking it for a period of five years, they to make their appraisement of the value of the property and to reveal nothing to anyone concerning the result of their finding, but to make a sworn report in writing and file it, sealed, with the local Federal officer; after their report, this officer to appoint another set of appraisers, who are to be men of affairs in the business relations of the community, they to make an appraisement according to their judgment and report to the Federal officer in like manner; the Federal officer then to call in the chairmen of the two appraising committees, and they three to open the sealed reports of the two committees and make a final appraisement and recommendation for the loan on the property.

There to be established in the Treasury at Washington a commission of 12 men, to be known as the rural-credit commission, 7 of these men to be actual farmers who have had five years continuous experience in deriving their living from the soil immediately previous to their appointment, the other 5 men to be men of affairs in the financial life of the Nation. Their salaries and expenses to be paid by the United States Government.

The local Federal officer will report to this commission the recommendation of his appraising committees, and this Federal commission, if it be satisfied that the recommendation is for a reasonable and secure loan on the property, to cause to be filled out a form of mortgage, which shall be returned to the local officer for acceptance and signature by the borrowing farmer. This mortgage to be then returned to the Federal commission. When the commission shall have accumulated a sufficient number of these mortgages, they to offer them for sale, with the guaranty of the Government behind them, at par or face value, and at the least rate of interest for which they will be accepted by the investing public.

When such mortgages are sold the sums derived from their sale to be forwarded to the local Federal officer or officers and paid over on receipt to the borrowing farmer or farmers, and the date upon which the borrower receipts for the money shall be the date from which the mortgage is to begin, and the rate of interest at which the Federal commission has sold the mortgage shall be the rate of interest on the mortgage. The commission to collect, in addition, at each interest period, a percentage for amortization; and in addition to this, the commission to collect annually from each borrower a sum of not to exceed one-tenth of 1 per cent, which is to be held in the United States Treasury as a guaranty against loss on the part of the Government for its guaranty of these mortgages.

I am aware that here the objection will be raised that the Government should not guarantee these mortgages; that it is unprecedented, etc.; but if you will consider that these loans would be made at not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the property, that each year a certain per cent of the face value of the mortgage will be paid by the borrower, and that in addition there will be collected from all the borrowers in the United States a sum of money each year which at the end of a 35-year period, at one-tenth of 1 per cent, will amount to a 3½ per cent guaranty deposit in the Treasury, it will be seen that there can be no possible risk to the Government in guaranteeing these mortgages. I believe I will ask you to consider this a little more fully. The Government will have as a guaranty two dollars for one in property value; it will also have the appreciated value of the property from year to year (and no one can doubt that most farm lands will constantly appreciate from year to year); it will also have the amortization paid by the borrower reducing the face value of the mortgage, and, in addition, this 3½ per cent at the end of a 35-year period.

If this system of appraisement and security does not constitute an absolutely safe business deal, it is impossible for us to conceive of one.

Now, gentlemen, we have presented the outline of our plan, and desire to make some further explanations and arguments in behalf of it. The kernel of the whole matter of rural credits for investment is that the loans must be for a long time and the source of these loans be investment and not demand capital. All investment loans for agriculture should carry the amortization feature, and the most necessary feature of the whole is that they should bear a rate of interest considerably below the commercial rate.

Now, as I have said, I have not found among any of the plans any that proposed rural credits in line with this idea. Gentlemen, agriculture can not pay commercial rates of interest nor prosper under short-time loans, nor long-time loans derived from demand capital. As evidence of this last, banks do not, as a rule, seek to lend the permitted 20 per cent of their capital on long-time loans. The plan which we here propose meets all the demands above set forth.

This plan does not bring the necessarily low interest of agricultural loans into competition locally through neighborhood cooperations with the commercial interest charged by the local banks. This should be gravely considered by you.

Strong emphasis is laid in most of the plans proposed before you on some form of local cooperation among farmers of a financial nature before they can secure any form of rural credits. If local cooperative banks are to be our only source of farm loans, they must compete with local commercial banks, not only as regards the rate of interest but also with regard to the use of local capital. Therefore these cooperative banks of a local nature, being more or less in competition with local commercial banks for local capital, would have a tendency not to lower but to actually raise the local rate of interest. And this further result would follow that the higher rate of commercial rate of interest would attract the local money supply, and would not only serve to raise interest locally on all classes of loans but also would attract local capital more to commercial loans by reason of an increased interest which could be paid by money used for commercial purposes in that locality.

And, again, local cooperation by farmers in order to obtain investment loans is not wanted by the American farmers any more than by American merchants. There is no more reason for the American farmer being compelled to cooperate with his fellow farmers in order to obtain a loan of investment nature on land of known value than there is for cooperation among merchants to obtain loans of a commercial nature on their property of known value or on their credit.

This cooperative feature would tend to destroy the incentive for the individual to build up his own credit according to the laws of credit, individual wealth, trade ability and integrity, and have a tendency to communize him. I am speaking now, of course, of land loans and not personal credit for purely agricultural productive purposes.

It may seem strange that a nation-wide organization purporting to teach and practice cooperation should object to a cooperative system of rural credits. But this is only apparent. Those among us who have studied cooperation realize that, broadly speaking and as applied to agricultural efforts, according to American ideals, it is to be divided into two kinds—one may be called productive cooperation and the other distributive. Now, productive cooperation may not necessarily be communism, but it is at least communistic and tends toward communism. The organization which I have the honor to represent before you has in no way any inclination to enter into productive cooperation, but confines its efforts solely to the advancement of the idea of a distributive cooperation among its fellows. It presumes that the individuals composing its membership will be able to provide their own homes, tools, land, or, that is to say, their own investments, according to the capacity of the individual, and that the individual will use his own judgment as regards his investments and his production. After he has produced a commodity of a kind, the farmers' union undertakes to teach him to cooperate to find a market; but even in that cooperation the individualistic idea is steadfastly maintained so that the individual among us producing the less number or amount of commodities or inferior commodities can not derive any benefit through his cooperation with his fellow cooperators, who have been able to produce a greater amount of marketable commodities of a better grade. In other words, we are purely an American farmers' cooperative organization and scarcely at all tinged with the idea of productive or communistic cooperation, which can not but tend to bring about a leveling of individualistic character among its membership; but, as I have intimated,

we strive constantly through our cooperative ideas of a distributive nature to bring out and develop the very best in each individual among us by a competitive system of cooperation. Therefore, we are opposed to cooperative land banks or cooperation of any nature that tends even to transplant to American soil the peasantizing and communistic farm cooperation ideas and practices of the European countries.

Our plan for rural credits places the individual on his own resources for a loan on his own property without involving either the limited or unlimited liability of his neighbors. But there is in this plan a cooperation which is American in its nature; it is not local, but is Nation wide. Each borrower pays a small assessment to the Federal commission as a guaranty for every other borrower, and after all our plan is cooperative, but does not affect the individual nor his personal ability to obtain a loan perceptibly. And, involving as it does all the borrowers in a national liability, constitutes in our plan a far better security for a loan than could possibly be had under any system of local cooperation where only a few men relatively stand liable or as security for loans in a locality. The whole guaranty fund distributed among all the borrowers in the Nation assembled at one point as guaranty for all loans would certainly be better security than any local cooperative plan could offer. This plan certainly would act to stabilize all the loans, whereas under local cooperation some loans would be amply secured and some possibly would not, which would tend to depreciate the value of all farm loans and thereby tend to increase the rate of interest at which they could be secured.

We advocate a limit to the amount that can be borrowed by any farmer in this way. If the amount is not limited, this condition could arise: The large landholders, by reason of better business ability, could borrow more easily than the man who is perhaps not so well informed and who is occupying all of his time in a struggle to support a family and pay for a home, and the result would be that while the rural-credit law would be ostensibly for the help of such home-owning farmers it would become, in effect, a real help toward extending landlordism and syndicatism in farms throughout the country, and the genuine purpose of the rural-credit law would be defeated. Also, in this connection, a rural-credit law which does not actually provide for a rate of interest below the commercial rate would aid to this end, since the more competent men of larger means and greater ability in handling money could necessarily make greater profits and could, therefore, pay a higher rate of interest.

As I have intimated, our plan preserves:

First. The individuality of the borrowing farmer and does not tend in any way to communize him.

Second. Is cooperative at last, but not directly in a communistic or joint-liable sense.

Third. Its guaranty is distributed over so wide a field as to be not burdensome on any borrower.

Fourth. Its security or guaranty is better, as I have intimated, than any local guaranty of a cooperative nature could possibly be.

Fifth. The system of appraisement can not but arrive at a secure valuation and eliminate all reasonable doubts as to the value of the property as security for the loan.

Sixth. The Federal commission, composed as it is of actual farmers and business men, can act as a safeguard to farmers in other matters of a national nature pertaining to agriculture, somewhat after the plan of the German Landwitshaft-rat.

Seventh. This plan insures a low rate of interest on agricultural loans by using the Government to bring the owner of investment money and the small borrowing farmer together without the intermediary of any profit-taking form of business whatever. The big point in this is that the small borrower could reach the investor of long-time money with perfect ease, whereas no plan which I have heretofore heard proposed offers to do this nor to provide a real method for lowering interest on agricultural loans.

Eighth. This plan of obtaining money at low interest would not affect the local commercial rate of interest in any way.

Ninth. Does not admit of the possibility of loss to the Government that all other plans I have heard proposed seemed to.

Tenth. Does not use any demand money for long-time loans.

Eleventh. Would relieve local banks of their present necessity of striving to carry the long-time loans of their communities on demand money.

Twelfth. But would permit local banks to use all their capital for commercial or personal credit or for productive loans, thus going a long way toward providing a means for personal credits in the community where much money was borrowed by the farmers for investment.

Thirteenth. The money loaned as we have outlined on farms in any community would largely find its way into local banks of that community, and thus increase their resources for commercial and personal credit uses.

Fourteenth. A large factor in this plan is that it gives efficient aid, as I have said, to the small borrower to reach the investor of long-time money and borrow for a low interest.

In conclusion I wish to say that the theory of all law, as I understand it, is that every man is equal before the law, both as to its opportunities and to its restrictions; that an opportunity offered by a legal enactment may seem to be fair and open to all, but this fact is true, that wherever the law offers men opportunities those men of best business ability and resources are the ones who profit most and necessarily the great masses of less resourceful men profit less.

American farmers have as much ability as any other class of our people, but our ability is not usually what is termed business ability. Our occupation consumes our interests and ability in other directions than those of a strictly commercial business nature. Therefore, when we are left to compete with commercial business of better business resources and ability than ourselves, we always stand to fail to get our share of the opportunities, which, in theory, we should share equally with others, because the other classes are better trained and skilled in business than are we and can secure to themselves the benefits more readily.

Therefore we farmers here and now ask this Government to cure in this matter of rural credits this disadvantage in finances under which we labor. In substance, we ask the Government to act as our middle man and create for us this opportunity of securing credit based on investment money and to bring us in touch with the investors under such statutory legalization as will secure to us that which we are unable to secure for ourselves in competition with these more resourceful and better trained men. This, gentlemen, in substance, is our plea, and we feel that the more serious consideration you give to this subject the more benefit you will confer upon American farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

[Mr. SLOAN addressed the committee. His remarks will appear hereafter.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

[Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota addressed the committee. His remarks will appear elsewhere in to-day's RECORD.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally arose; and Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Navy Department.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill that I have pending on the woman suffrage question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is such a large number of Democrats on the other side, nine in all, that I shall have to raise the point of no quorum. Of course, I realize that a great many of them are going out on the 4th of March in any event——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota make the point of no quorum?

Mr. NORTON. No; I will not make the point at this time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, before I begin I want to ask unanimous consent to make extensions of my remarks in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the brief time available to discuss our foreign relations, and particularly our relations with the Far East. At this juncture our foreign relations are perhaps in a more critical condition than they have been for many decades, possibly for more than a century. The importance of those relations is not confined to Europe, the chief theater of war. The most important and critical situation of all is the one in the Far East, as it has developed in the course of this war.

Space is annihilated. The nations of the world must find a way to live together as neighbors. The immediate result of the annihilation of space in the era of militarism has been a rush to arms in five countries. Out of the great war the nations will adjust themselves and find a way by which they can live peaceably as close neighbors.

What applies to nations of the same race, as found close together in Europe, will apply to the great races of the world, and especially to the great yellow race and the great white race. These two great races must find a way by which they can live together peaceably, in harmony with each other and with the world.

China embodies the bulk of the yellow race. In fact, in the Chinese Republic now live approximately one-third of the whole human race. China is the Republic of the yellow race. America is the Republic of the white race. Those two nations have

already established between themselves a condition of peculiar friendship and amity. America has interested itself in the welfare of China for various reasons. I will not go over in detail the various disinterested steps that our country has taken which have drawn close the ties that bind us to the great Chinese people. The relations of China to America and to the world are threatened by a violent change of status following the capture by Japan of the German possession or leasehold of Kiaochau and its port of Tsingtau.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman speaks of the annihilation of space with relation to the races. Why does not Japan as the ally of England take part with their land forces in the present European war if space has been annihilated?

Mr. HOBSON. Well, I do not think it is a question of space which keeps her from taking part, because there are troops taking part in the European war that have come from longer distances than would be required for the Japanese troops.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I yield.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. As I understand, the alliance between England and Japan is that Japan is not supposed to take any stock in the war only as an adversary of Great Britain might affect Japan in the Far East. In other words, Japanese belligerency is confined to the Occident, and Japan is under no obligation to take stock in the war in Europe.

Mr. HOBSON. Well, my understanding is that the articles of alliance which were made public prescribe military cooperation in the regions of the Far East, but I understand Japan has announced her readiness to send troops to Europe under the obligations of the treaty. Now, this change of status in China by the substitution of Japan for Germany has suddenly opened up the whole far eastern question in a form to affect the very life of the Republic of China, and involves the relations of America to China, and ultimately the relations of the white race and the yellow race.

In 1899 and in 1900 the United States entered into negotiations and exchanged notes with the various nations of the world with a view to coming to a common ground in their attitude toward China. The object was clearly stated by Secretary Hay in a communication to the Chinese Government dated July 3, 1900, as follows:

> The policy of the Government of the United States is to seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China, preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity, protect all rights guaranteed to friendly powers by treaty and international law, and safeguard for the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all ports of the Chinese Empire.

Our Government's efforts were crowned with peculiar success. Definite written agreements were entered into with all the great nations to maintain the open-door policy in China and to respect the integrity and sovereignty of that Empire, it being then an Empire. I will not recite the correspondence here, but for purposes of reference I will put it in my remarks as an extension. The first Government to confirm those articles was Great Britain, then France, Russia was next, and then came Japan, followed by Italy, then Germany. All agreed with our Secretary of State in his attitude and his recommendations. In the case of Japan it is a peculiarly happy note of confirmation, and substantially to this effect:

> Viscount Aoki to Mr. Buck: I have the happy duty of assuring your excellency that the Imperial Government will have no hesitation to give their assent to so just and fair a proposal of the United States, provided that all the other powers concerned shall accept the same.

When all the great nations had pledged their acceptance there was established the most unanimous part of international law thus far adopted by the civilized nations of the world, the just and humane principle or doctrine known as the open-door policy in China, which in principle has the same foundation as the other great American policy, the Monroe doctrine, based on respect for the rights of weak peoples and the establishment of equal opportunity for trade.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. HOBSON. I am quoting from treaties, conventions, international acts, protocols, and so forth, between United States and other powers, volume 1, Malloy. I will put these in my remarks as an extension.

Now, in 1908 our Government exchanged an identical note with the Government of Japan making more binding the open-door policy. This note had five provisos. It was exchanged between the two on November 30, 1908.

> 1. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.
> 2. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.
> 3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.
> 4. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.
> 5. Should any event occur threatening the status quo as above described or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

There could be no agreement more specific, more solemn, more binding or sacred to the good faith of the two Governments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Could I have an extension? A good deal of time has been taken by asking me questions.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no more time to yield.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield to the gentleman five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. HOBSON. In 1858 the treaty of amity and commerce was negotiated with China, and the first article of the treaty reads as follows:

> There shall be, as there have always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Ta Tsing Empire, and between their people, respectively. They shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling cause, so as to produce an estrangement between them, and if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively the United States will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feelings.

The relationship of our Government to the Chinese Government as established by this article is peculiar and intimate—that of an elder brother holding himself always ready to help in time of trouble. The reliance that the Chinese Government places in us is shown in the following:

CHINESE RELIANCE ON UNITED STATES—CHINESE GOVERNMENT TO UNITED STATES MINISTER AFTER BOXER TROUBLES.

> Now China, driven by the irresistible course of events, has unfortunately incurred well-nigh universal indignation. For settling the present difficulty China places special reliance in the United States. We address this message to your excellency in all sincerity and candidness, with the hope that your excellency will devise measures and take the initiative in bringing about a concert of the powers for the restoration of order and peace.

It was perfectly natural for our Government, acting under this obligation and under the obligation of section 5 of the joint note with Japan cited above, to ask for a statement of intentions when the Japanese proceeded to the siege of Kiaochow. Our Government was informed, so the papers stated, that the purpose of the Japanese Government was simply to remove Germany as an element of discord from the Far East, and that the intention was to restore Kiaochow and Tsingtau to the Chinese Government.

I will not here review in detail what has happened since the fall of Tsingtau, though I will put in my remarks as an extension various newspaper chronicles. Step by step a grave crisis has been created. The Chinese Government requested the Japanese Government, when the Germans had been removed, to withdraw her troops, abolishing the war zone, since no war further existed. The Japanese Government responded by making certain demands upon the Chinese Government—21 in number. Secrecy as to their nature was insisted upon by the Japanese Government, but it soon became known that Japan had very serious designs upon the sovereignty of China. The Chinese Government was not permitted to give out officially what these demands were, but the Japanese Government proceeded to give out official information that was incomplete, that omitted the very demands that struck at the integrity and sovereignty of China as a whole, such as the demand that the Chinese Government employ Japanese advisers for conducting administrative, financial, and military affairs, and the demand that the Chinese Government employ Japanese for policing China. The Japanese information likewise omitted demands striking at the principle of the open door, such as the demand for exclusive concessions in the Yangtze Valley and the heart of China.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to get the truth in this matter, I introduced a resolution on the 10th day of February, in line with the treaty obligation our country owes China, as pointed out here, and carrying out the spirit of section 5 of our specific agreement with Japan to discuss such questions together. The resolution called on the State Department to supply Congress with the correspondence and the facts and the information relating to these demands that are reported to have been made on the Chinese Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was that resolution privileged?

Mr. HOBSON. The resolution is privileged. I requested the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to give me a hearing and to act upon this within the seven-day limit prescribed by

the rules of the House. My impression was that the chairman of that committee at first was very amiably inclined to grant my reasonable request for a hearing and to take the action within the appointed time. I am informed that afterwards he conferred with the State Department and at its instance decided to ignore the regular procedure and to deny my request for a hearing and to cover up the whole question as far as practicable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have undertaken at various times on the floor of this House to speak about conditions in the Far East. Mr. Chairman, the hiding of the truth can serve no good purpose, particularly in a republic. The people are entitled to know the truth about this question. If the demands in question are just and do not conflict with the principle of the open-door policy and do not seriously affect the status quo, then there can be no objection to this information being made public. If my demand is unjust and would invade the rights of American citizens in violating the principle of the open door and threatening the sovereignty of China, then not only our Government but our people are entitled as a right to the truth and the whole truth. The future course of China, the future course of the world, may depend upon America's doing her full duty in this crisis. A definite expression of our position would tend to relieve the situation and might avert action by them that could only lead ultimately to war. I have therefore to-day introduced a second resolution, citing our peculiar responsibility for the existence of the open-door policy in the Far East, and stating that we would view with disfavor the overthrow by any nation of the status quo during the period of the war that is distracting so many of the nations we prevailed upon to establish the open door, and stating in simple terms our adherence to the principle of the open-door policy in the Far East and that we would view with grave concern, as an unfriendly act, any offensive movement striking at the integrity and sovereignty of China.

Further on, under the five-minute rule, I will add to my remarks.

[Mr. HOBSON'S address under the five-minute rule is as follows:]

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to pursue further the question of foreign relations and the crisis in the Far East.

I lived in China for about a year and a half. On an average more than 1,000 Chinese worked for me during that period. We were rebuilding Spanish gunboats sunk at Manila and brought over to China to be reconstructed. This residence in China and close contact with its people led me to gain an intimate knowledge of Chinese character. I was very deeply impressed and returned with a profound and even affectionate regard for China and things Chinese. All my observations and investigations have lead me to conclude with Secretary John Hay "that the key to the world's politics for the next five centuries is China." My colleagues can imagine the solicitude I felt in reading the following extract from an article by Count Okuma, prime minister of Japan, which forecasts the ruling of China by Japan:

> We must be careful to keep this point in mind and prepare ourselves with power to meet the struggle for existence.
>
> The people who can not meet this struggle will be crushed. Some one may say that even though a country fall, the people of the country may survive. But a race whose country has fallen, being unable to stand in the struggle for existence, is bound to be oppressed by other races and their increase stopped. If one can not earn a competence, he can not marry, and human increase will cease. In that way an unseen human slaughter is perpetuated.
>
> Thus those who are superior will govern those who are inferior. I believe within two or three centuries the world will have a few great governing countries, and others will be governed by them, will pay homage to the mighty. In other words, about four or five great countries, each having a population of 500,000,000 and an enormous territory, will be developed, and the other countries will be attached to these great ones. For instance, England, Russia, Germany, and France may be such countries. There may be one or two other independent countries.
>
> In that event, woe to the nations which are governed. We should from now on prepare ourselves to become a governing nation, not a nation governed.

The estimated average wage throughout the Chinese Empire is about 10 cents for a hard working man, perhaps a little less. I do not hesitate to say that if the Chinese were working in the open markets of the world, according to the world's scale, that this would increase fivefold and even tenfold. The foreign commerce of China now averages less than a dollar per capita. This would increase fivefold and tenfold, with a correspondingly tremendous increase in the purchasing capacity of that people.

Now, about one-third of the human race live in China—they have about them, where they live, the richest natural resources yet undeveloped in all the world. There is no such combination elsewhere on the face of the earth. Most of the undeveloped lands of the earth elsewhere have no industrial population ready to supply the labor for development. China has. I can not help foreseeing that the great commerce of the world, the great course of the world's civilization is going to swing around the Pacific Ocean. As important as are the events in Europe now occurring, the great futures for our children and our children's children and the human race are to be determined around the great Pacific Ocean.

It so happens that in the fullness of time America was placed in the Far East without ever having done violence to any far-eastern country. We fell heir to the responsibilities of the Philippine Islands, and yet never committed violence against them. We have never imposed opium on China; we never seized the territory of China nor of any weak people either on the Eastern or the Western Hemisphere. We stand to-day with clean hands and pure hearts on the threshhold of this vast myriad of human beings, with all their stupendous possibilities of industrial development and capacity to enrich the world's commerce beyond the dreams of men to-day. I believe in destiny, because I believe in God. America stands innately for the principle of justice to the weak and equal opportunities between all—upon these foundations must be built the future peace of the world and the cause of civilization. In the march of world events America has become responsible for these principles in Atlantic and Pacific alike, under the Monroe doctrine in America and the open door in China.

Now, affairs in the Far East have reached a crisis. If a small military nation is to change the peaceful evolution of the great Chinese Republic, without question it will affect the generations unborn of all nations. In taking the stand I do, Mr. Chairman, I know that I am promoting the real cause of enduring peace. It is fundamental to say that when a people are just, as ours are, when they are disinterested and seek no selfish advantage anywhere, they ought not to be afraid of the truth, and where treaty rights give them a standing and duty calls, they ought not to be afraid to enunciate their adherence to the principles of right and justice, of humanity and sympathy, because some military power might not like it. It would be the greatest larceny, the greatest tragedy in the life history of the human species, for any military monarchy, through the power of the sword, against the rights of all other nations, and trampling upon the rights of the weak, to usurp the sovereignty of the Chinese Republic. [Applause.]

The American Nation is in honor bound, as well as bound by the dictates of self-interest, to prevent any such world tragedy. [Applause.]

[From the Washington Post, Wednesday, February 10, 1915.]

JAPAN SCHEMES TO SEIZE ALL CHINA—REPUBLIC IS TO BE TAKEN, REGARDLESS OF UNITED STATES, HOBSON SAYS—TELLS HOUSE OF INTRIGUES—WANTS CONGRESS TO GET DEMANDS ALREADY MADE OF MIKADO—SEES TIME NOW FOR ACTION—ALABAMA REPRESENTATIVE DECLARES GRADUAL SUPPRESSION OF COUNTRY, FOR WHOSE INTEGRITY THIS NATION HAS GIVEN ITS PLEDGE, IS GOING ON BEHIND SCREEN OF EUROPEAN WAR—INTRODUCES RESOLUTION CALLING ON STATE DEPARTMENT TO FURNISH SERIES OF 21 DEMANDS MADE SINCE BOMBARDMENT OF TSINGTAU—CONTENDS JAPAN IS CAPITALIZING THE REWARD FOR HER ASSISTANCE TO ALLIES—JAPAN KNOWS OF HELPLESSNESS OF NATIONS TO PREVENT SEIZURE.

The positive assertion that Japan has laid plans to take over China by force, and that this is to be done with the silent acquiescence if not the open sanction of Great Britain and with an utter disregard for the open-door policy with respect to China prevailing among the powers, was made last night by Representative RICHMOND PEARSON HOBSON, of Alabama, who recited a series of significant international events in support of his statements.

TAKING ADVANTAGE OF WAR.

Mr. HOBSON declared it was his opinion that Japan, in starting upon this enterprise now, is taking advantage of the general calamity in Europe, and that, because of the war conditions, America stands as the only obstacle in the way of the accomplishment of the plan. Japan, according to Mr. HOBSON'S well-known views, is not greatly concerned about American opposition, being in the position rather of inviting war with this country than of avoiding it.

FORESEES DRASTIC SOVEREIGNTY.

The sovereignty which Japan would exercise over China, the Alabama student of international affairs said, will be more drastic in character than that exercised over India by Great Britain. It would not only police the country, but it would control its development and direct its educational and social advancement, if there could be such a thing under an arrangement of this character.

Mr. HOBSON talked earnestly and deliberately, making his statements with a deep conviction that he was in possession of knowledge and deductions of which the American people should be apprised for their own good and protection. Prepared or not prepared for war, it was his opinion that the United States, as the one great Nation whose hands are untied by the struggle in Europe, should not sit with hands folded and without protest while a single nation takes it upon itself to wipe out treaty obligations which are solemn pledges to keep inviolate the integrity of China.

HE INTRODUCES RESOLUTION.

During the day Mr. HOBSON introduced in the House a resolution calling upon the State Department to furnish Congress with whatever information the department has in its possession, officially or unofficially, with respect to a series of demands recently made upon the Chinese Government by Japan. There are 21 of these demands, and

Mr. HOBSON is certain that if they are made public they will reveal the purposes of Japan.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas recent press dispatches have announced that 21 demands have been made upon the Chinese Government by a foreign Government: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Secretary of State is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to transmit to the House of Representatives any information in the possession of the State Department from official or unofficial sources relating to any recent demands, unusual between free Governments, that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by any other Government, and any similar information as to whether any recent demands that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by another Government, if enforced, would imperil the 'open-door' policy or the integrity and sovereignty of China."

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, before which Mr. HOBSON will appear as soon as possible in an effort to get a favorable report.

Reports to the State Department from Tokyo and Peking so far have been so meager that officials say they have been unable to determine the exact nature of Japan's demands.

Mr. Hobson last night declared that these demands constitute the most serious event of the entire war, so far as the United States is concerned, and that they are, in fact, of more significance than all the other happenings in Europe combined.

"I have noticed with great concern," said Mr. Hobson, "a series of press dispatches from Tokio foreshadowing a very serious change in the relations of China to America and all other countries. The first dispatch stated in effect that when the fighting around Kiauchau was all over and the Chinese Government pronounced that the war zone about Kiauchau had been abolished, the Japanese Government notified the Chinese Government that its proclamation was regarded by Japan as an unfriendly act.

APPEARED VERY SINGULAR.

"Since the fighting was over and no more war operations were being executed, it appeared on the face of it very singular that the cessation of the war zone reservation by China could possibly have given any just cause of complaint by Japan or any other country.

"The next dispatch announced briefly that the Japanese Government had entered into negotiations with the Chinese Government, with a view to determining the future relations between the two Governments, and also 'with a view to regulating the future development of China.' The latter part of this dispatch in its very vagueness was ominous, to say the least, as it is difficult to see how one Government can undertake to regulate the internal affairs of another free Government.

ACQUIESCENCE OF GREAT BRITAIN.

"The next dispatch announced that Japan had the support, or at least the acquiescence, of Great Britain, and that, by inference, no other nation of Europe would take exception.

"This clearly indicated that Japan is taking advantage of the occupation of the European nations, and is capitalizing the reward for her assistance to the allies, which later was a practical free hand in China, as far as the nations of Europe are concerned.

"The next dispatch announced that Japan had made 21 distinct, specific demands on China, the substance of which were being kept a secret. The next dispatch stated in effect that the Chinese Government, in spite of the menacing attitude of Japan, was opposing and resisting all attempts to encroach upon her sovereignty. The last dispatch announced that Japan has threatened to use armed forces unless China complies with her demands, these armed forces being already on the mainland of China ready for action.

CAN BE NO MISTAKE, HE SAYS.

"There can be no mistaking what this means. Japan is proceeding substantially to annex China and suppress that country's independence and sovereignty, and Japan is doing this at the point of the bayonet.

"This is in sinister contrast with the first announcement of Japan in undertaking the siege of Kiauchau to respect the integrity of China and restore Kiauchau to the Chinese Government.

"As I recall, our American Government made prompt inquiries of Japan as to her intentions in this matter and received the reply just referred to. The recent developments, which I have just cited, of course must command the most serious consideration not only from our own Government but from every patriotic citizen and every man who loves humanity and respects the rights of the weak against the encroachments of the unjust strong.

QUESTION "TANGIBLE AND OBVIOUS."

"The question is not academic. It is concrete, tangible, and obvious. America, with the other great nations, including Japan, has entered into solemn agreement under the leadership of the late John Hay, then Secretary of State, to respect the integrity of China and to uphold the principle of the open-door policy in China, under which all would engage in commerce on an equal footing.

"In addition to this, America has a solemn treaty compact with China, assuring to us the privileges of 'the most-favored nation.' What would become of our rights and other interests if Japanese sovereignty were extended over the entire Chinese Nation can be readily seen from what became of our rights in southern Manchuria when Japan took over that territory in China.

SEES TREATY RIGHTS IN DANGER.

"The question is best put to America and Americans alone as to whether our treaty rights with China are to be practically destroyed by an outside power. It is a question of whether the open-door policy is to be destroyed forever, a question of whether America and the other nations are to have a fair and equal chance in the competition for commerce on the Pacific, or whether a military monarchy through the use of might and brute force shall be allowed to take advantage of the general calamity in Europe to overthrow the rights of all other nations to destroy the latest and most wonderful Republic in the world, and change the lives and destinies of one-third, and that one-third the most peaceful third of the human race.

"The least that America can do at this juncture is without delay to find out what these specific 21 demands are and therefrom what are the real purposes of Japan.

"Not only is our Government entitled to this information, but Congress and the American people are entitled to it."

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, February 11, 1915.]

JAPAN'S DEMANDS ON CHINA DRASTIC—BREAK ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND, SAY BRITISH PAPERS—RELATIONS ARE STRAINED—SPECIAL RIGHTS CLAIMED BY TOKYO FROM ORIENTAL REPUBLIC—CURB FOREIGN CONCESSIONS—CHINA MUST EMPLOY JAPANESE IN HIGH OFFICIAL POSITIONS IN ARMY, POLICE, AND FINANCIAL DEPARTMENTS, ACCORDING TO ONE VERSION OF THE DEMANDS—CAN CALL ONLY UPON TOKYO TO PRESERVE HER INTEGRITY—BRITISH "SPHERE OF INFLUENCE" MENACED—VIOLENT ATTACKS MADE ON GREAT BRITAIN BY NIPPON PRESS—ENGLISH AID IN CAMPAIGN AGAINST TSINGTAU BITTERLY RESENTED.

PEKING, *February 11.*

It has been learned from high Chinese authorities that the following, although it lacks important details—for instance, the number of Japanese officials to be employed—is substantially the body of the Japanese Government's demands on China:

JAPANESE DEMANDS.

No section of China's coast or any island off the coast hereafter shall be ceded or leased to another power.

China must employ Japanese in high official positions in the army, police, and financial departments.

China may call upon Japan alone for the preservation of her integrity.

No foreigners except Japanese may be employed in the arsenals.

At least half of the arms and ammunition for China hereafter must be purchased from Japan.

Japan will establish an arsenal in China.

China must grant to Japan the same privileges as other nations for the establishment of schools, churches, hospitals, and missions, and for the purchase of the lands for them.

ENTERS BRITISH SPHERE.

In the Yangtse Valley, which the British have formerly considered their sphere of influence, Japan requires joint control with the Chinese of the Hanyang iron works, the Tayeh mines, and the Ping-Hsian collieries.

China may grant no competing concessions to other foreigners.

Railway concessions are demanded from Nanchang to Chauchaufu, from Nanchang to Kukiang, from Nanchang to Wuchang, and from Nanchang to Hangchow.

In Fukien Province, to which the Japanese lay special claim because of its proximity to the Japanese island of Formosa, the Japanese require the exclusion of other foreigners from future railway, mining, and dock building concessions, unless by Japanese consent.

DEMAND SPECIAL RIGHT.

In the Province of Shantung, besides the transfer of all the German rights, the Japanese demand special concessions, including a railway from the present line to the coast.

In inner Mongolia the exclusion of other foreigners from future mining or railway rights, except with Japan's consent, is demanded.

In Manchuria the extension of the present railway and territorial leases to 99 years is requested.

In both Mongolia and Manchuria the demand is made for the privilege of immigration and farming, as well as trading with the population, and the rights of settlement and land ownership.

All the railways demanded must be under Japanese and not Chinese control.

SEE MENACE TO ENGLAND.

The British newspapers published in the Far East suggest that Japan by her demands is breaking the alliance with Great Britain, while Japanese newspapers criticize Great Britain, in some cases violently, accusing her of having profited by the alliance and of being selfish in Japan's natural sphere.

It is stated that the relations of the allies became strained when the Japanese entered the war and the British sent 1,500 men to participate in the siege of the German fortress of Tsingtau, which some of the Japanese publications are reported to have considered not assistance, but interference.

[From the Washington Post, Sunday, February 14.]

CHINA ANSWERS JAPAN—CONTENTS OF REPLY TO TOKYO'S DEMANDS KEPT SECRET—GRAVE DANGER SEEN BY UNITED STATES—REPORTED THAT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS BELIEVE NIPPON IS ESTABLISHING ITS RULE IN NEW TERRITORY OF YUAN SHI KAI—SENATOR HITCHCOCK DECLARES UNITED STATES SHOULD PROTEST.

PEKING, CHINA, *February 13.*

The Chinese Government yesterday delivered to the Japanese legation at Peking a written reply to the demands recently made by Japan on China.

The contents of the Chinese answer have not been divulged. It is the general belief in Peking, however, that the reply reiterates China's willingness to discuss only 12 of the 21 demands contained in the Japanese notes.

UNITED STATES OFFICIALS ANXIOUS.

NEW YORK, *February 13.*

A Washington dispatch to the American says:

"Officials at the State Department are more concerned than their official obligations will allow them to admit over the persistence of reports, even from official sources, that Japan is establishing herself dangerously and perhaps permanently in new territory in China.

"M. Reinsch, United States minister at Peking, has made several reports within the last week, dealing with the accounts of the specific demands by Japan on China.

HITCHCOCK URGES PROTEST.

"Members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate feel that the pending questions between this country and the Governments of Great Britain and Germany are not more serious for the United States than the intentions of Japan toward China.

"Senator HITCHCOCK, of Nebraska, Democratic member of the committee, said to-day:

"'It looks as if Japan has seen her opportunity and intends to take advantage of it.

"'I think the United States ought to protest against any steps by Japan looking toward the acquisition of control of China, but I don't think it will accomplish anything. I would do it simply to keep the record clean.

"'Secretary Bryan has said there never will be war while he is in office, which means that no matter how great the wrong he will not do anything to right it; so, under the circumstances, our protest would have little weight.

AFTER CLOSE OF THE WAR.

"'What will happen at the close of the war? England, France, and Germany will be impoverished, while Russia will be in splendid condition owing to her vast resources, and Japan will be as well off as ever. Japan already practically controls the Pacific Ocean, certainly the Asiatic coast, and at the end of the war she will be firmly established on the mainland. Russia will be extended very greatly in the direction of Constantinople.'

"Another prominent member of the committee, a Republican, who is regarded as one of the best statesmen in the country, admitted the gravity of the situation.

"One member of the committee said he had been told by a high Japanese official that the two possible sources of friction between the United States and Japan were the latter's aspirations in Manchuria and the treatment of Japanese in California. This was an admission that Japan has her mind on acquiring a foothold on the mainland of China."

[From the Washington Post, Monday, February 15, 1915.]

JAPAN PRESSES CHINA—INSISTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF TOTAL DEMANDS MADE RECENTLY—PEKING REFUSES TO YIELD—YUAN'S MINISTER AT TOKYO TOLD THAT FULL COMPLIANCE WILL BE REQUIRED—JAPANESE CONSTRUCTING BARRACKS ALONG RAILWAY LEADING FROM TSINGTAU TO CAPITAL OF SHANTUNG.

PEKING, *February 14.*

The Chinese minister at Tokyo to-day reported to his Government that the Japanese foreign minister, Baron Takaki Kato, had declared that Japan must insist on the acceptance of the total demands recently made in the Japanese note to China. At the Chinese foreign office, however, it was said to be the intention of the Peking Government to continue in its refusal to acquiesce in the Japanese demands.

JAPAN BUILDING BARRACKS.

WEIHSIEN, SHANTUNG, CHINA, *February 14.*

Wooden barracks are being constructed by the Japanese at every railway station, except the smallest, along the line between Weihsien and Tsinan. Many of the buildings are nearing completion.

ON RAILWAY TO TSINGTAU.

Tsinan is the capital of the Chinese Province of Shantung, and is connected by rail through Weihsien with Tsingtau, the port of the Kiauchau concession recently surrendered by the Germans to the Japanese troops. The distance by rail between Tsingtau and Tsinan is approximately 225 miles.

The treaty records are as follows:

1899.

OPEN-DOOR POLICY IN CHINA.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TRANSMITTING A REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE, WITH COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH VARIOUS FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS CONCERNING AMERICAN COMMERCIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA.

To the House of Representatives:

In response to the resolution of the House of Representatives of March 24, 1900, reading as follows:

"Whereas the commercial community of the United States is deeply interested in ascertaining the conditions which are to govern trade in such parts of the Chinese Empire as are claimed by various foreign powers to be within their 'areas of interest'; and

"Whereas bills are now pending before both Houses of Congress for the dispatch of a mission to China to study its economic conditions: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be requested to transmit to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public service, such correspondence as may have passed between the Department of State and various foreign Governments concerning the maintenance of the 'open-door' policy in China,"

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, March 27, 1900.

THE PRESIDENT:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to transmit herewith, as called for by the resolution of the House of Representatives of March 24, 1900, copies of correspondence which has passed between the Department of State and the Governments of France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and Russia concerning American commercial rights in China.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN HAY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 26, 1900.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING AMERICAN COMMERCIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA.

FRANCE.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Vignaud.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 6, 1899.

SIR: I have to inclose, for your confidential information, copies of instructions I have sent under this date to the United States ambassadors at London, Berlin, and St. Petersburg in reference to the desire of this Government that the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, and Russia make formal declaration of an "open-door" policy in the territories held by them in China.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) To London, No. 205, September 6, 1899; to Berlin, No. 927, September 6, 1899; to St. Petersburg, No. 82, September 6, 1899.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Porter.)

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 21, 1899.

PORTER, *Ambassador, Paris:*

Informally submit to French Government form of declaration outlined in inclosures with instruction No. 664, September 6, and ask whether France will join.

HAY.

(Mr. Delcassé to Mr. Porter.)

[Particulier.]

AFFAIRES ETRANGÈRES.

[Received at United States embassy at Paris December 16, 1899.]

MON CHER AMBASSADEUR: Je trouve votre mot en rentrant. Des déclarations que j'ai apportées à la tribune de la Chambre le 24 Novembre dernier et que j'ai eu depuis l'occasion de vous rappeler, se dégage clairement le sentiment du Gouvernement de la République; il désire dans toute la Chine, et, sous la réserve toute naturelle que toutes les puissances intéressées affirmeront leur volonté d'agir de même, il est prêt à appliquer dans les territoires qui sont cédés à bail, un traitement égal pour les citoyens et sujets de toutes les nations, notamment en ce qui concerne les taxes douanières et de navigation ainsi que les tarifs de transport par chemins de fer.

Je vous prie, mon cher Ambassadeur, d'agréer avec la nouvelle expression de mes sentiments dévoués l'assurance de ma plus haute considération.

DELCASSÉ.

[Translation.]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR: I find your note awaiting me on my return. The declarations which I made in the Chamber on the 24th of November last, and which I have had occasion to recall to you since then, show clearly the sentiments of the Government of the Republic. It desires throughout the whole of China and, with the quite natural reservation that all the powers interested give an assurance of their willingness to act likewise, is ready to apply in the territories which are leased to it, equal treatment to the citizens and subjects of all nations, especially in the matters of customs duties and navigation dues, as well as transportation tariffs on railways.

I beg you, my dear ambassador, to accept, etc.,

DELCASSÉ.

GERMANY.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. White.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 6, 1899.

SIR: At the time when the Government of the United States was informed by that of Germany that it had leased from His Majesty the Emperor of China the port of Kiao-chao and the adjacent territory in the Province of Shantung assurances were given to the ambassador of the United States at Berlin by the Imperial German minister for foreign affairs that the rights and privileges insured by treaties with China to citizens of the United States would not thereby suffer or be in anywise impaired within the area over which Germany had thus obtained control.

More recently, however, the British Government recognized by a formal agreement with Germany the exclusive right of the latter country to enjoy in said leased area and the contiguous "sphere of influence or interest" certain privileges, more especially those relating to railroads and mining enterprises; but, as the exact nature and extent of the rights thus recognized have not been clearly defined, it is possible that serious conflicts of interest may at any time arise, not only between British and German subjects within said area, but that the interests of our citizens may also be jeopardized thereby.

Earnestly desirous to remove any cause of irritation and to insure at the same time to the commerce of all nations in China the undoubted benefits which should accrue from a formal recognition by the various powers claiming "spheres of interest" that they shall enjoy perfect equality of treatment for their commerce and navigation within such "spheres," the Government of the United States would be pleased to see His German Majesty's Government give formal assurances and lend its cooperation in securing like assurances from the other interested powers that each within its respective sphere of whatever influence—

First. Will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory it may have in China.

Second. That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to al such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. That it will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances.

The liberal policy pursued by his Imperial German Majesty in declaring Kiao-chao a free port and in aiding the Chinese Government in the establishment there of a customhouse are so clearly in line with the proposition which this Government is anxious to see recognized that it entertains the strongest hope that Germany will give its acceptance and hearty support.

The recent ukase of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia declaring the port of Ta-lien-wan open during the whole of the lease under which it is held from China to the merchant ships of all nations, coupled with the categorical assurances made to this Government by His Imperial Majesty's representative at this capital at the time, and since repeated to me by the present Russian ambassador, seem to insure the support of the Emperor to the proposed measure. Our ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg has, in consequence, been instructed to submit it to the Russian Government and to request their early consideration of it. A copy of my instruction on the subject to Mr. Tower is herewith inclosed for your confidential information.

The commercial interests of Great Britain and Japan will be so clearly served by the desired declaration of intentions, and the views of the Governments of these countries as to the desirability of the adoption of measures insuring the benefits of equality of treatment of all foreign trade throughout China are so similar to those entertained by the United States, that their acceptance of the propositions herein outlined and their cooperation in advocating their adoption by the other powers can be confidently expected. I inclose herewith copy of the instruction which I have sent to Mr. Choate on the subject.

In view of the present favorable conditions, you are instructed to submit the above considerations to His Imperial German Majesty's minister for foreign affairs, and to request his early consideration of the subject.

Copy of this instruction is sent to our ambassadors at London and at St. Petersburg for their information.

JOHN HAY.

I have, etc.,

(Inclosures:) To London, September 6, 1899, No. 205; to St. Petersburg, September 6, 1899, No. 82.

—

(Mr. Jackson to Mr. Hay.)

[Telegram.]

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES,
Berlin, December 4, 1899.

I have just had a conversation with secretary of state for foreign affairs, who stated that the politics of Germany in the extreme Orient are de facto the politics of the open door, and Germany proposes to maintain this principle in the future. Germany does not wish the question to become the subject of controversy between the different powers engaged in China. She thinks it would be advantageous for the United States Government to confer with other European Governments having interests in China. If the other cabinets adhere to the proposal of the United States Government Germany will raise no objection, and Germany is willing to have the Government of the United States inform these other cabinets that no difficulty will come from her if the other cabinets agree.

JACKSON, *Chargé.*

—

(Count von Bülow to Mr. White.)

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT,
Berlin, den 19 Februar, 1900.

HERR BOTSCHAFTER: Eure Excellenz hatten mir mittelst eines am 24. v. M. hier übergebenen Memorandums mitgetheilt, dass die Regierung der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika von allen Mächten, an welche eine gleiche Anfrage wie in Eurer Excellenz Schreiben vom 26. September v. J., betreffend die Politik der offenen Thür in China, ergangen war, zufriedenstellende schriftliche Antworten erhalten habe. Eure Excellenz hatten unter Hinweis hierauf den Wunsch ausgedrückt, dass nunmhr auch die Kaiserliche Regierung ihre Antwort in schriftlicher Form ertheilen möge.

Indem ich diesen Wunsche gern entspreche, beehre ich mich in Wiederholung bereits mündlich ertheilter Aufschlüsse Folgendes zu Eurer Excellenz Kenntniss zu bringen: Wie die Regierung der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika nach Eurer Excellenz erwähntem Schreiben vom 26. September v. J. anerkannt, hat die Kaiserliche Regierung in ihrem chinesischen Besitz den Grundsatz völliger Gleichbehandlung aller Nationen in Bezug auf Handel, Schiff fahrt und Verkehr von Anfang an nicht allein aufgestellt, sondern auch praktisch im weitesten Umfange durchgeführt. Die Kaiserliche Regierung hegt nicht die Absicht von diesem Grundsatz, welche jede wirthschaftliche Benachtheiligung oder Zurücksetzung von Angehörigen der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika von vornherein ausschliesst, in Zukunft abzugehen, so lange sie nicht durch abweichendes Verhalten anderer Regierungen aus Reciprocitätsrücksichten hierzu genöthigt werden sollte. Wenn daher die übrigen, an der wirthschaftlichen Erschliessung des chinesischen Reichs interessirten Mächte sich zur Durchführung gleicher Grundsätze bekennen wollen, so kann dies der Kaiserlichen Regierung nur erwünscht sein und sie wird in diesem Falle auf Wunsch ihrerseits gern bereit sein, sich mit den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika und den übrigen Mächten an einer in diesem Sinne zu treffenden Vereinbarung zu betheiligen, durch welche wechselseitig die gleichen Rechte gewährt werden.

Ich benutze die Gelegenheit um Eurer Excellenz die Versicherung meiner ausgezeichnetsten Hochachtung zu erneuern.

BÜLOW.

[Translation.]

FOREIGN OFFICE,
Berlin, February 19, 1900.

MR. AMBASSADOR: Your excellency informed me, in a memorandum presented on the 24th of last month, that the Government of the United States of America had received satisfactory written replies from all the powers to which an inquiry had been addressed similar to that contained in your excellency's note of September 26 last, in regard to the policy of the open door in China. While referring to this your excellency thereupon expressed the wish that the Imperial Government would now also give its answer in writing.

Gladly complying with this wish, I have the honor to inform your excellency, repeating the statements already made verbally, as follows: As recognized by the Government of the United States of America, according to your excellency's note referred to above, the Imperial Government has from the beginning not only asserted but also practically carried out to the fullest extent in its Chinese possessions absolute equality of treatment of all nations with regard to trade, navigation, and commerce. The Imperial Government entertains no thought of departing in the future from this principle, which at once excludes any prejudicial or disadvantageous commercial treatment of the citizens of the United States of America, so long as it is not forced to do so, on account of considerations of reciprocity, by a divergence from it by other Governments. If, therefore, the other powers interested in the industrial development of the Chinese Empire are willing to recognize the same principles, this can only be desired by the Imperial Government, which in this case, upon being requested, will gladly be ready to participate with the United States of America and the other powers in an agreement made upon these lines, by which the same rights are reciprocally secured.

I avail myself, etc.,

BÜLOW.

—

GREAT BRITAIN.

(Mr. Choate to Lord Salisbury.)

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 22, 1899.

MY LORD: I am instructed by the Secretary of State to present to your lordship a matter which the President regards as of great and equal importance to Great Britain and the United States—in the maintenance of trade and commerce in the East, in which the interest of the two nations differs, not in character, but in degree only—and to ask for action on the part of Her Majesty's Government which the President conceives to be in exact accord with its uniformly declared policy and traditions, and which will greatly promote the welfare of commerce.

He understands it to be the settled policy and purpose of Great Britain not to use any privileges which may be granted to it in China as a means of excluding any commercial rivals, and that freedom of trade for it in that Empire means freedom of trade for all the world alike. Her Majesty's Government, while conceding by formal agreements with Germany and Russia the possession of "spheres of influence or interest" in China, in which they are to enjoy especial rights and privileges, particularly in respect to railroads and mining enterprises, has at the same time sought to maintain what is commonly called the "open-door" policy, to secure to the commerce and navigation of all nations equality of treatment within such "spheres." The maintenance of this policy is alike urgently demanded by the commercial communities of our two nations, as it is justly held by them to be the only one which will improve existing conditions, enable them to maintain their positions in the markets of China, and extend their future operations.

While the Government of the United States will in no way commit itself to any recognition of the exclusive rights of any power within or control over any portion of the Chinese Empire, under such agreements as have been recently made, it can not conceal its apprehensions that there is danger of complications arising between the treaty powers which may imperil the rights insured to the United States by its treaties with China.

It is the sincere desire of my Government that the interests of its citizens may not be prejudiced through exclusive treatment by any of the controlling powers within their respective "spheres of interests" in China, and it hopes to retain there an open market for all the world's commerce, remove dangerous sources of international irritation, and thereby hasten united action of the powers at Pekin to promote administrative reforms so greatly needed for strengthening the Imperial Government and maintaining the integrity of China, in which it believes the whole Western World is alike concerned. It believes that such a result may be greatly aided and advanced by declarations by the various powers claiming "spheres of interest" in China as to their intentions in regard to the treatment of foreign trade and commerce therein, and that the present is a very favorable moment for informing Her Majesty's Government of the desire of the United States to have it make on its own part and to lend its powerful support in the effort to obtain from each of the various powers claiming "spheres of interest" in China a declaration substantially to the following effect:

(1) That it will in no wise interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory it may have in China.

(2) That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within such "spheres of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

(3) That it will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances.

The President has strong reason to believe that the Governments of both Russia and Germany will cooperate in such an understanding as is here proposed. The recent ukase of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia declaring the port of Ta-lien-wan open to the merchant ships of all nations during the whole term of the lease under which it is to be held by Russia removes all uncertainty as to the liberal and conciliatory policy of that power and justifies the expectation that His Majesty would accede to the similar requests of the United States now being presented to him and make the desired declaration.

The recent action of Germany in declaring the port of Kiao-chao a "free port," and the aid which its Government has given China in establishing there a Chinese customhouse, coupled with oral assurances given the United States by Germany that the interests of the United States and its citizens within its "sphere" would in no wise be affected by its occupation of this portion of the Province of Shantung, encourage the belief that little opposition is to be anticipated to the President's request for a similar declaration from that power.

It is needless also to add that Japan, the power next most largely interested in the trade of China, must be in entire sympathy with the views here expressed, and that its interests will be largely served by the proposed arrangement; and the declarations of its statesmen within the last year are so entirely in line with it that the cooperation of that power is confidently relied upon.

It is therefore with the greatest pleasure that I present this matter to your lordship's attention and urge its prompt consideration by Her Majesty's Government, believing that the action is in entire harmony with its consistent theory and purpose, and that it will greatly redound to the benefit and advantage of all commercial nations alike. The prompt and sympathetic cooperation of Her Majesty's Government with the United States in this important matter will be very potent in promoting its adoption by all the powers concerned.

I have, etc.

JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

—

(Lord Salisbury to Mr. Choate.)

FOREIGN OFFICE,
London, September 29, 1899.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I have read with great interest the communication which you handed to me on the 23d instant, in which you inform me of the desire of the United States Government to obtain from the various powers claiming spheres of interest in China declarations as to their intentions in regard to the treatment of foreign trade and commerce therein.

I have the honor to inform your excellency that I will lose no time in consulting my colleagues in regard to a declaration by Her Majesty's Government and on the proposal that they should cooperate with the Government of the United States in obtaining similar declarations by the other powers concerned.

In the meantime I may assure your excellency that the policy consistently advocated by this country is one of securing equal opportunity for the subjects and citizens of all nations in regard to commercial enterprise in China, and from this policy Her Majesty's Government have no intention or desire to depart.

I have, etc.,

SALISBURY.

—

(Lord Salisbury to Mr. Choate.)

FOREIGN OFFICE,
London, November 30, 1899.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: With reference to my note of September 29 last I have the honor to state that I have carefully considered, in communication with my colleagues, the proposal contained in your excel-

lency's note of September 22 that a declaration should be made by foreign powers claiming "spheres of interest" in China as to their intentions in regard to the treatment of foreign trade and interest therein.

I have much pleasure in informing your excellency that Her Majesty's Government will be prepared to make a declaration in the sense desired by your Government in regard to the leased territory of Wei-hai Wei and all territory in China which may hereafter be acquired by Great Britain by lease or otherwise, and all spheres of interest now held or that may hereafter be held by her in China, provided that a similar declaration is made by other powers concerned.

I have, etc.,

SALISBURY.

(Mr. Choate to Lord Salisbury.)

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 6, 1899.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's note of November 30, in which you inform me that, after having carefully considered in connection with your colleagues, the proposals contained in my note of September 22 last Her Majesty's Government is prepared to make a declaration in the sense desired by my Government in regard to the leased territory of Wei-hai Wei and all territory in China which may hereafter be acquired by Great Britain by lease or otherwise and all "spheres of interest" now held or which may hereafter be held by her in China, provided that a similar declaration is made by other powers.

In acknowledging your lordship's note I have also, under instructions from the Secretary of State, to express to your lordship the gratification he feels at the cordial acceptance by Her Britannic Majesty's Government of the proposals of the United States.

I have, etc.,

JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

ITALY.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Draper.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 17, 1899.

SIR: This Government, animated with a sincere desire to insure to the commerce and industry of the United States and of all other nations perfect equality of treatment within the limits of the Chinese Empire for their trade and navigation, especially within the so-called "spheres of influence or interest" claimed by certain European powers in China, has deemed the present an opportune moment to make representations in this direction to Germany, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia.

To attain the object it has in view and to remove possible causes of international irritation and reestablish confidence so essential to commerce, it has seemed to this Government highly desirable that the various powers claiming "spheres of interest or influence" in China should give formal assurances that—

First. They will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory they may have in China.

Second. The Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. They will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of their own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to their own nationals transported over equal distances.

The policy pursued by His Imperial German Majesty in declaring Tsing-tao (Kiao-chao) a free port and in aiding the Chinese Government in establishing there a customhouse, and the ukase of His Imperial Russian Majesty of August 11 last, erecting a free port at Dalny (Ta-lien-wan) are thought to be proof that these powers are not disposed to view unfavorably the proposition to recognize that they contemplate nothing which will interfere in any way with the enjoyment by the commerce of all nations of the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by existing treaties with China.

Repeated assurances from the British Government of its fixed policy to maintain throughout China freedom of trade for the whole world insure, it is believed, the ready assent of that power to our proposals. The commercial interests of Japan will also be greatly served by the above-mentioned declaration, which harmonizes with the assurances conveyed to this Government at various times by His Imperial Japanese Majesty's diplomatic representative at this capital.

In view of the important and growing commercial interests of Italy in eastern Asia it would seem desirable that His Majesty's Government should also be informed of the steps taken by the United States to insure freedom of trade in China, in which it would find equal advantages to those which the other nations of Europe expect.

You are therefore instructed to submit to His Majesty's minister for foreign affairs the above considerations and to invite his early attention to them, expressing, in the name of your Government, the hope that they will prove acceptable and that His Majesty's Government will lend its aid and valuable assistance in securing their acceptance by the other interested powers.

I inclose, for your personal and confidential information, copies of the instructions sent to our ambassadors at Berlin, London, St. Petersburg, and to our minister at Tokio.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) To Great Britain, to Russia, to Germany, September 6, 1899; to Japan, November 13, 1899.

(The Marquis Visconti Venosta to Mr. Draper.)

ROMA, *7 Gennaio, 1900.*

SIGNOR AMBASCIATORE: A complemento di citò che mi aveva fatto l'onore di comunicarmi colla sua nota del 9 Decembre, 1899, Vostra Eccelenza mi ha participato ieri la notizia datale per telegrafo dal suo Governo, che tutte le Potenze interpellate dal Gabinetto di Washington in ordine alle opportunità di adottare una linea di condotta politica la quale assicuri al commercio di tutto il mondo parità di trattamento in Cina, hanno dato risposta favorevole.

Riferendomi alle sue comunicazioni e a quanto ebbi già a dischiararle colla mia nota del 23 di detto mese di Decembre, mi è grato di dichiararle che anche el Governo del Re aderisce di buon grado ai concetti di massima svolta nella menzionata nota del 9 Decembre.

Prego Vostra Eccelenza di volere portare questa nostra adesione alla conoscenza del Gabinetto di Washington, e profitto del l'occasione per rinnovarle, Signor Ambasciatore, gli atti della mia più alta considerazione.

VISCONTI VENOSTA.

[Translation.]

ROME, *January 7, 1900.*

MR. AMBASSADOR: Supplementary to what you had already done me the honor of communicating to me in your note of December 9, 1899, your excellency informed me yesterday of the telegraphic note received from your Government that all the powers consulted by the Cabinet of Washington concerning the suitability of adopting a line of policy which would insure to the trade of the whole world equality of treatment in China have given a favorable reply.

Referring to your communications and to the statements in my note of December 23 last, I take pleasure in saying that the Government of the King adheres willingly to the proposals set forth in said note of December 9.

I beg your excellency to kindly convey the notice of our adhesion to the Cabinet of Washington, and I avail myself of the occasion to renew to you, etc.,

VISCONTI VENOSTA.

JAPAN.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Buck.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 13, 1899.

SIR: This Government, animated with a sincere desire to insure to the commerce and industry of the United States and of all other nations perfect equality of treatment within the limits of the Chinese Empire for their trade and navigation, especially within the so-called "spheres of influence or interest" claimed by certain European powers in China, has deemed the present an opportune moment to make representations in this direction to Germany, Great Britain, and Russia.

To obtain the object it has in view and to remove possible causes of international irritation and reestablish confidence so essential to commerce, it has seemed to this Government highly desirable that the various powers claiming "spheres of interest or influence" in China should give formal assurances that—

First. They will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory they may have in China.

Second. The Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. They will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of their own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within such "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to their own nationals transported over equal distances.

The policy pursued by His Imperial German Majesty in declaring Tsingtao (Kiaochao) a free port and in aiding the Chinese Government in establishing there a customhouse, and the ukase of His Imperial Russian Majesty of August 11 last in erecting a free port at Dalny (Ta-lien-wan) are thought to be proof that these powers are not disposed to view unfavorably the proposition to recognize that they contemplate nothing which will interfere in any way with the enjoyment by the commerce of all nations of the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by existing treaties with China.

Repeated assurances from the British Government of its fixed policy to maintain throughout China freedom of trade for the whole world insure, it is believed, the ready assent of that power to our proposals. It is no less confidently believed that the commercial interests of Japan would be greatly served by the above-mentioned declaration, which harmonizes with the assurances conveyed to this Government at various times by His Imperial Japanese Majesty's diplomatic representative at this Capital.

You are therefore instructed to submit to His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Government the above considerations, and to invite their early attention to them, and express the earnest hope of your Government that they will accept them and aid in securing their acceptance by the other interested powers.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Viscount Aoki to Mr. Buck.)

[Translation.]

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Tokio, the 26the day, the 12th month of the 32d year of Meiji.
(December 26, 1899.)

MR. MINISTER: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the note No. 176 of the 20th instant, in which, pursuing the instructions of the United States Government, your excellency was so good as to communicate to the Imperial Government the representations of the United States as presented in notes to Russia, Germany, and Great Britain on the subject of commercial interests of the United States in China.

I have the happy duty of assuring your excellency that the Imperial Government will have no hesitation to give their assent to so just and fair a proposal of the United States, provided that all the other powers concerned shall accept the same.

I avail myself, etc.,

VISCOUNT AOKI SIUZO,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

RUSSIA.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Towner.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 6, 1899.

SIR: In 1898, when His Imperial Majesty, through his diplomatic representative at this capital, notified this Government that Russia

had leased from His Imperial Chinese Majesty the ports of Port Arthur, Ta-lien-wan, and the adjacent territory in the Liaotung Peninsula in northeastern China for a period of 25 years, your predecessor received categorical assurances from the imperial minister for foreign affairs that American interests in that part of the Chinese Empire would in no way be affected thereby, neither was it the desire of Russia to interfere with the trade of other nations, and that our citizens would continue to enjoy within said leased territory all the rights and privileges guaranteed them under existing treaties with China. Assurances of a similar purport were conveyed to me by the Emperor's ambassador at this capital; while fresh proof of this is afforded by the imperial ukase of July 30–August 11 last, creating the free port of Dalny, near Ta-lien-wan, and establishing free trade for the adjacent territory.

However gratifying and reassuring such assurances may be in regard to the territory actually occupied and administered, it can not but be admitted that a further, clearer, and more formal definition of the conditions which are henceforth to hold within the so-called Russian "sphere of interest" in China as regards the commercial rights therein of our citizens is much desired by the business world of the United States, inasmuch as such a declaration would relieve it from the apprehensions which has exercised a disturbing influence during the last four years on its operations in China.

The present moment seems particularly opportune for ascertaining whether His Imperial Russian Majesty would not be disposed to give permanent form to the assurances heretofore given to this Government on this subject.

The ukase of the Emperor of August 11 of this year, declaring the port of Ta-lien-wan open to the merchant ships of all nations during the remainder of the lease under which it is held by Russia, removes the slightest uncertainty as to the liberal and conciliatory commercial policy His Majesty proposes carrying out in northeastern China, and would seem to insure us the sympathetic and, it is hoped, favorable consideration of the propositions hereinafter specified.

The principles which this Government is particularly desirous of seeing formally declared by His Imperial Majesty and by all the great powers interested in China, and which will be eminently beneficial to the commercial interests of the whole world, are:

First. The recognition that no power will in any way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any leased territory or within any so-called "sphere of interest" it may have in China.

Second. That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. That it will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances.

The declaration of such principles by His Imperial Majesty would not only be of great benefit to foreign commerce in China, but would powerfully tend to remove dangerous sources of irritation and possible conflict between the various powers; it would reestablish confidence and security, and would give great additional weight to the concerted representations which the treaty powers may hereafter make to His Imperial Chinese Majesty in the interest of reform in Chinese administration so essential to the consolidation and integrity of that Empire, and which, it is believed, is a fundamental principle of the policy of His Majesty in Asia.

Germany has declared the port of Kiao-chao, which she holds in Shangtung under a lease from China, a free port and has aided in the establishment there of a branch of the Imperial Chinese maritime customs. The Imperial German minister for foreign affairs has also given assurances that American trade would not in any way be discriminated against or interfered with, as there is no intention to close the leased territory to foreign commerce within the area which Germany claims. These facts lead this Government to believe that the Imperial German Government will lend its cooperation and give its acceptance to the proposition above outlined, and which our ambassador at Berlin is now instructed to submit to it.

That such a declaration will be favorably considered by Great Britain and Japan, the two other powers most interested in the subject, there can be no doubt. The formal and oft-repeated declarations of the British and Japanese Governments in favor of the maintenance throughout China of freedom of trade for the whole world insure us, it is believed, the ready assent of these powers to the declaration desired.

The acceptance by His Imperial Majesty of these principles must therefore inevitably lead to their recognition by all the other powers interested, and you are instructed to submit them to the Emperor's minister for foreign affairs and urge their immediate consideration.

A copy of this construction is sent to our ambassadors at London and Berlin for their confidential information, and copies of the instructions sent to them on this subject are inclosed herewith.

I have, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) To London, September 6, 1899, No. 205; to Berlin, September 6, 1899, No. 927.

(Count Mouravieff to Mr. Tower.)

MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGÈRES,
PREMIER DÉPARTEMENT,
Le 18 Décembre, 1899.

MONSIEUR L'AMBASSADEUR: J'ai eu l'honneur de recevoir la note de Votre Excellence en date du 8–20 Septembre a. c. relative aux principes que le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis désirerait voir adoptés en matière économique par les Puissances ayant des intérêts en Chine.

Pour ce qui est du territoire cédé à bail par la Chine à la Russie le Gouvernement Impérial a déjà manifesté sa ferme intention de pratiquer la politique de "la porte ouverte" en érigeant Dalny (Ta-lien-wan), en port franc; et si à l'avenir ce dernier port, tout en continuant à rester franc était séparé par une ligne de douanes du reste du territoire dont il s'agit, les taxes louanières seraient prélevées dans la zone soumise au tarif, sur toutes les marchandises étrangères sans distinction de nationalité.

Quant aux ports déjà ouverts, ou qui le seraient à l'avenir, par le Gouvernement Chinois, au commerce étranger et qui se trouvent en dehors du territoire cédé à bail à la Russie, le règlement des questions relatives aux taxes douanières appartient à la Chine elle-même, et le Gouvernement Impérial n'a nullement l'intention de réclamer pour ses nationaux à cet égard des privilèges quelconques à l'exclusion des autres étrangers. Il va de soi que cette assurance du Gouvernement Impérial a pour condition qu'une déclaration semblable serait faite par les autres Puissances ayant des intérêts en Chine.

Convaincu que cette réponse est de nature à satisfaire à la demande exprimée dans la note susmentionnée, le Gouvernement Impérial se félicite d'autant plus d'avoir été au devant des vœux du Gouvernement Américain, qu'il attache le plus grand prix à tout ce qui peut entretenir et consolider les relations amicales traditionnelles existant entre les deux pays.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

COMTE MOURAVIEFF.

[Translation.]

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
December 18–30, 1899.

MR. AMBASSADOR: I had the honor to receive Your Excellency's note dated the 8th–20th of September last, relating to the principles which the Government of the United States would like to see adopted in commercial matters by the powers which have interests in China.

In so far as the territory leased by China to Russia is concerned, the Imperial Government has already demonstrated its firm intention to follow the policy of "the open door" by creating Dalny (Ta-lien-wan) a free port; and if at some future time that port, although remaining free itself, should be separated by a customs limit from other portions of the territory in question, the customs duties would be levied, in the zone subject to the tariff, upon all foreign merchandise without distinction as to nationality.

As to the ports now opened or hereafter to be opened to foreign commerce by the Chinese Government, and which lie beyond the territory leased to Russia, the settlement of the question of customs duties belongs to China herself, and the Imperial Government has no intention whatever of claiming any privileges for its own subjects to the exclusion of other foreigners. It is to be understood, however, that this assurance of the Imperial Government is given upon condition that a similar declaration shall be made by other powers having interests in China.

With the conviction that this reply is such as to satisfy the inquiry made in the aforementioned note, the Imperial Government is happy to have complied with the wishes of the American Government, especially as it attaches the highest value to anything that may strengthen and consolidate the traditional relations of friendship existing between the two countries.

I beg you to accept, etc.

COUNT MOURAVIEFF.

INSTRUCTIONS SENT MUTATIS MUTANDIS TO THE UNITED STATES AMBASSADORS AT LONDON, PARIS, BERLIN, ST. PETERSBURG, AND ROME, AND TO THE UNITED STATES MINISTER AT TOKYO.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1900.

SIR: The ——— Government having accepted the declaration suggested by the United States concerning foreign trade in China, the terms of which I trasmitted to you in my instruction No. ——— of ———, and like action having been taken by all the various powers having leased territory or so-called "spheres of interest" in the Chinese Empire, as shown by the notes which I herewith transmit to you, you will please inform the Government to which you are accredited that the condition originally attached to its acceptance—that all other powers concerned should likewise accept the proposals of the United States—having been complied with, this Government will therefore consider the assent given to it by ——— as final and definitive.

You will also transmit to the minister for foreign affairs copies of the present inclosures, and by the same occasion convey to him the expression of the sincere gratification which the President feels at the successful termination of these negotiations, in which he sees proof of the friendly spirit which animates the various powers interested in the untrammeled development of commerce and industry in the Chinese Empire and a source of vast benefit to the whole commercial world.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) Mr. Delcassé to Mr. Porter (received December 16, 1899), with translation; Mr. Jackson to Mr. Hay, telegram, December 4, 1899; Count von Bülow to Mr. White, February 19, 1900, with translation; Lord Salisbury to Mr. Choate, November 30, 1899; Marquis Visconti Venosta to Mr. Draper, January 7, 1900, with translation; Viscount Aoki to Mr. Buck, December 26, 1899, translation; Count Mouravieff to Mr. Tower, December 18, 1899, with translation.

NOTES EXCHANGED BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN NOVEMBER 30, 1908, DECLARING THEIR POLICY IN THE FAR EAST.

IMPERIAL JAPANESE EMBASSY,
Washington, November 30, 1908.

SIR: The exchange of views between us which has taken place at the several interviews which I have recently had the honor of holding with you has shown that Japan and the United States holding important outlying insular possessions in the region of the Pacific Ocean, the Governments of the two countries are animated by a common aim, policy, and intention in that region.

Believing that a frank avowal of that aim, policy, and intention would not only tend to strengthen the relations of friendship and good neighborhood which have immemorially existed between Japan and the United States, but would materially contribute to the preservation of the general peace, the Imperial Government have authorized me to present to you an outline of their understanding of that common aim, policy, and intention:

1. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

2. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

4. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

5. Should any event occur threatening the status quo as above described or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to

arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

If the foregoing outline accords with the view of the Government of the United States, I shall be gratified to receive your confirmation.

I take this opportunity to renew to your excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

K. TAKAHIRA.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of State.

—

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 30, 1908.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of to-day setting forth the result of the exchange of views between us in our recent interviews defining the understanding of the two Governments in regard to their policy in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

It is a pleasure to inform you that this expression of mutual understanding is welcome to the Government of the United States as appropriate to the happy relations of the two countries and as the occasion for a concise mutual affirmation of that accordant policy respecting the Far East which the two Governments have so frequently declared in the past.

I am happy to be able to confirm to your excellency, on behalf of the United States, the declaration of the two Governments embodied in the following words:

1. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

2. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

4. They are also determined to preserve the common interests of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

5. Should any event occur threatening the status quo as above described or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

ELIHU ROOT.

His Excellency BARON KOGORO TAKAHIRA,
Japanese Ambassador.

The resolutions are as follows:

House resolution 728.

Whereas recent press dispatches have announced that 21 demands have been made upon the Chinese Government by a foreign Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to transmit to the House of Representatives any information in the possession of the State Department from official or unofficial sources relating to any recent demands, unusual between free Governments, that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by any other Government, and any similar information as to whether any recent demands that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by any other Government, if enforced, would imperil the "open-door" policy or the integrity and sovereignty of China.

—

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 425) declaring the attitude of the United States toward the open-door policy in China.

Whereas pledges to respect the integrity and sovereignty of China and to maintain in that country the principle of the "open door" were mutually pledged by the United States Government with the following Governments, to wit: With the Government of Great Britain, November 30, 1899; with the Government of France, December 16, 1899; with the Government of Russia, December 18, 1899; with the Government of Japan, December 26, 1899; with the Government of Italy, January 7, 1900; with the Government of Germany, February 19, 1900; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan on November 30, 1908, renewed their mutual pledges by the exchange of identical notes pledging themselves anew to maintain the status quo, to respect the integrity and sovereignty of China, and to uphold the principle of the "open door," in specific terms, as follows:

First. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

Second. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

Third. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

Fourth. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

Fifth. Should any event occur threatening the status quo, as above described, or the principle of equal opportunity, as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

And

Whereas the mutual pledges aforesaid are based upon the clear principles of justice and right, and their faithful observance by the high contracting parties affects vitally the material interests of American citizens and the maintenance of peace, the development of prosperity, and the progress of civilization in the vast regions of the Pacific: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States would look with disfavor upon any effort to change the status quo in China while so many of the high contracting parties pledged to maintain that status quo are distracted by war, and that the people of the United States would view with grave concern as an unfriendly act any aggressive move on the part of a foreign Government against the integrity and sovereignty of China.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gravity of the situation and the relations between the United States and Japan and China as well as our relations at this time with the European nations at war there. It seems to me that at this time and under the existing circumstances it is absolutely necessary for this House and the people of this country to place their reliance in the President of the United States. [Applause.] He represents our country in our relations with foreign nations, and it would be a serious thing for this House or this Congress without all the information which the President possesses to endeavor to interfere. Woodrow Wilson is President of the United States, elected by the people of the United States, and he occupies a position where we must trust him in these matters, and where we must not endeavor to hamper or annoy him or interfere with him. [Applause.] I believe that he wants to preserve peace and uphold our rights and the dignity of our country. I hope that we will be able both to uphold our rights and dignity and preserve peace; but the only thing that we can do under the circumstances is to have faith in the administration. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concur in everything that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said in reference to the matter brought out by the speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. Our international situation is a delicate one, and it should be dealt with only by those who are intimately acquainted with every detail of these affairs. The inquiry proposed in the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama was a broad one, and, in my opinion, was one that ought not to have been entered into at this time. If the gentleman's resolution was privileged, as he says it was, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs had not given him that consideration he thought he deserved, he could have brought it up at the end of seven days in this House. I do not think it is privileged. It is not drawn in such a manner as to entitle it to the privilege he claims for it. I said to the gentleman I did not think it was wise at this juncture of our international affairs, at this particularly delicate period of our history, for the Foreign Affairs Committee to take up the inquiries called for in his resolution, and therefore I declined to call the committee together in special session for the purpose of considering it. [Applause.]

I believe it is the duty of every American, those in private life as well as those in public life, to give as little cause for friction with other nations as possible. I believe the paramount duty of the hour is to preserve our friendly relations with all nations as far as that can be done with due regard to the interest of our country and our people and the maintenance of our honor as a Nation.

The administration has splendidly labored to this end. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has aided at every stage of this splendid work, and in doing so we have had to suppress a number of inopportune bills and resolutions. [Applause.]

I believe I acted wisely and in the interests of peace and harmony between this country and our far eastern friends in reference to the gentleman's resolution. I further said to him, not that the State Department had requested me not to have a hearing upon this resolution, but that the State Department thought it was unwise to enter into the inquiries suggested in his resolution; and for that reason, and because my judgment fully accords with the opinion of the State Department, I took the responsibility of not assembling the committee.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield another minute to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to ask the gentleman if he believes that this Congress ought to know the terms—the real terms—of the 21 demands that have been made upon the Chinese Government by a foreign Government?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not believe that this is a time for Congress to inquire into the trouble between Japan and China, if there is trouble. I think the gentleman has an exaggerated idea of the situation existing between those countries. I have no idea that Japan desires to crush the great Republic of the East; and if she did, I have no idea that China, with her 400,000,000 of people, would sit supinely by

and permit her rights to be invaded and her liberties destroyed; and I am satisfied, and I believe the people of this country are satisfied, that the American Government will never allow her rights, present or prospective, in the Orient to be invaded or interfered with by any country. The gentleman can depend upon those intrusted with our foreign affairs not only to keep us out of war, as far as that result can be accomplished with honor, but to uphold and defend our rights whenever they are endangered. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have we left on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Only three minutes? I thought I had eight minutes, according to my figures here. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman, that I have only three minutes left?

The CHAIRMAN. That is all the time the gentleman from Illinois has—three minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is a bad counter. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I yield the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, about two hours ago there was an exciting scene on the floor of the House. I undertook to make a reply to certain attacks made upon me as well as attacks made upon Gen. Crozier, an officer of the Army, who was not present, and who, therefore, could not speak for himself. I believe the attack upon Gen. Crozier was unfair. I believe it to have been made at a time and in a place where it should not have been made. Certain gentlemen upon the other side insisted that by reason of the fact that I was undertaking to ask for fair play in behalf of a man who is serving under a Democratic administration, that therefore I was the representative of the Steel Trust or of some other trust. I asked particularly that I be given eight minutes in which to make a statement. I have been denied those few minutes. Therefore the gag rule which applied on the other side a few moments ago applies equally to this side.

While I accept the courtesy of the gentleman [Mr. HINEBAUGH] who has just yielded to me three minutes, I yield back to him the balance of my time and thank him for what I have had. [Applause.]

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have we left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I realize, as everyone else realizes, the delicacy of the present situation. I know, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] knows, and has so well stated, that we must trust much to the discretion of our President and to our Diplomatic Service. I do not like the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], because it looks now as if at this critical time it adds to our burdens and adds to our liability to get into trouble.

We on the Pacific coast are always face to face with the oriental question as it affects our own country, and we are willing to face it, and are going to continue to face it. But how shall we do it? We shall not face our own problems aright if at this critical period we recklessly butt into the relations of Asia. There is not the least excuse for our trying to maintain a Monroe doctrine there. The Lord knows we have enough trouble in maintaining a Monroe doctrine on this continent, and what Japan may or may not do to China or China to Japan is a matter between Japan and China. If we are injured, the time for us to assert the injury is after we are hurt. It is not the time now to assert that we have anything to do with the joint relations between Japan and China. Such an assertion is out of place and dangerous, especially so at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields back one minute.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for eight minutes.

A MEMBER. You can not do it.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I submit the request.

Mr. MURDOCK. You can run an elephant through this committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. My request is, Mr. Chairman, that I be permitted to proceed for eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to proceed for eight minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw that request until we read the bill under the five-minute rule. Then there will be an opportunity for him.

Mr. MOORE. I get no more assistance on one side than on the other. If I can not get time to answer a personal attack, I will ask that a quorum be present.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman wants to be nasty about that, all right.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman does not want to be "nasty." The gentleman from Illinois does not appreciate the seriousness of the attack that was made on me. I think he was not present at the time. Several gentlemen attacked me on the ground that I was a representative of the trusts, in connection with charges against an Army officer that I believe to be vicious and long since exploded.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania understands that under the practice, where the House fixes the time for general debate, the committee has no authority to extend general debate.

Mr. MOORE. I understand that; and that is the reason why I made my personal request for unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. You can do it when we read the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MOORE. I have made the request. Since my party leader desires me to withdraw it, I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Have we 40 minutes left on this side, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 37 minutes left.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, as I said the other day at the opening of this debate, this bill carries $165,000,000 for pensions. That amount will be reduced by an amendment, to be offered when the bill is considered under the five-minute rule, by making it $164,000,000, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior.

We had hoped that this pension-roll expense would be diminished, but it has not been so diminished. The act of 1912, known as the Sherwood Act, has, besides compelling us to pay $15,000,000 the first year to increase the pension amount, added over $62,000,000 during the past two years. According to a statement made by the Commissioner of Pensions in the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, the amount by which the act of 1912 would increase it would be something over $62,000,000.

That is the reason why we have not been able to reduce the amount. We know, Mr. Chairman, that that act is a pension-service act, not for disabilities or for wounds or diseases incurred in the service. Any man who served in the Army of the United States during the Civil War for the period of 90 days is entitled, when he arrives at a certain age, to go upon the pension roll at so much per month, and there is a large number of them on the roll for that reason now.

I undertook to investigate what the Civil War has cost us in the way of pensions. Since that war we have paid out in pensions $4,500,000,000. In addition to that, the Government of the United States, in 1866 and at other times, has appropriated $140,481,178.86 for bounties paid to men who enlisted in that service. Various States of the Union, for the purpose of securing the enlistment of men who enlisted or were drafted, paid the sum of $285,941,036. This amount was paid to men who enlisted in the Army, in the way of bounties.

The men who received these bounties from the States, in most instances amounting to $1,500 each, are the men whom the legislation of this Congress has placed upon the pension roll for mere service. I have no protest to make against this Government pensioning soldiers in the United States Army who suffered wounds or disease from their service. I have great honor and respect for the real soldier upon the Union side, as I have great honor and respect and love and affection for those who served in the Confederate Army, but I have not enough respect and regard for the man who enlisted for only 90 days, who, when he enlisted, received from $500 to $1,500 bounty from the State where he enlisted or was drafted before he would enlist, and who now comes to Congress and secures congressional action which entails this burden of $62,000,000 additional upon the people in less than two years.

I desire to call attention to this list containing the amounts paid by each State for these bounties.

Table exhibiting, by States, the aggregate colored and drafted troops furnished to the Union Army, 1861–1865, with bounties paid by States.

States and Territories.	Colored troops furnished, 1861–1865.	Number drafted.	Bounties paid by States.
Connecticut	1,764	12,031	$6,887,554
Maine	104	27,324	7,837,644
Massachusetts	3,966	41,582	22,965,550
New Hampshire	125	10,806	9,636,313
Rhode Island	1,837	4,321	820,769
Vermont	120	7,743	4,528,775
New England States	7,916	103,807	52,676,605
New Jersey	1,185	32,325	23,868,967
New York	4,125	151,488	86,629,228
Pennsylvania	8,612	178,873	43,154,987
Middle States	13,922	362,686	153,653,182
Colorado Territory	95	.....	.....
Dakota Territory	.....	.....	.....
Illinois	1,811	32,085	17,296,205
Indiana	1,537	41,158	9,182,354
Iowa	440	7,548	1,615,171
Kansas	2,080	1,420	57,407
Michigan	1,387	22,122	9,664,855
Minnesota	104	10,796	2,000,464
Nebraska Territory	.....	.....	.....
New Mexico Territory	.....	.....	.....
Ohio	5,092	50,400	23,557,373
Wisconsin	165	38,395	5,855,356
Western States and Territories	12,711	203,924	69,229,185
California	.....	.....	.....
Nevada	.....	.....	.....
Oregon	.....	.....	.....
Washington Territory	.....	.....	.....
Pacific States	.....	.....	.....
Delaware	954	8,635	1,136,599
District of Columbia	3,269	14,338	134,010
Kentucky	23,703	29,421	692,577
Maryland	8,718	29,319	6,271,992
Missouri	8,344	21,519	1,282,149
West Virginia	196	3,180	864,737
Border States	45,184	106,412	10,383,064
Alabama	4,969	.....	.....
Arkansas	5,526	.....	.....
Florida	1,044	.....	.....
Georgia	.....	.....	.....
Louisiana	3,486	.....	.....
Mississippi	17,869	.....	.....
North Carolina	5,035	.....	.....
South Carolina	5,462	.....	.....
Tennessee	20,133	.....	.....
Texas	47	.....	.....
Virginia	.....	.....	.....
Southern States	63,571	.....	.....
Indian Nation	.....	.....	.....
Colored troops [1]	.....	.....	.....
Grand total	173,079	776,829	285,941,036
At large	733	.....	.....
Not accounted for	5,083	.....	.....
Officers	7,122	.....	.....
Total	186,017	.....	.....

[1] This gives colored troops enlisted in the States in rebellion; besides this there were 92,576 colored troops included (with the white soldiers) in quotas of the several States; the third column gives the aggregate of colored, but many enlisted South were credited to Northern States.

	Gross expenditure.	Expenditure growing out of the war.
Bounty to Volunteers and Regulars on enlistment	$38,522,046.20	$38,522,046.20
Bounty to Volunteers and their widows and legal heirs	31,760,345.95	31,760,345.95
Additional bounty, act of July 28, 1866	69,998,786.71	69,998,786.71
Collection and payment of bounty, etc., to colored soldiers, etc	268,158.11	268,158.11

In addition to that Congress in 1866 paid back pensions and bounties amounting to $66,000,000, which, added to the others, makes a total of $140,481,178.86. So that the States, in order to secure these men to enlist, men who had to be drafted, paid this enormous sum of $285,941,000; and after being drafted or after enlisting, even if they served but 90 days, they are now to receive these pensions under this law.

I do not propose to criticize that law. I endeavored to do so when it was passed. I make these statements for the purpose of calling the attention of the country to the enormous amount that the people have burdened themselves for in the past and propose to burden themselves for in the future, not to men who fought from motives of patriotism, not to men who were wounded or who contracted disease, but men who became soldiers for pay, and who have never forgotten the proposition that they had to be paid to enlist, and who are now still paid by remaining on the pension rolls.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement in the RECORD, and also the report of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incorporating the matter referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report on the pension appropriation bill is as follows:

[House Report No. 1320.]

The Committee on Appropriations, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year 1916, submit the following in explanation thereof:

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on page 473 of the Book of Estimates for 1916, and amount to $166,100,000.

The accompanying bill appropriates $165,100,000.

The following statement gives, by appropriate title of expenditure, the amounts appropriated for 1915, the estimates for 1916, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1916:

Title of expenditure.	Appropriations for 1915.	Estimates for 1916.	Recommended for 1916.
Payment of pensions	$169,000,000	$166,000,000	$165,000,000
Fees of examining surgeons	150,000	100,000	100,000
Total	169,150,000	166,100,000	165,100,000

The reduction from $169,000,000 for 1915 to $165,000,000 for 1916 in the appropriation for payment of pensions is in accordance with the annual estimates submitted to Congress and is approved by the Commissioner of Pensions in statements made by him to the committee.

The reduction in the amount for payment of fees of examining surgeons in pension cases is also in accordance with the estimates and the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions from $150,000 for 1915 to $100,000 for 1916. This service is largely diminished for the reason that many who are put on the pension roll now because of age and service are not required to submit to medical examination.

ECONOMIES FROM ABOLISHING PENSION AGENCIES.

The pension appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913 abolished the 18 separate agents for the payment of pensions, at $4,000 each, and created in their place a single disbursing officer at $4,000, through whom all payments should be made. This change in the manner of paying pensions has been in operation for two years and has resulted not only in greater facility in the handling of pension disbursements but has resulted in the gratifying reduction of $145,000 annually in the cost of paying pensions.

ESTIMATED INCREASE IN COST OF PENSIONS DUE TO ACT OF MAY 11, 1912.

[Pension Hearings, 1916, p. 12.]

The number of pensioners on the roll under the act of May 11, 1912, the amounts paid out to such pensioners, and the average annual value per pensioner by fiscal years, as shown in the annual reports for 1912, 1913, and 1914, are as follows:

	Number of pensioners.	Amount paid.	Average annual value.
June 30, 1912	13,246	$23,929.94	$260.09
June 30, 1913	379,064	53,306,021.82	250.62
June 30, 1914	369,624	97,506,549.73	256.67

The exact additional cost to the Government for pensions, due to said act of May 11, 1912, is not obtainable, as the great body of the pensioners enrolled thereunder were gained from pensioners already on the roll under other laws, and in such cases no account of payments by differences in old and new rates is maintained, all pensions paid upon the new grant being charged to the law under which it is made, and the old rate being merged in the new from the date to which payment was last made at the old rate.

The grants under the act of May 11, 1912, have been very largely to pensioners who were on the roll under the act of February 6, 1907, as will appear by the following table, which

shows the number on the roll under said latter act on the dates in the above table and gives also the amounts disbursed and the average annual values:

	Number of pensioners.	Amount paid.	Average annual value.
June 30, 1912	333,579	$61,346,240.53	$176.41
June 30, 1913	16,241	36,376,470.43	170.08
June 30, 1914	7,158	2,000,203.23	174.76

The total of original allowances under the act of May 11, 1912, to claimants not on the roll under other laws for the three years noted was 1,456, and the balance was made up of transfers from the general law and the act of June 27, 1890, classes of Civil War survivors. The average annual value of these two latter classes combined for the three years was $194.27. The average annual value of the act of February 6, 1907, class for the same period was $173.75, and the average annual value of the three classes combined for said period was $184.01, as against an average annual value of $255.79 in the act of May 11, 1912, class showing an increase in annual value per pensioner in the latter class of $71.78. In a hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on January 30, 1913, it was stated by Mr. Thompson, of this bureau, that the act of May 11, 1912, would add about $72 per annum for each pensioner.

In view of the changes going on during the period in question in the classes named, which embrace all of the Civil War survivors on the roll, a comparison of the amounts paid out would not afford trustworthy information as to the increase in cost of pensions chargeable to the act of May 11, 1912.

The amounts paid out on account of pensions for the fiscal years 1909 to 1912, inclusive, are shown as follows:

1909	$161,973,703.77
1910	159,974,056.08
1911	157,325,160.35
1912	152,986,433.72

The reduction in pension expenditures by years was—

1910	$1,999,647.69
1911	2,648,895.73
1912	4,338,726.63

In the absence of legislative provision as made by the act of May 11, 1912, and in view of the progressive decrease in expenditure above shown, a decrease of $6,000,000 and over for the ensuing year 1913, and of $8,000,000 and over for the year 1914, or, say, $15,000,000 for the two years, would appear to be a conservative estimate.

As above shown, the amount expended in 1912 was $152,986,433.72. With decreases for the ensuing years 1913 and 1914 by $6,500,000 and $8,500,000, respectively, the expenditures for said years would have been:

1913	$146,486,433.72
1914	137,986,433.72
Total	284,472,867.44

The actual expenditures in said years were:

1913	$174,171,660.80
1914	172,417,546.26
Total	346,589,207.06

The difference of $62,116,339.62 might thus be taken to represent the additional cost to the Government for pensions chargeable to the act of May 11, 1912, for the period from date of its approval to the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1914.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PENSIONS.

The following table, furnished by the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the amounts paid by the Government in pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines, their widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, on account of military and naval service since the foundation of the Republic:

War of the Revolution (estimated)	$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension)	45,950,546.86
Indian wars (service pension)	12,801,521.01
War with Mexico (service pension)	48,693,102.08
Civil War	4,457,974,496.00
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection	46,092,740.37
Regular Establishment	31,936,517.21
Unclassified	16,508,447.41
Total	4,729,957,370.94

The following table, also compiled from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the number of pensioners on the roll, the annual value of pensions, the disbursements on account of pensions, the number of original applications filed, and the number of original claims allowed each fiscal year from 1879 to 1914, inclusive:

Fiscal year.	Number of pensioners on the roll.	Annual value of pensions.	Disbursements on account of pensions.	Total number of applications filed, original.	Total number of claims allowed, original.
1879	242,755	$25,493,742.15	$33,664,428.92	57,118	31,346
1880	250,802	25,917,906.60	56,689,229.08	141,466	19,545
1881	268,830	28,769,967.46	50,583,405.35	31,116	27,394
1882	285,697	29,341,101.62	54,313,172.05	40,939	27,664
1883	303,658	32,245,192.43	60,427,573.81	48,776	38,162
1884	322,756	34,456,600.35	57,912,387.47	41,785	34,192
1885	345,125	38,990,985.28	65,171,937.12	40,918	35,767
1886	365,783	44,708,027.44	64,091,142.90	43,895	40,857
1887	406,007	52,824,641.22	73,752,997.08	72,465	55,194
1888	452,557	56,707,220.92	78,950,501.67	75,726	60,252
1889	489,725	64,246,552.36	88,842,720.58	81,220	51,921
1890	537,944	72,052,143.49	106,094,250.39	105,044	66,637
1891	676,160	89,247,200.20	117,312,690.50	696,941	156,486
1892	876,068	116,879,867.24	139,394,147.11	246,638	224,047
1893	966,012	130,510,179.34	156,906,637.94	119,361	121,630
1894	969,544	130,120,863.00	139,986,726.17	57,141	39,085
1895	970,524	130,048,365.00	139,807,788.78	45,361	39,185
1896	970,678	129,485,587.00	138,215,174.98	42,244	40,374
1897	976,014	129,795,428.00	139,949,717.35	50,585	50,101
1898	993,714	130,968,465.00	144,651,879.80	48,732	52,648
1899	991,519	131,617,961.00	138,355,052.95	53,881	37,077
1900	993,529	131,534,544.00	138,462,130.65	51,964	40,645
1901	997,735	131,568,216.00	138,531,483.84	58,373	44,868
1902	999,446	132,152,800.00	137,504,267.99	47,965	40,173
1903	996,545	133,029,090.00	137,759,653.71	52,325	40,136
1904	994,762	134,130,203.00	141,093,571.00	55,794	44,296
1905	993,441	136,745,295.00	141,142,861.33	52,841	50,027
1906	985,971	136,237,749.00	139,000,288.25	37,212	34,974
1907	967,371	140,850,880.60	138,155,412.46	43,619	29,945
1908	951,687	159,495,701.00	153,093,086.27	46,619	37,691
1909	946,194	160,682,870.32	161,973,703.50	35,789	45,086
1910	921,083	158,332,391.82	159,974,056.08	31,777	28,027
1911	892,098	154,834,237.80	157,325,160.35	30,601	25,519
1912	860,294	151,558,141.40	152,986,105.22	27,692	22,777
1913	[1] 820,200	171,490,784.82	174,171,660.80	27,856	19,346
1914	785,239	166,449,333.26	172,417,546.26	33,869	19,287

[1] Does not include 72 pensioners, class, "Brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters," under "general law," formerly carried on the New York agency roll.

FIRST PAYMENTS.

The first payments made on new certificates each year for the past five years, with the averages, and the averages of first payments, by classes, during the past year are shown in the commissioner's report, as follows:

First payments during the last five years.

Fiscal year.	Number.	Amount.	Average.
1914	97,052	$4,856,614.31	$50.04
1913	433,995	18,250,225.00	42.05
1912	78,781	4,096,502.00	53.00
1911	93,632	4,842,925.00	51.72
1910	91,448	4,858,504.00	52.13
1909	124,634	6,489,416.00	52.07

Average first payments in each class.

Average value of first payments:	
In original cases	$67.94
In original Regular Establishment cases	120.49
In original act May 11, 1912, cases	148.97
In original act Feb. 6, 1907, cases	225.67
In original general law, Civil War cases	90.97
In original act June 27, 1890, cases	188.29
In original act Apr. 19, 1908, cases	48.68
In original War with Spain cases	264.18
In increase and reissue cases	45.25
In original War with Mexico cases	149.30
In original Indian wars cases	143.91
In all cases	50.04

NAVY PENSION FUND.

Navy pension fund: Section 4755 of the Revised Statutes provides that Navy pensions shall be paid out of the "Navy pension fund," upon an appropriation by Congress, so far as the same may be sufficient.

The naval pension fund at present amounts to $14,000,000, bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and is created under the provisions of sections 4751 and 4752 of the Revised Statutes.

The payments on account of Navy pensions during the fiscal year 1914 aggregated $6,047,904.48.

PENSIONERS, BY STATES AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Pensioners and amounts paid, arranged by States, insular possessions, Canal Zone, and foreign countries, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, 1914, p. 34.]

	Number.	Amount.
STATE OR TERRITORY.		
Alabama	3,094	$679,689.92
Alaska	77	16,915.36
Arizona	857	188,265.76
Arkansas	8,436	1,853,220.48
California	27,742	6,094,362.56
Colorado	7,709	1,693,513.12
Connecticut	9,581	2,104,754.08
Delaware	2,491	547,222.88
District of Columbia	8,607	1,890,785.76
Florida	4,870	1,069,841.60
Georgia	2,869	630,261.92
Idaho	2,150	472,312.00
Illinois	54,078	11,880,748.64
Indiana	47,858	10,514,339.04
Iowa	26,647	5,853,812.96
Kansas	31,017	6,814,409.76
Kentucky	20,449	4,492,236.32
Louisiana	5,146	1,130,473.28
Maine	13,659	3,000,609.12
Maryland	11,914	2,617,267.52
Massachusetts	32,675	7,178,401.08
Michigan	32,842	7,215,087.65
Minnesota	12,167	2,672,846.56
Mississippi	3,840	843,571.20
Missouri	37,804	8,305,676.32
Montana	2,264	497,355.52
Nebraska	13,758	3,022,357.44
Nevada	382	83,917.76
New Hampshire	6,283	1,380,249.44
New Jersey	19,739	4,336,858.72
New Mexico	1,816	398,938.88
New York	65,369	14,361,155.52
North Carolina	3,478	764,047.04
North Dakota	2,807	616,641.76
Ohio	74,250	16,312,133.60
Oklahoma	10,916	2,398,026.88
Oregon	7,469	1,640,789.92
Pennsylvania	72,407	15,907,263.36
Rhode Island	4,293	943,086.24
South Carolina	1,623	356,540.64
South Dakota	5,164	1,134,427.52
Tennessee	16,239	3,567,983.52
Texas	8,047	1,767,764.96
Utah	983	215,945.44
Vermont	6,264	1,376,075.52
Virginia	8,341	1,832,350.88
Washington	9,522	2,091,792.96
West Virginia	10,170	2,234,145.60
Wisconsin	18,941	4,160,958.88
Wyoming	804	176,622.72
Total	779,908	171,337,455.61
Canal Zone, total	1	240.00
INSULAR POSSESSIONS.		
Guam	2	504.00
Hawaii	72	15,816.96
Philippines	58	12,741.44
Porto Rico	35	7,688.40
Total	167	36,750.80
FOREIGN COUNTRIES.		
Algeria	1	144.00
Argentina	12	2,598.00
Australia	98	20,802.00
Austria-Hungary	35	6,156.00
Azores	5	1,104.00
Bahamas	3	720.00
Barbados	2	288.00
Belgium	21	5,104.32
Bermuda	7	1,008.00
Bolivia	1	180.00
Brazil	6	1,404.00
British West Indies	8	1,998.00
Bulgaria	2	360.00
Canada	2,692	529,620.00
Cape Verde Islands	1	96.00
Chile	11	3,030.00
China	18	4,067.16
Colombia	1	144.00
Comoro Islands	1	120.00
Costa Rica	3	702.00
Cuba	42	9,054.00
Danish West Indies	1	144.00
Denmark	48	9,510.00
Dominican Republic	1	144.00
Dutch West Indies	4	744.00
England	464	97,998.00
Egypt	1	144.00
Finland	7	1,500.00
France	88	20,918.00
Germany	504	96,204.00
Greece	9	1,320.00
Guatemala	4	732.00
Honduras	6	1,512.00
Hongkong	4	797.88
India	12	1,926.00
Ireland	415	85,814.10
Isle of Man	1	$240.00
Isle of Pines	8	1,764.00
Italy	59	15,967.44
Japan	34	6,732.00
Liberia	7	1,380.00
Luxemburg	3	432.00
Malta	2	288.00
Mexico	75	13,662.00
Morocco	1	144.00
Netherlands	14	2,784.00
Newfoundland	5	858.00
New Zealand	20	4,086.00
Nicaragua	2	324.00
Norway	69	12,659.94
Panama	3	444.00
Peru	10	1,800.00
Portugal	5	1,296.00
Russia	10	2,040.00
Samoa	1	96.00
San Salvador	1	216.00
Scotland	75	14,750.16
Seychelles Islands	1	144.00
Siam	1	180.00
Society Islands	1	288.00
South Africa	12	2,832.00
Spain	6	1,128.00
St. Helena	1	144.00
Sweden	75	14,618.88
Switzerland	69	14,202.00
Tasmania	1	276.00
Tonga Islands	1	216.00
Trinidad	2	372.00
Turkey in Asia	15	2,886.00
Turkey in Europe	2	330.00
Uruguay	3	648.00
Venezuela	1	144.00
Wales	29	5,592.00
Total	5,163	1,034,071.88

Pensioners and amounts paid, arranged by States, etc.—Continued.

SUMMARY.

	Pensioners.	Payments.
Pensioners residing in States and Territories and payments to them	779,908	$171,337,455.61
Pensioners residing in insular possessions and Canal Zone and payments to them	168	36,990.80
Pensioners residing in foreign countries and payments to them	5,163	1,034,071.88
Total	785,239	172,408,518.29
Payments by Treasury Department (Treasury settlements)		9,027.97
Total payments on account of Army and Navy pensions, 1914		172,417,546.26

CIVIL WAR SURVIVORS.

[From Report of Commissioner of Pensions, 1914, p. 5.]

The following shows the loss and percentage of loss to the pension roll by death of Civil War soldier pensioners from the year 1909 to 1914, inclusive. This is the first time that the percentages have been shown. It will be seen that the percentage of loss is increasing with the advancing age of the veterans.

Losses to pension roll, 1909 to 1914.

Year.	On roll at beginning of year.	Loss by death during year.	Percentage of loss.
1909	620,985	32,831	5.2
1910	593,961	35,312	5.9
1911	562,615	35,243	6.2
1912	529,884	33,981	6.3
1913	497,263	36,064	7.2
1914	462,379	33,639	7.3

DISBURSEMENTS FOR PENSIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF PENSION SYSTEM.

Disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of pension system, 1866 to 1914.

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1866	$15,450,549.88	$407,165.00	$15,857,714.88	126,722
1867	20,784,789.69	490,977.35	21,275,767.04	155,474
1868	23,101,509.36	553,020.34	23,654,529.70	169,643
1869	28,513,247.27	564,526.81	29,077,774.08	187,963
1870	29,351,488.78	600,997.86	29,952,486.64	198,686
1871	28,518,792.62	863,079.00	29,381,871.62	207,495
1872	29,752,746.81	951,253.00	30,705,999.81	232,229

Disbursements for pensions, etc.—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1873	$26,982,083.89	$1,003,200.64	$27,985,264.53	238,411
1874	30,206,773.99	966,794.13	31,173,573.12	236,241
1875	29,270,404.76	982,695.35	30,253,100.11	234,821
1876	27,936,209.53	1,015,078.81	28,951,288.34	232,137
1877	28,182,821.72	1,034,459.33	29,217,281.05	232,104
1878	26,786,009.44	1,032,500.09	27,818,509.53	223,998
1879	33,664,428.92	837,734.14	34,502,163.06	242,755
1880	56,689,229.08	935,027.28	57,624,256.36	250,802
1881	50,583,405.35	1,072,059.64	51,655,464.99	268,830
1882	54,313,172.05	1,466,236.01	55,779,408.06	285,697
1883	60,427,573.81	2,591,648.29	63,019,222.10	303,658
1884	57,912,387.47	2,835,181.00	60,747,568.47	322,756
1885	65,171,937.12	3,392,576.34	68,564,513.46	345,125
1886	64,091,142.90	3,245,016.61	67,336,159.51	365,783
1887	73,752,997.08	3,753,400.91	77,506,397.99	406,007
1888	78,950,501.67	3,515,057.27	82,465,558.94	452,557
1889	88,842,720.58	3,466,968.40	92,309,688.98	489,725
1890	106,093,850.39	3,526,382.13	109,620,232.52	537,944
1891	117,312,690.50	4,700,636.44	122,013,326.94	676,160
1892	139,394,147.11	4,898,665.80	144,292,812.91	876,068
1893	156,906,637.94	4,867,734.42	161,774,372.36	966,012
1894	139,986,726.17	3,963,976.31	143,950,702.48	969,544
1895	139,812,294.30	4,338,020.21	144,150,314.51	970,524
1896	138,220,704.46	3,991,375.61	142,212,080.07	970,678
1897	139,949,717.35	3,987,783.07	143,937,500.42	976,014
1898	144,651,879.80	4,114,091.46	148,765,971.26	993,714
1899	138,355,052.95	4,147,517.73	142,502,570.68	991,519
1900	138,462,130.65	3,841,706.74	142,303,887.39	993,592
1901	138,531,483.84	3,868,795.44	142,400,279.28	997,735
1902	137,504,267.99	3,831,378.96	141,335,646.95	999,446
1903	137,759,653.71	3,993,216.79	141,752,870.50	996,545
1904	141,093,571.49	3,849,366.25	144,942,937.74	994,762
1905	141,142,861.33	3,721,832.82	144,864,694.15	998,441
1906	139,000,288.25	3,523,269.51	142,523,557.76	985,971
1907	138,155,412.46	3,309,110.44	141,464,522.90	967,371
1908	153,093,086.27	2,800,963.36	155,894,049.63	951,687
1909	161,973,703.77	2,852,583.73	164,826,287.50	946,194
1910	159,974,056.08	2,657,673.86	162,631,729.94	921,083
1911	157,325,160.35	2,517,127.06	159,842,287.41	892,098
1912	152,988,433.72	2,448,857.31	155,435,291.03	860,294
1913	174,171,660.80	2,543,246.59	176,714,907.39	820,200
1914	172,417,546.26	2,066,507.15	174,484,053.41	785,239
Total	4,633,511,926.71	127,938,472.79	4,761,450,399.50	

SPECIAL ACTS.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, p. 43.]

Since 1861 there have been allowed by special acts of Congress 43,231 pensions and increases of pensions, of which 19,680 are now on the roll, with an annual face value of $5,944,484. Only a part of this is properly chargeable to special acts, as most of the beneficiaries had been previously pensioned under general laws at lower rates.

From June 30, 1913, and thereafter during the Sixty-third Congress, 894 persons were included in the special acts passed at the rates specified in the summary following:

Pensions granted by special act during the Sixty-third Congress subsequent to June 30, 1913.

RATES SPECIFIED.	Number.
$50	59
$40	74
$36	47
$35	2
$30	213
$25	5
$24	105
$21	1
$20	192
$17	2
$16	5
$14	1
$12	145
$10	3
Inoperatives:	
$50	5
$40	3
$36	2
$30	20
$24	6
$20	4
Total	894

Of the above, 153 were granted to persons not in receipt of a pension and 741 to persons then receiving smaller pensions.

The annual value of said special-act pensions is $269,592, and the annual increase due to the same is $115,872.

The following statement shows the number of pensions and increases of pensions granted by special acts during each Congress since March 4, 1861:

Number of pensions granted by special acts each Congress since Mar. 4, 1861.

Thirty-seventh (1861–1863)	12
Thirty-eighth (1863–1865)	27
Thirty-ninth (1865–1867)	138
Fortieth (1867–1869)	275
Forty-first (1869–1871)	85
Forty-second (1871–1873)	167
Forty-third (1873–1875)	182
Forty-fourth (1875–1877)	98
Forty-fifth (1877–1879)	230
Forty-sixth (1879–1881)	96
Forty-seventh (1881–1883)	216
Forty-eighth (1883–1885)	598
Forty-ninth (1885–1887)	856
Fiftieth (1887–1889)	1,015
Fifty-first (1889–1891)	1,388
Fifty-second (1891–1893)	217
Fifty-third (1893–1895)	119
Fifty-fourth (1895–1897)	378
Fifty-fifth (1897–1899)	694
Fifty-sixth (1899–1901)	1,391
Fifty-seventh (1901–1903)	2,171
Fifty-eighth (1903–1905)	3,355
Fifty-ninth (1905–1907)	6,030
Sixtieth (1907–1909)	6,600
Sixty-first (1909–1911)	9,649
Sixty-second (1911–1913)	6,350
Sixty-third (1913 to June 30, 1914)	894
Total	43,231

Mr. BARTLETT. The information which I have given as to these bounties is taken from a work called "American Politics," by Mr. Cooper, a Republican, of Pennsylvania, who for a number of years was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature and chairman of the Republican State committee in 1881–82. It is to be found on page 74 of that volume.

I get this statement with reference to the $142,000,000 that the United States Government appropriated for bounties from a document of the Senate issued in 1879, containing a statement of the expenses of the war, and which contains the amounts of bounties paid by the United States during and immediately after the war. That document puts the total expenses of the war at $6,189,929,908.58.

This bill carries $164,000,000 for the next year, and we appropriated $169,000,000 last year. There is a surplus of between seven and seven and one-half million dollars on last year's appropriation. I had hoped that we could have reduced the bill by that amount, but the Commissioner of Pensions and the subcommittee and the committee did not think proper to do so.

It seems that whenever the pension roll decreases in number and amount—and it necessarily decreases in numbers as the years go by, for 35,000 to 36,000 die and drop out every year—that new schemes are to be inaugurated and devised for continuing this enormous pension roll, larger before the present war commenced than was appropriated by the European countries for any one year. For myself I protest against this kind of legislation.

I know the bill for 1912 was passed by a Democratic House, but that does not make it one that I can favor. I repeat that the soldier who is wounded and diseased by fighting his country's battles ought to have a pension, and I would be glad to vote for it. But these bills that propose simply to give these men payment, not for wounds, not for disease, not for long service, but merely because they were on the pay roll for 90 days, does not meet with my favor. The most of them that enjoy that benefit are men who went into the Army not from patriotic motives, not to defend the flag, but because there was paid to them by the States bounties sometimes as high as $1,500 in one case.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Why did not the committee give the Commissioner of Pensions all he asked for?

Mr. BARTLETT. We have given him all that he asked for and more.

Mr. AUSTIN. As I read the report, it is a million dollars less.

Mr. BARTLETT. Because the commissioner reduced his estimate and then further asked us to reduce it to $164,000,000. I have his letter here.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Georgia complains of pensioning the soldier that had no disability. Is it not a fact that the Southern States pension soldiers who are indigent?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; who have no property.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then why should not the Federal Government do it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Because the Federal Government does not limit it in that way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are some other things that I desire to say, not relating to pensions. First, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] this morning, in reply to my colleague [Mr. TRIBBLE], said that I did not oppose a certain bill which, as far as I can learn, no House or Senate heretofore has thought proper to report and put upon the calendar, a bill to authorize the exercise of the interstate-commerce power of regulating the hours of labor of children of various States in this Union. I did not by my vote seek to oppose such a bill. I knew it was useless. I knew the forces behind that clamor

paid no more attention to the restrictions of the power of this Government in that Constitution than they did on other occasions. I knew they were endeavoring to do that which Jefferson warned the people before he died, in one of his letters written after his retirement, that the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution would be used as an elastic shield under which the Federalists would endeavor to draw all the powers of the States to the Federal Government and throttle and destroy the powers of the States.

I have lived to see in the Congresses of which I have been a Member, time and time again, when the police powers of the State were swept from it under the guise of doing some great moral thing which was solely within the power of the State to do.

Mr. Chairman, I can not better illustrate what I mean than by reading just here an editorial from a great American author, who has lived long and devoted his life to the business of editing a great newspaper—Henry Watterson, of Louisville, Ky.

When the former President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt—who had, I hope, a good purpose, I will not say for the gratification of ambition to promulgate his doctrine of new nationalism, and had gone down to defeat in 1912—had taken himself to the jungles of South America to recuperate and come back again from Elba, Mr. Watterson wrote this:

> The end of the Republic is not yet. Impiety we behold on every hand; ingratitude and folly; women quarreling with nature for not making them men; men quarreling with freedom for not leveling conditions; the visionary seeking to abolish disease and sin by act of Congress, the demagogue flattering these delusions; but the hand of God is not yet ready to descend to blight the land and blast the people.
>
> Not yet; not yet. Maybe it will be His will to lead them through kindly light from the darkness of the hour to higher and better things. Who shall say? Anyhow, He has lifted all present menace of the Deluge. Once more He has saved the people in spite of themselves. The return of the native may have ornithological, even geographical significance, but not political importance. The man on horseback can only prance in the circus ring. Caesar never again; just plain Teddy of the tiger heart and forked tongue, wanting an office and wanting it bad, like the rest of those who have been here to-day and gone to-morrow, as presently he shall be.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he has the editorial that Mr. Watterson wrote about Bryan and the Democrats in 1896?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, I have not; I read it.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is equally good authority.

Mr. BARTLETT. And a very good editorial, too. Mr. Chairman, I hope he is right. Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago, when I entered the Halls of this House as a representative of my State, where I have served continuously since that time with almost the unanimous indorsement of my people, both at the primaries and at the election, no such bill as that could have been championed, even by a so-called Democrat from Pennsylvania. [Laughter and applause.] I have no apologies to make to him or to anybody else for our position on this sort of a bill. When the gentleman says that this bill was aimed at a few Southern States who coined the labor of children into dollars, he made a statement that was far from correct; indeed, it was reckless. [Applause.] The gentleman said that it was in order to protect us. Mr. Chairman, on one or two occasions I have had the privilege of putting into the RECORD the laws of the State of Georgia in regard to child labor. The senior Senator from Georgia, then governor of Georgia, and the junior Senator, then a Member of the House, and myself aided in passing through the Legislature of the State of Georgia a law which protected children in the factory from being improperly worked, children under 14 years of age. We need no enlightenment; we need no assertion from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to know that we have done such a thing as that.

If the gentleman is so interested in taking care of the lives and bodies of the children who are working under the lawful age, then he might have devoted himself in years gone by and at the present time to cleaning up his own house in Pennsylvania. If I recall correctly, an investigation had by the direction of President Roosevelt, over which George Gray, then a circuit judge of the United States, presided, developed conditions so shocking and horrible in the minds of Pennsylvania, with reference not only to the employment of children, but of men and women, that the whole country was shocked. The gentleman would better pull the beam out of his own eye before he undertakes to criticize or interfere with the mote in his neighbor's eye.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I desire to say in respect to that. We invite the slanderers down to the State of Georgia, where I live, so that they may see for themselves the happy condition, the safe condition, the contented condition of the many people employed in the mills, the children employed in the mills under the laws of Georgia, and if that does not show up well in comparison with the State of Pennsylvania, then I shall be ashamed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] would better, I repeat, sweep out the dirt and filth on this subject from the State of Pennsylvania and the mines and workshops there before he undertakes to come in here and in his unconstitutional way undertake to protect the children of Georgia. The gentleman spoke of those who opposed by their voices and by their votes this measure. I voted against it. There is not a man in this House on either side who did not know when the bill was called up and my name was called that I would vote against it.

It is not because I have not as much at heart the interest and protection of the children of the country as has the gentleman from Pennsylvania; not because I would not advocate and have not advocated in my own State legislature the enactment of laws to protect them from avarice of the mill owners, but because I know, when the fathers builded this Government and wrote into the Constitution the words that are written there limiting the power of the Government and reserving certain rights to the States, that they intended that no one like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] should undertake to lay his hand on the sacred ark of the covenant and invade the liberties of the people of the States by enacting a law of that kind. I believe, as do many others, that this is a Government with limited powers, and that certain rights are reserved to the States; and if that be treason to the Democratic Party and to the country, then the gentleman may make the most of it. I have lived in that sort of belief and I have advocated in this House for 20 years that belief, and I shall go out of it maintaining that belief and my own self-respect. I shall go back to my people knowing that I have kept the faith, whether they approve or do not approve, or whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania approves or does not approve. I would rather retire to private life, as I shall do, with these convictions, and go down to my grave believing in them and believing that I stand for them, than have all of the cheap claptrap notoriety that people get from endeavoring to change the laws of the State by these unauthorized and unjustifiable methods.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I realize the gentleman's sincerity, but does the gentleman expect the Supreme Court of the United States to hold the child-labor law unconstitutional?

Mr. BARTLETT. I expect the Supreme Court of the United States to administer the law as it has heretofore declared it, and to say that you can not exercise the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution to regulate the police laws of the States.

Mr. MURDOCK. But if the Supreme Court holds that it is constitutional, what then?

Mr. BARTLETT. Then the people will have to submit to it.

Mr. MURDOCK. And in that event we would have had hold of the right horn of the dilemma and the gentleman of the wrong horn.

Mr. BARTLETT. That does not make it right. I decide these questions of constitutionality by my own convictions and not by what the Supreme Court or somebody else may say. I am the judge, and not the Supreme Court.

I did not intend to say anything on this, Mr. Chairman. I have done so because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] threw out such a broad challenge to those of us who spoke against it and those of us who voted against it in stating that we were endeavoring to fasten upon the country wrongs perpetrated by avaricious mill owners against the children of the country.

Another thing. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed as a Democrat to any proposition looking to the Government ownership of the public utilities of this country. No Democratic platform, no Republican platform that I have ever read, and no platform of any of the great parties that have battled for the supremacy of this great Government in the last 100 years has ever advocated it. On every stump in Georgia, from the mountain to the seaboard, from Savannah to the Chattahoochee River, every Democratic candidate and speaker have rung out the protest of the Democratic fathers against so-called Government ownership or any species of Government control. That was a policy which originated as far back as 1872 with the Socialist Labor Party. I did not believe in it then and I do not believe in it now. Men may come and men may go, parties may change and men in parties may change, but that faith I shall hold to as an abiding truth. I have kept it and I propose to keep it on all occasions, however much I may regret that the occasion arises when I shall have to assume that position and give expression to my opinion in opposition to my party. I see no difference between Government ownership of railroads and Government ownership of ships that ply the seas. In truth, I would rather under the operation of government vote for Government owner-

ship of railroads than I would for Government ownership of ships, because the United States Government has the right to exercise the power of eminent domain through the States, also to condemn a right of way for its highways to carry the mails or military supplies, or build railroads under the commerce clause of the Constitution, as the Supreme Court has said, but whoever, until this month or this year, ever proclaimed the doctrine that the United States Government had the right to condemn a highway across God's highway, upon the seas of the world, which is God's highway, 3 miles from shore.

No man is prohibited from going upon it or sailing upon it, and you can not exercise a power or sovereignty or force and say you condemn it and use it. So I found myself disagreeing with the policy of my party, the policy advocated by my friends in this House. I declined to accept it. I have the greatest admiration, affection, and respect for the man in the White House. I think he is one of the greatest Presidents whom we have had in many decades in this country—a sincere, true patriot. I do not propose and have not proposed to indulge in any sycophantic praise of him. I took my political life in my hands in the primaries in 1912 in my district in advocating his nomination, and some who are now shouting his praises were fiercely attacking him.

I stood up for him and carried my particular section for him in the primary. I thought in 1912, as I think now, that he was the best man of all the candidates we could nominate for the Presidency and the only man we could elect. He is a manly man; he has opinions of his own, and when occasion arose which called upon him to do so he asserted those principles and voted them or remained quiet and did not support the candidates who represented the principles he could not accept. I claim the same right to vote and voice those principles that I have believed in all my life, whether in the Democratic caucus or in the House. I exercised this right in the Democratic caucus. The Democratic caucus has formulated a rule by which a man who could not support a measure that contravenes his view of the Constitution of the United States or which violates the pledge which he had made to his people could be excused from supporting a caucus measure.

But these small men who undertake to enlarge their proportions by standing in the glaring light that beats around the White House go around and glibly talk about "bolters." They want front seats and front places in the White House light; they who hold up their hands and shout, like Demetrius of old, "Great, great is Diana of the Ephesians." So they shout, "Great, great is Woodrow Wilson in the White House." [Applause.] As Demetrius said when St. Paul undertook to tell him about the Christian religion and the wonders which Christ and His disciples had worked, when he undertook to preach the doctrine of Christianity, Demetrius urged the people to stone him because it interfered with Demetrius's business. And so these shouters for Wilson would have it done to us. I do not care if they stone me like Demetrius would have stoned St. Paul because we interfered with their business of patronage. [Laughter and applause.] Why, I am ready to be stoned; I am ready to be pilloried in the white light of public opinion of my State and of my constituency; and if I can not show them that I stood for the faith of the fathers, that I exercised a right that a Democratic caucus gave me when we organized the Democratic caucus, then I must accept the consequences; but I would rather wrap the robes of private station around me and retire to my home and serve the balance of my life as a private citizen than to be forced by any sort of demand to lose my respect.

I can lose office and be satisfied. I can lose the good opinion or approval of those men who have one opinion to-day and another to-morrow, but I can not go to my home and my people with my self-respect gone, and tell them that I did it by the dictation of anybody, and I will not do it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks, by putting in extracts from the National Magazine, which gives a statement of the various instances where States have undertaken government ownership of railroads and have failed. I ask to put that in.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF UTILITIES.

(By William Clayton.)

"Government ownership and operation is not an entirely new proposition in this country, for minor ventures were made as far back as colonial days, most of which were financial failures. Prior to 1860 appropriations exceeding $12,000,000 had been made by Congress for the construction of Government-owned transportation projects, but the most searching investigations which students of political economy have made have brought to light nothing remarkable except the fact that no financial success followed these undertakings.

"The older States have had the most disappointing experience with practically every project they have launched, and a very interesting volume could be compiled from the records of government owned and operated canals in some of the Eastern States. The figures would be appalling, and they would indicate a waste of money far beyond all reason. Outside of New York State the great majority of canal projects have either been abandoned or turned over to private ownership; and even in New York State no one would venture to assert that the canals have been other than a gigantic failure except so far as they have assisted in the development of the territory through which they were built. As enterprises standing alone, the financial losses have been colossal.

"History shows that several American States have owned and operated steam railroads, only to abandon them as unprofitable and therefore unsuccessful. The only Government railroads in this country to-day are the Panama Railroad, operated by the Federal Government, and a short road in Texas known as the Penitentiary line. (The apparent success of Government operation of the Panama Railroad is due to excessively high rates and monopolization of the traffic. For instance, the Panama Railroad's average freight rate in the fiscal year 1913 was a trifle short of 3½ cents per ton per mile, which was more than four times greater than the average of the privately owned railroads of the United States—three-quarters of a cent per ton per mile.) Georgia and North Carolina own certain railroads, which were built several years ago, but they are now leased and operated by private companies. Before going out of the railroad business these States encountered disastrous experiences in the operation of the system. Probably no better account of an unsuccessful experience may be found than the story told by Hon. T. B. Wamock, formerly judge of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, who wrote, in 1906: 'This road (from Goldsboro to Morehead City) has been operated by the State of North Carolina for nearly half a century, in war and peace, by Democrats, by Republicans, and by fusionists, with various degrees of failure.

"'The private stockholders for years have pleaded for a lease or anything to avoid a continuance of political mismanagement. During these many years no dividend has been earned, though one or two presidents declared dividends of 1 or 2 per cent per annum for political effect, when such moneys should have been used in betterments. Finally, during the administration of Gov. Aycock, it became known that the administration had determined to heed the cries of the private stockholders and the sound business judgment of the people of the State and to lease this last of the State's railroads. A great sigh of relief went up from mountain to sea. The effect of the lease was immediate. The first year of private management improved the roadbed and equipment to a point never before approached. The road is being extended and new connections made and is run upon business as opposed to political methods. The service, both passenger and freight, has been nearly doubled, and favoritism has been abolished.'

"The experience of Cincinnati, which owns the Cincinnati & Southern Railroad, has been nothing but unsatisfactory from a financial standpoint.

"Missouri has had a most unfortunate experience in railroad construction and operation, and it is stated that its losses in this line of endeavor amount to approximately $25,000,000.

"The State of Pennsylvania is said to have lost about $20,000,000 in its railway projects. This loss resulted from its experience with the old Philadelphia & Columbia Railroad.

"Indiana started out in the late thirties to demonstrate its faith in public ownership, but, after a year's experience as an owner and operator of the Madison & Lafayette road, frankly admitted its failure and stopped the losses after a million and a half had been sunk in the enterprises.

"These illustrations are not the only unsuccessful experiences that American States have encountered with public ownership and operation. Unfortunately, a complete story of these failures has never been written, and as many of them occurred before our present generation the precedents have not been sufficiently considered. When these failures are better understood they will aid in forming correct conclusions regarding the wisdom of municipalizing everything in sight.

"The commissioner of accounts of the city of New York recently reported to the mayor that the net loss from operating the Staten Island ferry for seven years was $4,450,699. The

city's loss on the Staten Island ferry proper, coupled with the loss on what is known as the Thirty-ninth Street division, a Brooklyn ferry, has been $6,625,000, an average of $2,934 a day. Gazing at these figures, and then contemplating the fact that these ferries paid when they were privately operated, can not but dampen the ardor of any municipal ownership enthusiast.

* * * * * * *

"Every government of municipal enterprise is exposed to political outbidding of one politician by another. Government employees become electoral factors in proportion to the increase of Government and municipal activities. They become the actual masters of those to whom in theory they are subservient.

"In the Municipal Trading Report, Sir Thomas Hughes, twice mayor of Liverpool, states: 'The day on which a man becomes the employee of a municipal corporation he ought to have no further voice in the choice of his superiors.'

"The New York World recently states:

"'Nominally the civil-service employees of New York are public servants. In reality they are public masters.

"'The original civil-service laws were enacted to protect faithful public servants from political bosses and to safeguard the public business from the demoralization of public welfare. We have protected all these employees from the boss, but we have got to devise means to protect the public from its employees. No corporation would dare take the aggressive stand against public regulation that these civil-service employees take.

"'New York has a written charter, but it is only a matter of form. The real charter of New York is to be found in the decrees of 60,000 and more civil-service employees, all organized against their employers, the people of New York. They are all despots of our democracy.'

"One difficulty common to most forms of government ownership arises from the necessity of dealing with a large number of employees. The tasks of a government, whether it be a nation or a municipality, are sufficiently varied and comprehensive to take up all the ability and time of the administrators, without adding unnecessarily to their duties. In public ownership there is a multiplication of the activities of government which brings about vexatious interference with liberty and a restriction upon legitimate enterprises. In other words, instead of the liberties of the people being protected they are curtailed."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, namely.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may proceed for 10 minutes as though it were in general debate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope that will be done, and I join with the gentleman from Illinois in that request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the gentleman from Illinois, also the gentleman from Georgia, for this courtesy at this time. It is rather belated, since what I have to say could have been more appropriately said at the time the discussion was on. I rise now to say a word or two with respect to a practice that has grown up here of criticizing men who are not present. I do not mean to reflect upon the gentleman from Georgia, for instance, who has just made a very severe attack upon my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], inviting a reply that I presume, in due course, will be made in defense of the child-labor bill, but I do think some Member in this House should rise when a statement is being made about an individual who is not here, which statement involves a charge of corruption concerning individuals who are not present to defend themselves.

Now, I have no desire to question the motives of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER]. He has started out on a line of investigation which is special to his particular district and he endeavors to broaden it so that it will attract general attention. But when he comes into the House and asks leave to have read a statement, which statement he represents to be a response to a very lengthy attack made by him in the RECORD, and which does not upon its face appear to be a statement of the person to whom it is attributed, it is entirely regular, fair and just that some one—it happened to be me in this instance—should rise and question the authenticity of the statement.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15 our very industrious colleague from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] inserted a speech of more than 22 pages in length, which is a direct attack upon the War and the Navy Departments, and which throughout breathes the spirit of corruption and of graft, and which in some instances directly asserts that officers of the Government serving under our distinguished Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, are in league with certain trusts and combinations for the purpose of making money and making it corruptly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not yield just now. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], having gone thus far in the RECORD, proceeds this morning, under time granted to him by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], to have read an article from a newspaper, which, according to his statement, is in answer to his lengthy speech of February 15. The gentleman from Illinois stated in his address of this morning—a stenographic copy of this address being before me—that he, the gentleman from Illinois, having called attention to the fact that—

Four firms, which constitute the War Trust of this country, have drawn down $175,000,000 worth of contracts from the Government for munitions of war, and that Army and Navy officers have permitted these four concerns to outrageously overcharge the Government for every dollar's worth of those supplies—

therefore he calls attention to the fact that Gen. Crozier—and that comes very close to an implication that Gen. Crozier is one of the officers who is permitting the Government to be "outrageously charged"—

That Gen. Crozier, the present Chief of Ordnance, who does the buying of these supplies for the Army, was formerly in partnership with the Bethlehem Steel Co.; that he was in partnership with them on the day he was made Chief of Ordnance—

And so forth. Having made this fling, the gentleman from Illinois says:

My attention has been directed to an answer by Gen. Crozier to the charges which I have made, and I think, in fairness to Gen. Crozier and in order that his views may be in the RECORD, as mine have been placed in the RECORD—

And so forth. That this alleged statement by the general should be read from the Clerk's desk, and so forth.

Now, it was patent to every Member who listened to the newspaper article which the gentleman sent up to the Clerk's desk to be read that it did not emanate from Gen. Crozier; that it was just as I said when breaking into the reading of the article, observing that it was unfair, that the article iself represents a man of straw set up to be knocked down. That is to say, the gentleman from Illinois, having made his charges, 22 pages in length, which charges have not been responded to, discovers a newspaper dispatch saying that Gen. Crozier contemplated doing so and so, and that Gen. Crozier might reply. That is the only basis for the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that Gen. Crozier proposed to do anything.

I said that this was not a fair method of procedure, and I was interrupted by certain calls from the floor, indicating that I was very much out of order and that I ought not to proceed. Now, in the speech of the gentleman from Illinois of February 15, after he has roasted Gen. Crozier, he says very much as he says in offering this newspaper statement about this man of straw, this bugaboo that he intends to knock down:

I do not desire to do Gen. Crozier the slightest injustice, and, on the other hand, I am equally anxious that no injustice be done the taxpayers of this country.

He compliments the general, but he proceeds to lambast him just about as severely as a first-class, energetic newspaper writer is capable of doing, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] is all that.

Now, in the course of my effort to reply briefly to the newspaper statement that was read, in order to explain that it was not a statement from Gen. Crozier, in order to have it appear in the RECORD that something was being used that was not, apparently, furnished by Gen. Crozier, there came certain objections, cries of "Sit down," cries of "the gentleman is out of order," suggestions, and catcalls from Members who did not address the Chair that I "should take my seat"; suggestions that I was the representative of the Steel Trust. Although some of them were undoubtedly jocular, these suggestions

about the trusts came from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], from the distinguished and always deliberate gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], and they also came with some explosive violence from the distinguished Democratic interrupter of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

These gentlemen said that because I was endeavoring to play fair and have the House do the decent thing toward a Federal officer under a Democratic administration, who was not here, that I was speaking in the interest of trusts and combinations. Of course, to me that insinuation is the veriest joke. To my constituents it would be laughable. Those who know me and have watched me here know that I have been as outspoken on this floor against illegal trusts and combinations as any Democrat ever dared to be. I have not even fallen in with the more recent Democratic notions that the Shipping Trust must be taken care of by the purchase of foreign ships; that the Railroad Trust must be taken care of, even from the White House, by increasing the freight rates in order that the railroads may have larger profits; that the Oil Trust and the Cotton Trust may have more protection by the purchase of ships to enable them to make more money; that the great shippers and exporters of the country must have an insurance company, paid for by the money of the people, in order that exporters may loot the people a little. All these things I have not fallen in with under this Democratic administration. I have protested against the modern Democratic forgetfulness of the common people of the land and their falling into hands of the trusts. I have wondered why they did it, whether it was for the purpose of securing campaign funds or not I do not know. It may have been to get on the right side of the "big interests" with the hope of continuing the last Democratic administration for another term.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will not yield. I have not been able to agree with the gentlemen who represent the trusts of this country upon the Democratic side of this House——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope it will be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MOORE. Well, as the gentleman is the special representative of the President of the United States, who recently received 62 representatives of the "big interests" in order that a better understanding might be had as to how the business of the country could be restored and normal conditions be resumed, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman infer that the President of the United States coerced the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. MOORE. Oh, I make no such intimation. It is a fact, however, and the gentleman may ponder over it, that after the railroad presidents of the United States visited the White House and told the President their troubles, the President of the United States did issue a statement, saying that the railroads ought to have consideration, and that the freight rates ought to be increased. It has happened that the Interstate Commerce Commission has taken the same view of the situation that the President did, and has granted an increase of rates. Under a Democratic administration that formerly stood for the downtrodden people of the land and was forever against private monopolies, and particularly against railroad domination, that is pretty good.

Mr. WALSH. Let the gentleman be fair to the President, and say——

Mr. MOORE. That is as far as I can yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman ought to know that he did not coerce the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MOORE. I did not say so. If the gentleman is going to be the President's sole defender on this floor——

Mr. WALSH. I do not pretend to be the President's sole defender on this floor——

Mr. MOORE. Why, then the gentleman will be the only Democrat who has responded to the Washington Post's Macedonian cry for help from Democratic Members to stand up and defend the President against the so-called vicious attacks that the Republicans are poking into the present administration. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman should be fair.

Mr. MOORE. I am as fair as I can be under the circumstances. People who were prosperous in the gentleman's own district under the last Republican administration are now out of work. The people employed in the potteries up there are now seeking employment. They lost it because they voted for the gentleman's friend, now the President of the United States. They had the false notion that they could have continued prosperity under a low-tariff system. The gentleman knows that very well, because the slogan of the gentleman's campaign was "Walsh works with Wilson"; the result was that Walsh was left at home. I think the people of Trenton will verify that.

Mr. WALSH. Sometimes merit is not recognized at first, and there is still hope. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE. The outlook is not very cheerful.

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

Mr. MOORE. Gladly, if the gentleman will give me more time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think that a real Democrat at any time takes suggestions from the Washington Post as to what a Democrat ought to do?

Mr. MOORE. Well, sometimes the Post speaks out only in the interest of the Democratic Party. Its editor and proprietor is an excellent Democrat; he gives the party good advice from time to time. [Laughter.]

It seems to me that it ought to be stated now, in view of the protests that arose from the Democratic side a moment ago against a Republican Member daring to take his feet to even ask for fair play for a Democratic officeholder, that we ought to find out the origin of the case. I do not know whether Gen. Crozier is a Republican or a Democrat, and I do not care. I have not taken the trouble to call up Gen. Crozier or any of his friends to find out what his attitude is on these charges that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] has brought against him. I do not know whether he knows that his name was used in this body to-day or not. I speak only in the interest of fair play, and just now I am endeavoring to trace the origin of the man whom the Democrats did not want defended on this floor a little while ago, but whom they apparently desired to denounce, and whom they would connect with the great trusts of this country.

Let us see where he came from. I understand he was a captain in the Bureau of Ordnance some years ago, and that he was the inventor of what is called the disappearing gun carriage. I am not going into details, because they are technical, and I have not the finesse in that regard of my distinguished friend from Alabama, Capt. HOBSON. But in a departmental report signed by the Hon. Daniel S. Lamont, Secretary of War, and a very clever Democrat he was, I find this—the report was for the year 1894:

> The establishment of type disappearing gun carriages for 8-inch and 10-inch guns, invented by officers of the Ordnance Corps and believed to be unequaled for rapidity and simplicity of action by any carriage elsewhere in use, is a notable achievement of the year. This problem solved, the armament of our harbors may now be prosecuted as rapidly as means are available.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> At the date of the last annual report of the department a selection of a type carriage for 8 and 10 inch guns was expected within a few months. Since then the 8-inch Buffington-Crozier disappearing carriage has been tried with results, as stated by the Board of Ordnance, exceeding for rapidity and smoothness of operation the most sanguine expectations of this board. The carriage is the combined invention of Col. Buffington and Capt. Crozier, of the Ordnance Department, and reflects credit on the inventive skill of American officers.
>
> It is a satisfactory solution of one of the most difficult problems which has confronted military science.

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

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, Daniel S. Lamont signed this report. He was a Democrat. It was indorsed by Grover Cleveland, a great Democratic President; and the origin of the scandal against Col. Buffington and Capt. Crozier started with the Democratic administration in 1894. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In extending these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the charges of the gentleman from Illinois seem to have been exploded long ago. The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations and the House itself have grown tired of thrashing over this matter. If there was anything

wrong with Gen. Crozier, why did Grover Cleveland in his annual message to Congress, December 7, 1896, referring to the invention of Capt. Crozier, say this:

> During the same year, immediately preceding the message referred to, the first modern gun carriage has been completed and 11 more were in process of construction. All but one were of the nondisappearing type. These, however, were not such as to secure necessary cover for artillery gunners against the intense fire of modern machine rapid-fire and high-power guns.
>
> The inventive genius of ordnance and civilian experts has been taxed in designing carriages that would obviate this fault, resulting, it is believed, in the solution of this difficult problem.

Apparently Gen. Crozier has had the confidence of every administration from the days of Grover Cleveland down to the present time. He appears to have the confidence of the administration of Woodrow Wilson, and I am at a loss to understand why, if he began with Cleveland and continues under Wilson, there should be any good reason for refusing him a decent hearing in a Democratic House of Representatives. It is not my case; it is yours.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HOBSON. Which gentleman from Alabama?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, a good many things have been said about the President coercing the Democrats into supporting the shipping bill. I think I know the sentiment on this side. Two-thirds of the Democrats over here were for the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Two-thirds?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; and only 16 excused themselves, and of those, only 14 finally voted against the bill. The Progressives on that side voted with us, and I am not sure but that one or two Republicans did.

A MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, the Republicans may have voted solidly against the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate. Five Progressives voted for the bill and seven voted against it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, that is one time that the minority of the Progressives were in the right, and the majority was in the wrong. [Applause.]

I knew the bulk of the Republican Party stood that way. The President of the United States does not need any defense at the hands of anybody here. His great work speaks for itself. The Republican Party is taking advantage of a distressing condition that exists in this country on account of war. One half the world is at war and business is disturbed along various lines. You are playing politics at a time when you ought to be supporting, with all your heart and head, this great chief in the White House. You are undertaking at this time to play politics; but, gentlemen, it is going to turn on you, and we are going to turn it on you in the campaign of 1916. The people will have learned long before then that conditions which are distressing business were brought about by the war in Europe. You are going to tell them and you have been telling them that it is caused by the tariff. Canada has a high tariff, and yet business is in an awful fix in Canada, and it is war that has caused it. War has injured conditions there just as war has injured conditions here.

Mr. FOWLER. Has not Germany the highest protective tariff of any country in the Eastern Hemisphere?

Mr. HEFLIN. And yet gentlemen will say that the war had nothing to do with disturbed business conditions in Germany. They would say that it is the Democratic Party in the United States that has done it, and that is what they would have the people believe. But you can not fool the people with these things.

The President of the United States is fighting the greatest trust on the earth, the Shipping Trust. It is owned by people who live in foreign countries, and you gentlemen have shown your great friendship and sympathy for the people here by supporting the foreign Shipping Trust. You will also have that to meet in the next campaign. And the obstacles which you are trying now to place before this great man of peace in the White House will rise up to haunt you in the next campaign. Let me appeal to your patriotism once. Cease this effort at a political play and put the good of your country and the good of the American people one time above your insatiate desire to return to power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that general debate was going to be continued on this subject. I have no objection.

In what I had to say a few minutes ago I stated my position upon a certain proposition, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has repeated the language of the street, which we hear so often from those who do genuflections and swing censers before the President of the United States, that those who opposed the shipping bill were actuated by friendship for and interest in the Shipping Trust. That does not refer to me; but since the suggestion has been made I will ask, Where is the Shipping Trust in the country? It is the coastwise trade, and everybody knows it. Who are the people who have stood in the way? I do not mean Members of Congress. I never reflect upon the views or motives of Members of the House. Men who have honor and character enough to receive the votes of their constituencies and to be entitled to seats in this Congress are above suspicion of their motives and ought not to have their motives or their votes questioned, unless some proof can be brought against them. I despise that sort of argument and criticism against Congress, and I take it for granted that every Member of this House is as honest in his motives as I am, and I would resent the suggestion that I am in any way influenced in my vote.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BARTLETT. I can not yield. I will yield in a moment. But the country knows and everybody knows that those of us who could not give our support to the shipping bill in the caucus agreed to support it if gentlemen would agree to make it temporary and would strike a blow at the great Shipping Trust—the coastwise trade—and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and the people who thought as he did, headed by him, voted it down. We got 58 votes for it, but it was voted down. Now, "let the galled jade wince. My withers are unwrung."

Mr. HEFLIN. I should like to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does not the gentleman from Georgia know—I want to state to him that I did not have him in mind.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know you did not. You ought not to have had anybody in mind.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not have the gentleman in mind. I was replying to the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and had no reference to the gentleman from Georgia at all.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this in reply to the gentleman from Georgia——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want just an opportunity to speak for two minutes. I did not intend to cast any reflection on the gentleman from Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that I may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman refers to what occurred in the caucus, about making a limitation on this purchase of ships. I want to say to the gentleman that that is exactly what the trust wanted. Whenever he asks this Congress to set a time to sell these ships, the trust rejoices, because it knows that nobody but the trust will bid and buy, and we did not want the Government to be helpless in the hands of the trust when it got ready to dispose of these vessels. We did what we thought was right. We followed the suggestion of the Senate Democrats, of the President in the White House, and the majority of the Democrats on this side. It has become the policy of the Democratic Party, and I choose to stand beneath the unfurled flag of my party, and I will stand and fight in the open, with Woodrow Wilson and four-fifths of the Democratic Senators and nine-tenths of the Democrats in this House. That is where I stand on this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I choose to stand with my party. I always did. I stood for it, I apprehend, when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was in his swaddling clothes. I do not propose to permit him or anyone else to say where I shall stand, nor do I propose to permit him or men who entertain views not Democratic, and not drawn from Democratic sources, to drive me out of the Democratic Party. They may go, but I shall stay. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, $165,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 1, by striking out the figures $165,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof $164,000,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, according to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions there remained at the end of the last fiscal year $7,658,572.87 surplus of the $169,000,000 appropriated under the bill of that year. When the commissioner was before the committee that was preparing this bill he stated positively at that time that he was satisfied that $165,000,000 would be sufficient. Since that time he has further information, and on February 5, 1915, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations received this letter:

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I understand that your committee has made a reduction of $166,000,000 to $165,000,000 in the appropriation for pensions during the fiscal year 1916. It will be entirely safe to make a further reduction of $1,000,000 from this amount, making the appropriation $164,000,000.

Cordially, yours, ———.

That information was obtained after the committee had made its report to this House, and, therefore, following the suggestion of the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior, I have offered this amendment.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee what is the annual reduction in the pension fund occasioned by the deaths of the old soldiers?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; it is in the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice here that in 1912 the reduction was $4,319,000. I presume it is much higher this year.

Mr. BARTLETT. The number of deaths during the year 1914 was 33,639.

Mr. STAFFORD. What were the total reductions occasioned by those deaths?

Mr. BARTLETT. It left a balance, as I stated to the gentleman, of $7,658,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I understood the gentleman, he stated $169,000,000 were appropriated, and there was a surplus of $7,000,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; that was the surplus. They did not pay it out.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would leave a balance of $161,000,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And yet, notwithstanding the surplus, you are appropriating $164,000,000 instead of $161,000,000, and not taking into account the savings that will result by the increasing deaths of the old soldiers as the years go by. Does not the gentleman think there will be still a surplus of many million dollars if we appropriate $164,000,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I do; and if the gentleman will offer an amendment to make it $161,000,000 I will vote for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is in charge of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am in charge of a bill that has been agreed to by a committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. From the figures presented by the gentleman for last year we appropriated $169,000,000, and there was a surplus of $7,000,000. That means that only $162,000,000 are necessary, and certainly with the continued deaths the figure that would be sufficient would be below $160,000,000. It does not require any argument to show that, because in 1912 the reductions in pensions occasioned by deaths at that time amounted to $4,338,000, and certainly as the age increases the reduction increases also.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is true. I endeavored to do that. I read from the hearings at page 8:

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it likely that you would have as much unexpended balance at the end of the next fiscal year as you had at the end of the last fiscal year

Mr. SALTZGABER. No, sir; I hardly anticipate that much, because the appropriation has been reduced all the time.

Mr. BARTLETT. You will have as much ratably or comparatively?

Mr. SALTZGABER. That is pretty hard to answer. I do not know just the meaning of the word "ratably" in that connection.

Mr. BARTLETT. In other words, if on an appropriation of $169,000,000 you saved $7,658,000, on an appropriation of $166,000,000 you would save as much, would you not?

Mr. SALTZGABER. No, sir; not necessarily. The amount required is diminishing, but the estimate was made $3,000,000 less to start with on that account. Now, as I have said to you, probably less than that will be required, though just how much less is a matter of speculation.

Mr. BARTLETT. If we give you $165,000,000, that will meet all the requirements?

Mr. SALTZGABER. I think that will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "separately," insert:

"From and after July 1, 1916, no pension shall be paid to any person who resides in a foreign country, and who is not a citizen of the United States, except for actual disabilities incurred in the service."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I feel reasonably sure, from the discussion and comments which this amendment has received, that it represents the real sentiment of the American soldiers themselves. I am certain that it represents the sentiment of the rest of the taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why does the gentleman put this off to July 1, 1916? Why does he not make it effective July 1, 1915?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this amendment was considered in the Sixty-second Congress and was very vigorously opposed by some of the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. One of the questions they raised was whether the department could get ready to put it into force during the current year. In my own judgment it can be put into force, and I have drawn and will offer, if this amendment is defeated, a limitation upon the existing appropriation. I am not sure but that both ought to go in, but I am perfectly certain that no possible injustice can result if we give them the fiscal year in which to ascertain and prepare for this change.

Mr. BARKLEY. They have now nearly five months before this appropriation becomes available.

Mr. BORLAND. That is true; but this amendment will get more votes than the amendment the gentleman has in mind. I know that from experience.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the opinion of the Commissioner of Pensions upon this subject?

Mr. BORLAND. The opinion of the Commissioner of Pensions is very decidedly in favor of this amendment. I quoted that in my speech this afternoon, and I have it here in the hearings on page 21. The present Commissioner of Pensions is an old soldier and has the confidence and respect of the entire body of old soldiers of this country. I read from the hearings:

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask a formal question, and I do not ask the commissioner to answer it if he does not desire to do so: In your judgment, Mr. Commissioner, is it proper for a man who rendered service in the Civil War or any other military service for the United States Government, and who because of that service was placed upon the pension roll, to be deprived of that pension because of the fact that subsequently he declared his allegiance to some other country than the United States? In your opinion, Mr. Commissioner, should or should not that fact bar him from receiving the pension that he obtained as a service pension because of his service to the United States? You need not answer that question if you prefer not to do so.

Mr. SALTZGABER. I have an opinion on the subject, and it is this: I am so thoroughly American that I believe that a man who abjures his allegiance to this country ought not to receive any reward from it.

So that the present Commissioner of Pensions has a clear-cut opinion which he does not hesitate to express. I am very glad to find that my colleague from New York, Mr. GOULDEN, an old soldier in the Union cause, and my colleague from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, agree very heartily in the absolute justice of this provision and the relative justice of it to the old soldiers who remain under the American flag and who contribute to the expenses of the American Government.

They have no sentiment, such as gentlemen who have opposed this in the past seem to think, that this is some kind of an injustice to the American soldier. In fact they take the opposite view, that this is an act of justice to the American soldier, who, in the last analysis, through himself, his sons, and family pay the taxes out of which these pensions must be paid.

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

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the gentleman's amendment deprive a widow of a pension whose husband fought for the preservation of our Union, who now lives say in Ireland or Canada? Would it not deprive them of pensions?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, that objection has been raised also and made much of; and I want to say to my friend from Illinois, whom I know is perfectly sincere in asking the question, that as long ago as 1893, when this matter first came

up, the question was raised then whether some of the widows or dependent mothers of soldiers who were foreigners and never became citizens of the Nation would not be affected by this provision. At that time, in 1893, there were less than 3,000 of these foreigners drawing pensions, whereas to-day there are over 5,000 of them. Now, the gentleman will see that if there are any widows in Ireland, or dependent mothers, their number ought to decrease very rapidly after the war and not increase at this rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. My own judgment is this: That while there may be some widows remaining—I doubt whether there are any dependent mothers—if there may be some widows remaining in foreign countries whose husbands came here and fought and died under the American flag, we could very easily take care of those cases by special bills; in fact, when that question was put to the commissioner as to how we could deal with exceptional cases of foreigners who ought to have some reward from the Federal Treasury he said the way to deal with it was by a special bill in Congress. And these special bills would not amount to anything near the million dollars we are now dispensing. Another point that the commissioner made is this: We provided in the last bill—Sixty-second Congress—that pensions should be paid by checks instead of by vouchers. Well, that saved a good deal of time and some expense to the pensioner in getting his money and the trouble of going down and signing the voucher. It was an awful fight to get that through. I happened to be one of the conferees on the part of the House, and it took us three or four months, against a most bitter fight of these men who are capitalizing this pension business all over the country, to get that kind of an amendment into the law. Yet the commissioner says to-day that there is a saving made of $145,000 in the annual expense of running his office every year; and not only that, but it saves from one to eight days' time of pensioner in getting his money and he saves the expense and trouble of executing his voucher.

In addition to that, he says that that safeguard can not be extended to foreign pensioners; that he must continue to pay by voucher to foreign countries because there is no way of applying our fraud laws to a foreign country. If somebody over there continues to get a pension check after the pensioner died and continues to cash it, we can never reach him until some casual information comes through some American consul or otherwise that that pension ought to be stopped. That there is no way of our controlling that in foreign countries——

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

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. In answer to the objection of the gentleman from Illinois, I will state it in this way: I heard the argument made by the gentleman from Tennessee a year ago on this question. Now, if there are any of these Irish widows, or widows of other countries, who are deserving of a pension, I will agree to get a private pension for every one of them.

Mr. BORLAND. They could very easily obtain them. But the main point is this: We might as well solve this question now as at any other time. We could not get into a war with any country on the globe without finding part of our own money, and perhaps men who are drawing pensions from this Government, under arms opposing us. It would perhaps be voluntary and perhaps by draft, but at least we would be fought by our own men and our own money. No nation in the world has ever done that or ever ought to do it, and we ought not to continue to do it.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman just a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Commissioner of Pensions, at the suggestion of the committee, has prepared a letter, which can be read, that would reach the situation by asking certain questions.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I have seen this letter prepared by the commissioner, and I will ask to have it inserted in the RECORD, so that it may be before the House. It consists of four questions. The commissioner says it would be very easy in sending out the next pensions to foreign countries to insert the letter, and have it returned with the answers, and that the expense would be but trifling.

Mr. COOPER. Would the gentleman read those questions?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I will. I may overrun my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will give you more time.

Mr. BORLAND. It says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, ———, ———.

———— ————:

Please answer the following questions for the information of the Congress of the United States, and return this circular in the same envelope with your next voucher for pension.

————— ————,
Commissioner of Pensions.

1. Where were you born?
2. Name the countries in which you have resided since your birth, and the years of your residence in each country.
3. Of what country are you now a citizen?
4. Were you ever a citizen of any other country; and if so, name the country and State, how you became a citizen thereof, and how your citizenship was terminated?

Signature: ———— ————.

Post-office address: { ———— ————, ———— ————.

Now, there are four simple questions. It discloses exactly what Congress wants to know, whether this pensioner was ever a citizen of the United States, and whether——

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the gentleman a question, which, with his answer, will, I think, embody the whole argument. Does the gentleman believe that it would have been wrong for the Government of the United States to pension Von Steuben, the German, or Lafayette and Rochambeau, the Frenchmen, or Kosciusko and Pulaski, the Poles, who helped to win our freedom, and then went back to Europe?

Mr. BORLAND. Congress, I think, did vote special ones to each of those gentlemen.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; it did. And why should it not have pensioned them as long as they lived? [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. They are all dead.

Mr. BORLAND. That is not the question involved.

Mr. COOPER. Some of these other men came from Europe and helped 50 years ago to save the flag of the United States, and ought to be pensioned as long as they live, and wherever they live, for the same reason exactly. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. That very question was asked Mr. Saltzgaber, the Commissioner of Pensions, and my recollection is that it appears in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes' extension.

Mr. MANN. How long is this going to run?

Mr. BORLAND. No longer than five minutes, so far as I know, unless some other gentleman wishes to speak.

Mr. FOWLER. I want some time.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman want to agree to time?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. I just simply wanted an explanation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not want to make an explanation while the gentleman was on the floor.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to have the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], because I do not want him to base upon exceptional cases a general rule. I do not want him to come here and say that there might be some distinguished gentleman that ought to be recognized, and that that is a good reason why a lot of men who expatriate themselves and take up homesteads in Canada ought to continue to draw pensions. Listen to what the commissioner said about that:

Mr. SALZGABER. I think that if there is any foreigner who came to this country and rendered service to it in the time of its peril, if that service was of conspicuous merit it would be a matter for Congress to deal with.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SHERWOOD. That is what they did with Lafayette when he came over here. The Congress gave him $110,000 in gold.

Mr. BORLAND. There is no question but that Congress should deal with those cases. But we should not ask the American taxpayer to pay a lot of pensions to men who have abandoned this country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it was only a few years since that Congress put a man—a prominent Democrat, I think—Gen. Osterhaus, on the retired list as major general. He does not draw a pension. He draws the pay of a retired major general. I believe he lives in Germany. I would not take it away from him. Would you?

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. MANN. It was only recently that you on that side of the House voted to put him in that class. The proposition came from the Democrats of his drawing the pay of a retired major general, but your proposition is that if some poor German came over and fought for the preservation of this Union and went back home, and is drawing $12 a month, you will take it away from him. But you leave the general to draw $7,500 a year.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not be better for the gentleman to leave politics out of this?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had 15 minutes. Let me have a few minutes. I did not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman without his consent.

Mr. MANN. Let me proceed for a moment. This proposition has been before this House on several occasions. Everybody knows it will not become a part of the law when this bill is passed. I do not believe that it will pass this House. It certainly will not pass the Senate at this session.

We are trying to avoid on this side of the House a special session, but gentlemen on that side keep injecting propositions that may cause one. What are the facts in the case? There are 5,163 of these pensioners living in foreign lands, and their pensions amount to a little over $1,000,000. That is $200 a person on the average. More than half of them live in Canada. Those in Canada consist of two classes: First, the men or their widows who came over the border during the war and volunteered, with no obligation except the moral desire to help preserve the Union. [Applause on the Republican side.] Do we owe them nothing? They came from a foreign country to fight for us. Do we owe them nothing? The other class consists of American citizens who have since the war gone to Canada, in the Northwest, in the hope that they may better their condition by taking homesteads there. They fought for the Union. Are we, in their older age, when they have gone out to help make the prairies bloom with crops, to take away from them our little pittance that we give to them?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MANN. No; not yet. Wait a moment. Nearly one-tenth of these pensioners live in Ireland. The Irish blood is always for liberty. [Applause.] They are always ready to fight for liberty. [Renewed applause.] They came over here as young men and fought in behalf of the country. Probably most of these pensioners are their widows who have gone back to the Green Island to spend their last days, being meanwhile dependent on the little pension of $12 per month which we pay them. Do you propose to take that away from them? That is what this amendment does.

And nearly one-tenth of these pensioners are in Germany. Do we propose now, in this condition, to take away from those pensioners in that land the little pension that we pay to them, when they were willing to help us in our hour of need and war? And will we repay them, when they need this little pittance, when they are at war, by taking it away from them? That would be base ingratitude, unworthy of any civilized being. [Applause on the Republican side, and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was offered to the bill in 1913, when the bill was in committee. It was adopted, and it was made a part of the bill as reported from the Committee on Appropriations. When the bill came before the House it was stricken out in Committee of the Whole, and when it got before the House itself on a roll call the House agreed to the amendment.

I do not know whether it was incorporated in the bill at the next session or not as it came from the committee. Anyhow, the amendment was offered on the floor. This bill does not carry the amendment. Neither the subcommittee nor the full Committee on Appropriations placed it there, although an effort was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] to do so, and he reserved the right to do as he has done and as he should do, holding the convictions that he does.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I agree with him about the amendment. I voted for it in the committee. I voted for it heretofore on the floor of the House on two occasions. I do not believe that anyone who was a citizen of the United States and who has adjured that allegiance and sworn allegiance to some foreign country ought to be permitted to tax the people of this country to continue the payment of the pension that he might be entitled to if he still remained a citizen of this country.

I at one time put into the RECORD, when this question was first up, a list of the leading countries of the world, which provided that within a certain time after a pensioner left the realm that he was a subject of and went to a foreign country he would be stricken from the roll, unless it should appear by his affidavit that he still retained his allegiance to the country which pensioned him.

Now, this amendment will in no way affect those who are temporarily residing abroad. It can affect only those who never did owe allegiance to the United States or to those who, having owed it, abandoned it and took up allegiance to some other country.

Now, it may be true, and I have no doubt it is true, that numbers of people came here from foreign countries and enlisted during the war from 1861 to 1865. It is a historic fact that many thousands of them were paid bounties and enlisted because they were paid bounties; and I to-day incorporated in the RECORD a list showing the amounts of bounties thus paid, aggregating something like $285,941,036, which the States paid to those people when they enlisted and $160,000,000 by the United States. And when they have received bounties and have received pensions up to this time, it seems to me that when men want to continue to draw pensions for which the people of this country are so highly taxed they should at least, when they go abroad, retain their allegiance to the flag of the United States and not forswear their allegiance to it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Commissioner of Pensions is in accord with the veteran organization known as the Grand Army of the Republic. He is a member of that organization, and a prominent member, and in close touch with the organization. I understand that the feeling in the Grand Army is that whatever pensions are paid out should be paid to soldiers who have not renounced their allegiance to the United States. They want to save this $1,034,000 that is paid out to foreigners.

Now, this country is good enough for me to live in. I think if a man who served in the Army thinks some other country is more desirable, and he renounces his allegiance to the United States, the Government of the United States does not owe him anything.

Now, in answer to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says about the Canadians coming over here and fighting, it is true. But this amendment takes care of every soldier who was wounded or disabled in the service, so that it can do no injustice to any worthy soldier of the war, and I am in favor of the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], and I hope that it will not be adopted. These gentlemen who enlisted in the military service of our country had no contract with the Government that they should remain citizens of the United States after their services terminated.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FIELDS. Not now. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that these men who enlisted under our flag and helped to maintain our Union should now be remembered by us who enjoy the glories of the flag, and that we should not forget them, wherever they may be. I realize that the adoption of this amendment would make some saving in our appropriation, but I am one of those who believe that a time comes to all men when they should hold their patriotism above their pocketbooks. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], the chairman of the committee, referred to the fact that these pensioners have left the United States as a matter of choice. Some may have done so. Others may not. Some may have crossed the Canadian line to follow their children. Should this great Government now deprive them of the pensions they earned in supporting the Government because out of love for their own children they have followed them into a foreign country? I say it is unfair, it is unjust, it is un-American, it is unpatriotic, and I hope the amendment will be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This proposition has been before the House three or four times in the past, and if my memory serves me right, after due deliberation it has always been voted down, I suppose on the theory that it would be an act of injustice to those who gave their bodies and their health when they were in the prime of life to be devoted to the service of this country.

Mr. SHERWOOD. This takes care of those who are disabled. This is another proposition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I know that. I have personal knowledge of a number of cases of persons who live in Germany. They get $12 a month. If they were required, under this amendment, to return to the United States, they could not live on $12 a month, and most of them would become objects of public charity, while in the old country, surrounded perhaps by their kinsfolk and descendants, they can make both ends meet, even on $12 a month. And I want to assure the gentlemen of this House that every one of those men is as much of a patriot now as he was at the time he fought under the

flag. [Applause.] There are laws in the European countries which require a man, after he has resided there for a certain length of time—I believe it is two or three years—to make his decision either to return to the United States or to become a citizen of the other country. Now, most of those men at the expiration of that time, with the aid of friends, return to this country for a trip, for the purpose of renewing their passports, and then they go back again. But there are others who are financially unable to make that trip. They are as good Americans as we are.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. All right. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman, I suppose, is familiar with the laws of Germany on this as on other subjects. Does he understand that the German Government pays pensions to men who are not German citizens?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not know.

Mr. LOBECK. I can answer that. A constituent of mine, Mr. August Carstens, in my home city of Omaha, wrote me a letter a few days ago, in which he said that he served in the Franco-Prussian War and in the Schleswig-Holstein War, and that he is now drawing a pension from the German Government, and he told me the amount. The letter is written in German. I do not happen to have it with me.

Mr. BORLAND. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. LOBECK. He is an American citizen, and has been ever since 1873.

Mr. BORLAND. They do not know it.

Mr. GORDON. They probably do not know it over there.

Mr. LOBECK. Germany does know it. That is one case in which Germany pays a pension to an American citizen.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I want to refer to a statement made by my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. He said these men might die and we would not know anything about it, and that the pensions would continue to be paid to dead men. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that every one of these men has to register with the American consul and the voucher has to be executed before the consul, and a man has to present himself in person, and consequently there could be no such thing as a fraud on the Government. If there is, the American consul would have to be in collusion with the pensioner, and that is almost out of the question. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that this amendment, regarding it as most unjust, as I do, will not prevail.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, no man on the floor of the House during my service in Congress has been more careful and more considerate of the public Treasury than myself. But when it comes to the question of appropriating money for the necessary administration of the Government I have always cheerfully subscribed to a liberal sum. The question on the amendment now pending, it appears to me, in addition to the arguments presented by other gentlemen, is that if passed at this time it might be construed by some of the countries now engaged in war as an unfriendly act on the part of the United States.

While I do not go as far as to say that that would be done, yet I do say that to pass this amendment at this time, after having kept the law on the statute books for all these long years in the past, it might be construed by some at least as an unfriendly act on the part of this country.

To the men who gave their lives that my country might be free and that liberty might be preserved throughout the length and breadth of the land, I have a consideration which amounts to a devotion, and so long as I live I shall never be guilty of an act which will desecrate the great services of the soldiers who have made it possible for this country to be the greatest among all other nations. [Applause.] And as much as I am anxious, Mr. Chairman, for retrenchment at this time, I will not begin by starving the soldiers, their widows, orphans, and dependent mothers in order that we may have some little retrenchment. [Applause.] I would rather increase the pension of every soldier who fought to save the Union than to decrease a single one of them. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How is it that the gentleman so radically disagrees with the members of the Grand Army in these vociferous remarks, in which he expresses himself as in favor of the soldier?

Mr. FOWLER. I understand from the soldiers in my district that I am in accord with their wishes, but as far as the Grand Army is concerned, I have a resolution in my pocket now to offer at the first opportunity to appropriate $20,000 out of the Treasury to help defray the expenses of their encampment in Washington during the coming summer.

Mr. Chairman, I would not, I will not vote against a measure that will bring to these soldiers, their widows or orphans, these soldiers now on the tottering side of time—I say I could not and I will not vote for a measure which may be construed as an assault upon the pensions of the soldiers of my country. [Applause.]

You pass this amendment, and it is only a question of time when other amendments will be offered, and there will be one assault after another until the pensions of the soldiers in this country will be seriously imperiled.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, old Dr. Johnson said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel," and he never uttered a truer word. We have to hear and read these buncombe speeches made by men who want to show their love for the old soldier by dipping deep into the public Treasury.

What is the question before the House? The question is as to cutting off a million dollars in pensions now paid to those who have renounced their allegiance to the United States and became citizens of foreign countries. The amendment excepts in every case those who sustained actual injury, clearly meeting the case mentioned by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] where they lost limbs or health. They are expressly excepted under the amendment. It simply cuts off those who are drawing pensions for other reasons than disabilities incurred in the service and who have renounced their allegiance to the United States. That is the proposition, and it seems to me, as a matter of common sense, it ought to be adopted. I do not think there is a nation on the face of the earth outside of our own that pays pensions to aliens.

The gentleman speaks of fraud. Any lawyer on the floor of this House knows that fraud committed in a foreign country may be committed with impunity in behalf of these alien pensioners and our courts have no jurisdiction to prosecute them. They are beyond the seas, beyond our jurisdiction, and beyond the reach of our process; and this law, which permits pensions to be paid to aliens in foreign countries, is simply placing a premium upon fraud, and when fraud is committed there is absolutely no remedy. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON], respecting the chances of fraud in the payment of foreign pensions, I want to say I had an experience as American consul at Glasgow, Scotland, and under the regulations every pensioner was required to come to the consulate every three months, where he or she qualified to the necessary vouchers and were identified before the American consul. After that performance was completed the vouchers were transmitted by me to the Secretary of the Interior, and the pension checks were returned by mail. So there is absolutely no chance in the world of committing fraud against the Treasury of the United States in the payment of pensions to those living abroad.

In addition to the exemption stated by the gentleman, that these pensions should continue to soldiers who were diseased or injured, it does not cover the cases of widows of soldiers who live abroad, and I know of one or two instances in the city of Glasgow where we are paying pensions to the widows of Union soldiers. I hope the Members of this House will let these old defenders of the Union and their widows die in peace. [Applause.] They have only a few months or years to live. They are 70 and 75 years of age, beyond the seas in foreign lands, and we now propose to strike them down, to bring hardship and unhappiness to the hearts of every one of them who were willing to risk their lives to preserve the Union. The American Congress is now called upon to forget justice, to forget humanity, and to forget the services of these men in the time of the country's peril. No man in this House should vote for this unjust amendment.

Mr. GOOD rose.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to fix on some time when debate shall close on this paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. GOOD. I want only five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. HULINGS] has a substitute which he desires to offer to the amendment.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not like this amendment very much, and I prepared an amendment to offer as a substitute in its place, but I do not believe I like that very much. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] has changed his mind. I do not believe that this is a good time to cut these people off.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the opportunity of offering at least a pro forma amendment in order to make reply to some remarks which were made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] in charge of the bill in general debate when I was not present.

Mr. MANN. There is another paragraph.

Mr. PALMER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this same proposition has been before the House every year during the past four years when we considered the pension appropriation bill. A few years ago I put into the RECORD the letter of Mr. Lochren, who was Commissioner of Pensions during the second administration of President Cleveland. Judge Lochren wrote in his annual report the following:

> A clause of chapter 187 of the public acts of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress provides:
> "That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to a nonresident, who is not a citizen of the United States, except for actual disabilities incurred in the service."
> I respectfully ask your attention to this clause, in the hope that you may recommend its repeal. It causes great trouble and annoyance to the excepted classes, who constitute the great bulk of nonresident pensioners, in compelling them to make proof that they belong to these excepted classes. And the final result is that payments under it are withheld from but few, save widows and dependent mothers, who have little else for their maintenance. The saving is too little to offset the suffering inflicted in individual cases. If all nonresidents were refused payment of pension some plausible argument might be made in support of such policy; but none can be urged in favor of this law, which, while giving annoyance to all, strikes only the most helpless.
> I should not feel warranted in asking attention to this law but for the fact that it entails much work on this bureau, in answering communications, and seems to yield little practical results except annoyance and apparent cruelty. I recognize to the fullest extent that my sole duty is to execute and administer the laws as they are enacted—fairly and honestly interpreted.
> Very respectfully,
> WM. LOCHREN,
> *Commissioner.*
>
> The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

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

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield. That was the opinion of Judge Lochren, the Democratic Commissioner of Pensions under President Cleveland. What he says expresses my views, and I believe it expresses the views of the people of the United States.

The report on this shows that of those nonresidents who receive pension, 504 reside in Germany, and almost 500 of them in Ireland, and more than 400 in England. Does anyone suppose that any considerable number of those ever were citizens of the United States and have renounced their citizenships? Certainly not. According to the report of Judge Lochren a large majority of them must be the widows of soldiers who gave their services to the United States, and those widows are now receiving a small pension of $12 a month. By this amendment you propose to take it away from them. When their husbands enlisted in the cause of the Union we did not object to them because they came from Germany, or Ireland, or England, or Canada. We accepted their services, and when we enacted a pension law we called it a service pension. We gave a pension in accordance with the service which was rendered by the soldier, and now we are going to say, no matter how distinguished the service, if a person who rendered that service, or if his widow, lives in a foreign land, he or she shall not receive a penny of this service pension. I am opposed to the amendment. It has been defeated every time it has been offered; it ought to be defeated now. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

> For fees and expenses of examining surgeons, pensions, for services rendered within the fiscal year 1916, $100,000.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] closed the general debate upon the bill I was not upon the floor, coming in just as he was uttering perhaps the last sentence. I was told afterwards that he had indulged in some remarks about the child-labor bill which passed this House day before yesterday and about myself, and cast some animadversions upon the great State which I in part represent upon this floor. Since then I have examined the reporters' notes of the gentleman's speech, and I find that the gentleman took it upon himself to defend the Constitution against the violent assault which was being made upon it by this child-labor bill and to defend the imperial Commonwealth of Georgia against the aspersions of a mere Pennsylvanian. I have the highest regard and respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia. I have always considered him an able lawyer, a wise man, and a sincere man. I can not help but believe that he is too wise a man and has been too keen an observer of current events to hold me in any wise responsible for conditions in Pennsylvania. I grant that conditions with respect to labor in Pennsylvania are not what they ought to be, especially with respect to the conditions under which women and children are permitted to labor in that great industrial State. These conditions are caused by the fact, admitted now by all men, that that State is controlled in its governmental operations under a partnership agreement which has long been in force between the great protected interests of my State and the Republican machine; and I am quite sure that my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, will not suspect that I have any sympathy with either end of that partnership.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not mean to interrupt the gentleman without his permission, but I interrupted the gentleman to say I did not think he had anything to do with it.

Mr. PALMER. Well, the gentleman's declaration was it was my duty to remove the beam in the Pennsylvania eye before I undertook to extract the mote in the eye of the State of Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a mere figure of speech.

Mr. PALMER. I have made some effort to remove the beam, and the gentleman must know that I have myself expended some effort and energy——

Mr. MANN. And money.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). At the cost of a seat in this House in order to better conditions in that great State. But I am against the exploitation of child labor——

Mr. BARTLETT. So am I.

Mr. PALMER. I am against the labor of women and children under improper conditions in my State and in my district just as much as I am against it in the State of Georgia. [Applause.] I have fought in Pennsylvania ever since I have been in public and political life to better the conditions under which men as well as women and children shall work, and my own district is one of the districts where conditions have not been what I would like to have them, and where I have made some fight to better them, as some of the gentlemen here present know. I regret that better progress is not being made in Pennsylvania; I regret that in regard to child labor it is one of the dark spots in the county, just as I regret Georgia is a dark spot; and I regret to say that despite the beautiful promises made in our State by the party candidates who were successful in the late campaign, word comes to-day from Harrisburg that the new governor of the Commonwealth has issued a declaration stating that though he is just as much for a proper child-labor law now as he was before election, still he thinks that business conditions in the State are such as to make it necessary to postpone consideration of that legislation until the session of the legislature two years hence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object, since the gentleman is making an attack upon his own State, I desire to respond. I agree to the gentleman continuing as long as he pleases, if we may have an equal amount of time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] will proceed.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I expect to have some time.

Mr. PALMER. I shall certainly not object.

I am making no attack, Mr. Chairman, upon Pennsylvania. I have heard that kind of talk until I am tired of it. I am a Pennsylvanian, like my friend, the gentleman who represents a great Philadelphia district. I love my State. My people came there when William Penn nosed the good ship *Welcome* up the Delaware in 1682, and with his Quaker colonists founded his great experiment in the woods, and they have lived there ever since. And I hope I shall be buried beneath her beautiful hills.

I love my State, but I would not believe that I could love her if I should stand silent when I see her despoiled by the machine that dominates that Commonwealth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Pennsylvania is one of the States where we have not protected the little children, and, with all due respect to the gentleman from Georgia, so is Georgia. He says he was the author——

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say that I was the author——

Mr. PALMER. Well, that he had actively worked, perhaps, for child-labor legislation in Georgia; and yet I find that of 40 States in the Union which prohibit child labor under 14 years in mills and factories, Georgia is not one.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I say to the gentleman that is not correct? We have an act which prohibits it now, with children under 14 years.

Mr. PALMER. When was it passed?

Mr. BARTLETT. In 1908.

Mr. PALMER. I will say to the gentleman that what I am reading from——

Mr. BARTLETT. I have seen that publication, and I have taken occasion to put in the RECORD on two different times the statute of the State of Georgia, which shows what the law is.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield on that subject?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will look at the debate two years ago on this matter he will find that the statement is correct.

Mr. PALMER. I was about to say that while I have not examined this myself, this compilation was made by the agents of the child labor committee, who have gone over the matter with great care and in whose accuracy I have great confidence. Of 16 States which forbid child labor in mines and quarries, Georgia is not one. Of 16 States which forbid children working more than eight hours a day in mills and factories, Georgia is not one. Amongst 33 States which forbid any work by children under 16 years of age in mills and factories, Georgia is not one. And it does seem to me, therefore, that I was perfectly justified in the statement that the employing interests of Georgia are opposed to this bill, just exactly as they are opposed to the bill in Pennsylvania, where a strong and bitter fight has been made by the textile mill owners, as has been made by the cotton mills in Georgia, against any law which would forbid night work of children under 16 or work for more than 8 hours a day or more than 48 hours in the week.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] went on to impeach my Democracy, I assume because of the position I have taken in support of this bill, which to his mind is violently against the Constitution and against every principle of the party to which we both adhere. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be a great constitutional lawyer like my friend from Georgia. Before I came to Congress I was engaged for 15 or 16 years in the active practice of the law, being almost constantly busy in the trial of cases, many of them involving constitutional questions; and I have always been too busy trying cases and practicing law to indulge in the practice, which I find to be so common in Washington, of publicly expressing my views about the Constitution when the Constitution is not in issue [applause] and, because I approve of my own remarks, considering myself a great constitutional lawyer. [Applause.] The trouble with the gentleman from Georgia is that he comes from a school of lawyers who interpret the Constitution according to their own preconceived notion of what the Constitution ought to mean instead of according to what the Supreme Court says it does mean. They find the Constitution bounded by four corners which they set up in their own mind, and refuse to allow to the supreme judicial authority in the land the privilege of erecting the corners which shall mark the boundaries of that instrument. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. I have no manner of doubt that this proposed Federal child-labor bill is entirely constitutional. I get it not from some idea that I may have of what I think the Constitution ought to mean but what the Supreme Court has said time and again the Constitution does mean. Under the power to regulate interstate commerce I have no doubt that the Supreme Court will hold, when this law gets to it, as it will some day, I presume, that the Congress has full power to prohibit from interstate commerce any articles which are produced under conditions which inside of a State call for the exercise of the police power of a State.

The Supreme Court held that we may prohibit the transportation of so innocent a thing as a piece of pasteboard, representing a lottery ticket, because the use to which that lottery ticket may be put in the future is against the public morals. It has been held that we may prohibit from interstate commerce articles which endanger the agents and carriers in transportation, such as explosives and loose hay.

My mind is clear that if we can enact a law which the Supreme Court upholds, prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce of articles which, though innocent in themselves, yet, because of the use to which they will be put, may be prohibited as being against the morals of the Nation, so we may by law prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of articles which have been produced in such a way as to operate against the morals of the Nation. If we may prohibit the transmission of articles in interstate commerce because of the final use to which those articles or products are put, we may follow them back to the system under which they were produced.

I shall not argue the constitutional question, but I do not believe that real constitutional lawyers who will discuss it and argue it in the light of the opinions of the Supreme Court, without being prejudiced by their own individual opinions upon its political and economic phases, will ever fail to hold that this law is entirely constitutional. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to undertake at this late hour to say anything much in reply to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has said. I want to say, however, that I did not know at the time that the gentleman was not in the House. I was informed that he was. I would have said what I did say had he been present, and he knows that, I am sure.

I do not arrogate to myself any great knowledge of constitutional law, Mr. Chairman, nor believe or consider myself or pretend to be any great constitutional lawyer, but I do believe, and, so far as I can judge from what the Supreme Court has decided in other cases, I am confident they will hold the bill he refers to to be unconstitutional, if it ever becomes a law. And believing that, in construing the Constitution of the United States, it is my duty when I come to vote upon a question that I believe is contrary to that instrument to vote against it.

Now, the Supreme Court of the United States in the lottery case did not decide that Congress had the right to prohibit the transmission of any legitimate article of commerce through the channels of interstate commerce. They distinctly decided in that case that they would not decide that such was the law. Great lawyers, among them one who has been Attorney General of the United States from the State of Pennsylvania, have in another body rendered reports from the Committee on the Judiciary in which they have questioned the constitutionality of laws like this.

I have no apologies, Mr. Chairman, to make for the assertion that I believe in the Constitution of the United States. I believe we should preserve it, Mr. Chairman, because only by preserving it can we maintain and perpetuate this Government. And I can not do better than to call attention to what was said by the great orator, Edmund Burke, upon an occasion when he was urged to agree to a certain bill for reform in the British Parliament, when he refused to advocate certain measures which, in his opinion, violated the constitution of Great Britain, though unwritten. He said on that occasion, "We should bear in mind that we have a Government to preserve as well as a Government to reform." And I am unwilling to give my adherence to the proposition that the Congress of the United States can do what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] says it can do, namely, exercise the power given under the commerce clause for the purpose of regulating or executing the police laws of the States.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Do not do me the injustice to say that I said anything of that sort.

Mr. BARTLETT. I so understood you.

Mr. PALMER. No. What I say is that the Congress has the right to prohibit from interstate commerce any product which was manufactured and produced under conditions which call for the exercise of the police power in the State where it was produced.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is virtually the same.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; it is. I beg the gentleman's pardon; that is the same—that if the State, in the exercise of its police power, has imposed upon it the duty of correcting certain evils that exist in it and fails to exercise that power, then it becomes the duty of the United States Congress to exercise the power of the interstate-commerce clause of the United States Constitution to regulate those things. Now, I do not profess to be a great lawyer, but I do not suppose that anybody who professes to be a great lawyer or to be a lawyer at all would make any such claim as that.

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, I did not mean any reflection upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not doubt that he has used every effort, as he has stated, in his State to correct these evils. I would not have said anything about the gentleman or his bill if he had not challenged the votes of those who had voted against the bill in his speech in reply to my colleague [Mr. TRIBBLE]. I would have contented myself with simply voting my conviction. But I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe Congress has the right to exercise the power of the commerce clause of the Constitution to prohibit the transmission through the channels of commerce perfectly legitimate articles of commerce.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I want just five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should preserve the Constitution of the United States. I believe it is the great charter of our liberties, and that if we attempt, because the States do not exercise their reserve rights, to assume on the part of the United States Congress the power to pass police laws, then there is nothing left to it.

Mr. Chairman, the English people have a great constitution, which they call the Magna Charta, the chart of English liberty. I will conclude by quoting Stimson on the Constitution:

> It is a sad contrast between the way that so many of our people or our newspapers feel to-day, 120 years after the adoption of our Magna Charta, and the way the people felt in England, exactly the same time, 120 years, after the adoption of their own. For in 1253, 138 years after John's charter, in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of Henry III, a popular King, a great jurist, and a radical maker of new laws: "On the 3d day of May [I read from the statutes of the realm in Latin], in the great hall of the King of Westminster, in the presence of the King and his brother and the marshal of England and the other estates of the realm, we, Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishops of London, and Ely and Rochester, and Worcester, and Lincoln, and Norwich and Carlyle, and St. David's, all appareled in pontificals, with tapers burning, against the breakers of the liberties or customs of the realm of England, and, namely, those which are contained in the charter of the common liberties of England, excommunicate, accurse, and from the benefits of our holy mother the church sequester all those who by any craft or wiliness do violate, break, diminish, or change the statutes and free customs of the realm of England, to the perpetual memory of which excommunication we, the aforesaid prelates, have put our seals."
>
> So in 1253 they felt in England when they called attention to the great charter of English liberties, and so in 1910, to-day, when we love that great charter of English liberties and swear to observe the greater charter of American liberties, to-day we feel that the curses of those who love liberty should be visited upon those who violate it.

Mr. Chairman, these great lovers of English liberty and of the Magna Charta, for more than 120 years after it had been adopted, were accustomed to gather for the purpose of perpetuating that great charter and pronouncing condemnations against those who would violate it. Now, nearly 130 years after our great instrument was adopted, when we have lived under it and perpetuated our Government under it, I have no love for those who would destroy it by the means that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] undertakes to destroy it. I have no apologies to make to him or to any one else of these reformers who would destroy our Government in order to reform it. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am glad this discussion between my friends from Georgia and Pennsylvania [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. PALMER] was confined, in large part, to constitutional lines, because I want to avoid that sort of a discussion. My regret is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who was sent for to come to the defense of his State in consequence of the attack of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], has seen fit to attack Pennsylvania rather than to defend it. My friend [Mr. PALMER] is a colleague for whom I have great respect. I especially respected him in the last campaign when he had the courage to accept a nomination for Senator from Pennsylvania in order to test out those views he entertained with regard to the spoliation of the State by the party in power. Everything he has said to-day about the State being despoiled he said with tenfold vehemence from every stump in every town he could reach with his own resources and those that were contributed to his campaign by wealthy patrons of the Democratic Party. But the people of the State did not accept the arguments and charges of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] at the valuation he has given them in his argument to-day.

The people of Pennsylvania heard all of this talk about the State being despoiled. There are 8,000,000 of them over there, and they are pretty sensible. About 1,000,000 of them voted. But when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who has not defended his State as I hoped he would to-day, came amongst the people of the State to tell them of the wrongs that had been inflicted upon them, he failed to tell them anything about the low tariff he had helped to inflict upon them.

The people of Pennsylvania knew the industrial record of the State for more than 100 years. They understood, for they had enjoyed the progress and prosperity that had resulted from a protective-tariff system; they knew it to be a mill-building rather than a mill-destroying system; a labor-employing, rather than a labor-despoiling system, and they were not especially enamored of the things my colleague undertook to say to them. They knew that in the matter of educating our children we spend more money in Pennsylvania for the public-school system, perhaps, than is spent in any other State of this Union, with the possible exception of one. They knew that 1,000,000 children were going to school in Pennsylvania, and that we had even a compulsory education law, of which my colleague [Mr. FARR] was the author when he was in the Pennsylvania Legislature. They knew we had a law regulating the employment of child labor. We have a law which prevents them from laboring under 14 years of age, and, with certain conditions, under 16 years of age. The people said, "We do not agree with you, Mr. PALMER, that this State, which has been builded up under a protective-tariff system until it is the most prosperous industrial community in the world, and until it has acquired the largest individual farming community in the country—we do not agree with you, Mr. PALMER, of Pennsylvania, when you say that this State, which under the old system has grown rich, which under the old system has kept all its people employed, which under this system has put itself absolutely out of debt—we do not agree with you, Mr. PALMER, that this great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been despoiled." [Applause.]

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] persisted. He continued to tell his story from one end of the State to the other, and people who were ambitious for power, or who were fond of getting their pictures in the newspapers as belonging to the uplift, contributed largely to his campaign. The newspapers published his terrible tales of spoliation and reveled in the destruction of his opponent, but the people, the voters of the Commonwealth, knew what the gentleman stood for, and on election day they marched up to the polls and by a majority of more than 250,000 they buried Mr. PALMER and told him his charges were not true.

Mr. PALMER rose.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman want to ask me a question?

Mr. PALMER. I want to try to get a little time after the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman says he can not remain silent while his State is being despoiled. The gentleman has told the people of his Commonwealth all this, but he has not been supported by those to whom he made his appeal. He should not find fault with them now.

Mr. DONOHOE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I yield to my colleague from an important industrial district of Philadelphia, and I suggest that before he asks me a question he answer one from me, as to whether there is not a great lack of employment in his district just now?

Mr. DONOHOE. I had rather answer it by propounding my own question first.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I would like to ask the gentleman an Irish question——

Mr. DONOHOE. On that I am at home.

Mr. MOORE (continuing). Whether it is true that in his district there is a tremendous number of the unemployed just now, due to a Democratic tariff law, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] was partly the author?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHOE. I will answer the gentleman by saying that there is a tremendous demand for a better child-labor law in our State.

Mr. MOORE. That may be. There is also a desire for it because a number of the ladies who do not have any children and who do not understand that the widowed mothers whose children must have some support are anxious to keep this uplift publicity game going. I have seen the children of the poor, who were supporting widowed mothers in wretched apartments, turned out of their employment and made to walk the streets because of the restrictions imposed by some of these laws.

But what I wanted to know of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who speaks of the despoiling of his State, whether there has been anything under heaven that has so tended to despoil our State, that was more prosperous than any other in the country, than the Underwood tariff bill, the steel schedule of which was written by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who now prates about the spoliation of his State?

Go into the mill districts represented in part by the gentleman who has just interrogated me [Mr. DONOHOE] and look at the long lines of unemployed to-day, who were actively and busily employed before the gentleman who speaks of the spoliation of his State got in his deadly free-trade work.

Go into my own district where the people got good wages two and a half years ago, happy men, women, and children, and where there was no great necessity for passing restrictive laws and see them to-day wending their toilsome, weary way to the soup houses to obtain the sustenance of life.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Missouri arises. He knows that there is a large number of unemployed in Kansas City. A newspaper clipping handed to me day before yesterday states that in Kansas City there are 5,000 men seeking an opportunity for employment. These are days of Democratic spoliation.

Mr. BORLAND. Whoever said that did not know what he was talking about, for it is not the fact.

Mr. MOORE. When we had the protective system, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows——

Mr. BORLAND. What was the condition in the gentleman's district in 1907?

Mr. MOORE. In 1907 we were doing as well as could be expected. [Cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" and laughter on the Democratic side.] The gentleman knows that in 1907 there was no tariff panic. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], just as all Democrats do, seeks to evade, when the tariff question is reached, by pointing to the financial panic of 1907 as an excuse for the wickedness of the existing tariff law, which actually took labor away from the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not yield, much as I like my friend from Illinois. He made a beautiful soldier speech to-day, but I have got to finish this. Only the other day the gentleman from Pennsylvania who speaks about the spoliation of his State voted to still further decrease the opportunities for labor in his State. He voted to take away from the shipyards of the Delaware River, where we build more ships and give more employment in this calling than elsewhere—he voted to take away the wages of men who are laboring there in order that the Government might take their money to build ships in foreign shipyards. The gentleman voted for the passage of that slip bill, which would take the bread and butter from the mouths of the workmen in his own district, where at the Bethlehem Steel Works they are now employed. When he voted to transfer American work and wages to foreign shipyards he contributed still further to that work of spoliation in Pennsylvania so unhappily begun when he assisted in putting the Democratic free-trade tariff law into effect. Spoliation of the State is not the brick the gentleman ought to throw.

Mr. PALMER rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would yield to me just a moment or two. I want to say to the Republican side of the House that I have asked the chairman of the Republican conference to call a conference of Republicans to-morrow afternoon to be held in the Hall of the House immediately after the adjournment of the House, in reference to a matter which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] communicated to me to-day; and I want to say that if there are any Members elect in the next House who are here, we want them to attend the conference as well.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE], are only another illustration of what I said awhile ago was the cause of the evils from which we suffer in Pennsylvania, and that is the fact that the government there is controlled by a combination between the most corrupt political organization in America and the most avaricious and greedy set of manufacturers on earth. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is perfectly natural, in view of the fact that the attack which we made upon this hog combine in Pennsylvania in 1914, and which resulted in a majority by 28,000 of the people of Pennsylvania repudiating its foremost friend and exponent, that when we go after the hog combine, it should squeal; and I have always observed that the smaller the pig the louder the squeal. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman says that what we argued for in Pennsylvania in 1914 was repudiated. Not at all. Nearly 30,000 more men voted against what the gentleman stands for in Pennsylvania this year than voted for it, and only because of the unfortunate circumstance that the enemies of this corrupt combine could not be joined upon single candidates is the gentleman permitted to boast that Pennsylvania to-day can have in the United States Senate a member of his own political party.

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

Mr. PALMER. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman, but I did not quite understand him. Was there not a unity upon the candidate for governor?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman is a gentleman of keen understanding, and he knows perfectly well what I meant when I said that the chief of the Republican organization in Pennsylvania was repudiated in 1914 by a big majority of the voters of Pennsylvania. He knows. When the gentleman says that it was the Underwood tariff law, for which I am partly responsible, that brought about that result in Pennsylvania, he knows that he is not speaking according to the facts. I make no apology for the Underwood tariff law, and in my district, the greatest industrial district in Pennsylvania and one of the greatest in the Nation, I have defended it upon every stump, and the voters have supported it by a big majority; and that great district, with one of the biggest steel and iron mills in America, will be represented in the next Congress, as in this, by a Jeffersonian Democrat who believes in the Underwood tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will tell the gentleman—no, not him, because he knows—but I will tell other gentlemen what caused the result in Pennsylvania. It was not the tariff that beat the Democratic Party, it was rum—r-u-m—for the organized liquor traffic of Pennsylvania, operating alongside of the vicious interests which the gentleman from Pennsylvania always supports, threw into that campaign the largest campaign fund ever known in a State campaign in the history of our country, and it took, as the gentleman knows, more than a million dollars to seat a Republican Senator in the United States Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, the gentleman's party organization in Philadelphia and in the State has filed accounts in which they admit—admit—having spent $750,000 for that purpose, and my experience with the Republican machine is that what they do not admit is at least twice what they do confess. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. PALMER. For a question.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman state how much was expended by the Democratic campaign committee in Pennsylvania in the last senatorial fight?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly. There was expended in the senatorial fight, and the fight for the State ticket included, approximately $75,000. Why, the gentleman knows that the Republican State committee in Pennsylvania when it filed its account admitted unpaid obligations exceeding in amount all that the Democratic Party expended in the State.

Mr. MOORE. That is evidence of honesty in expenditure—that we owed $90,000.

Mr. PALMER. I am waiting to see whether you pay it.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to ask the gentleman, since he has been personal, whether he would indicate how much money was spent in all by the gentleman who ran for governor of Pennsylvania on the Democratic ticket——

Mr. PALMER. Oh, well——

Mr. MOORE. He was a rich man.

Mr. PALMER. I do not remember, but I believe he accounted for $33,000, or something of that kind. I can not yield further.

Mr. MOORE. But the gentleman——

Mr. PALMER. It is so infinitestimally small in comparison with what the Republicans have spent it is hardly worth the time to consider it.

Mr. MOORE. Why does not the gentleman be fair and tell us what was spent on his side?

Mr. PALMER. I have said.

Mr. MOORE. What the gentleman and his colleague, who ran for governor——

Mr. PALMER. I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has not; the matter has been concealed.

Mr. PALMER. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania defends the action of the Republican legislature in our State in refusing to pass laws to protect little children upon the same old plea, the same old ground, that without those laws Pennsylvania has prospered and become rich and great. He says that our great textile industries, all of our industries have grown wealthy, and that is true. I know men who have woolen mills in our State who say they can consign them to the scrap heap and still show a great profit under Republican tariff laws. I do not deny that wealth has been produced, I do not deny that men have grown rich, but I do declare, as a Pennsylvanian, that the greed of these men, ever seeking additional wealth, ought not to be strong enough to grind down into the mire the little boys and girls, the mothers and fathers of to-morrow's generation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who knows as well as any man in our State the true Quaker spirit of that great old Commonwealth, when pushed into a corner, now defends the interests that he and his colleagues represent upon this floor, still when the question was presented day before yesterday, out of fear of the righteous wrath of the mothers of Philadelphia, he ran away and would not vote against this child-labor bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have no patience with the gyrations of a gentleman who tries to play both sides against the middle in that fashion.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman want me to tell him——

Mr. PALMER. He runs away from the wrath of the mothers and fathers of Pennsylvania, and at the same time defends the protected interests of our State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, one word in reference to the Georgia statute, which I have sent for and received. The gentleman from Georgia says it was a liberal statute protecting children, and I notice it provides that no child under 10 years of age shall be employed. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. But the gentleman has not read it all.

Mr. PALMER (reading)—

No child under 10 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about a factory or manufacturing establishment within this State under any circumstances.

Under certain conditions a child under 12 years of age shall not be employed, and in reference to children under 14 years of age it says:

On and after January 1, 1908, no child, except as heretofore provided, shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.

I admit, though I do not pretend to be the lawyer my distinguished colleague from Georgia is, that under that law children under the age of 14 can work between 6 a. m. and 7 p. m., and I congratulate the gentleman in having a State in the same class with our own beloved Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman read the next section?

Mr. PALMER. I read it.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has not read the next section.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interfere with the discussion of the gentlemen that is not pertinent to this bill, but the hour is growing late, and it is desired, if possible, to start on another appropriation bill to-night.

Mr. MANN. Ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill close in five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all further debate on this paragraph close in five minutes, with the understanding that we will go on and pass the pension bill then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this bill close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, it surprises me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is willing to compare the child-labor laws of Pennsylvania with those of Georgia. In Pennsylvania a child under 14 years of age shall not work——

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I have only five minutes. If you could accord me a little more time——

Mr. TRIBBLE. I wanted to ask one question.

Mr. FARR. Unless that child can read and write he shall not work until he is 16. I want to say that no State of the Union has better factory laws, better child-labor laws than the State of Pennsylvania, and I defy the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to disprove that statement. But my point is this——

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FARR. I have only five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman defies me.

Mr. FARR. If you will see that I get five minutes more I will yield. But the manifest unfairness of such a comparison does not any more astonish me than the gentleman's hypocrisy on the floor of this House——

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR (continuing). Any more than his demagoguery on the floor of this House. The protected State of Pennsylvania, the men and women who are deprived of work, defeated the gentleman. So far as association with the corporations and the manufacturers of Pennsylvania is concerned, no man stands closer than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. He admitted on the floor of this House at the time that he was preaching this demagogism that he was the paid employee of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, of Scranton, and I say that he was a paid legal lobbyist in Harrisburg, fighting splendid measures in the interest of human welfare.

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

Mr. FARR. Yes; if I can get more time to finish my statement.

Mr. PALMER. I shall not take much time.

Mr. FARR. Now, what I attack is the hypocrisy——

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I do not like to be discourteous. I have made certain statements, and I shall yield to the gentleman. I think the House will be fair to me and accord to me any reasonable time I want.

Mr. PALMER. I simply ask the gentleman to yield for the purpose of permitting me to say that when the gentleman declares I, anywhere or at any time, made the statement that I was a paid lobbyist of any railroad corporation——

Mr. FARR. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. PALMER. That is exactly what the gentleman said. If the gentleman makes the statement——

Mr. FARR. I object.

Mr. PALMER. If he says that, it is absolutely false—and he knows it.

Mr. FARR. I say to the gentleman that I charge him now, as I charged him before, with being a lawyer in the employ of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, and also as a paid legal lobbyist in Harrisburg, fighting measures in the interest of the children and the women and for the highest human welfare of our people.

Mr. PALMER. And I say it is absolutely false.

Mr. FARR. It is true. No State in the Union, and I challenge the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is befouling his own nest, to point to another State that compares in real substantial progress in the interest of the people with Pennsylvania. It was the first to take up this great question of tuberculosis. It spent more money than all the other States combined in the investigation of the causes that led to that dread disease.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I would like to ask the gentleman to yield for a minute. I just want to correct the statement he has made. Massachusetts was the first State in the Union to take up the question of fighting tuberculosis. The old Bay State led the way in waging war against the dread white plague, and I am particularly proud to have had a prominent part in that kind of a campaign.

Mr. FARR. Massachusetts does not compare with Pennsylvania in that respect.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Not in rotten politics, thank God!

Mr. FARR. Now, the reason the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] advances for his defeat in Pennsylvania is rum. The gentleman went all over the State of Pennsylvania talking against rum, and he came down here and voted for rum. The gentleman went all over the State with Mr. McCormick, his colleague on the ticket for governor, the former mayor of Harrisburg, talking about the toiling men and women and those who have suffered terribly as the result of the op-

pressiveness of corporations and manufacturers. Mr. McCormick when mayor of Harrisburg vetoed an ordinance presented to him, asking him to advance the price of labor from $1.35 to $1.50 a day when that city was spending vast sums for beautification.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more, because the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has taken that much of his time.

Mr. HULINGS. Oh, we have already had too much of this "bunk."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HULINGS. I object.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANN. You can not do that in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is unable to do that in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I object.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). To answer the charges made against me by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman has made more charges than all the other Members of the House combined, and he does not want anybody to reply to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLINE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Let us get through with this bill first. The gentleman has the right to rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANN. If that is the case, before we pass this bill I will raise the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman should allow me five minutes in view of the kind of talk that has been had on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] desires to state a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his request.

Mr. MANN. I will withdraw my point of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT] makes the point that there is no quorum present. There were only 115 Members present when the Chair counted, and 2 more make 117. That is not a quorum. There is no quorum present.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas rose.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. For no purpose at all. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, that a call of the House be ordered.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia calls for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 43.

So a call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82.]

Aiken	Gittins	Linthicum	Sabath
Alexander	Glass	Loft	Scott
Anthony	Goldfogle	Logue	Seldomridge
Avis	Gorman	McClellan	Selis
Baker	Graham, Pa.	McGuire, Okla.	Sherley
Barchfeld	Green, Iowa	McKenzie	Sims
Barnhart	Greene, Vt.	MacDonald	Sisson
Beall, Tex.	Gregg	Mahan	Slayden
Bell, Cal.	Griest	Maher	Slemp
Bowdle	Guernsey	Manahan	Small
Britten	Hamill	Metz	Smith, Idaho
Broussard	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Smith, Md.
Brown, N. Y.	Hamlin	Mondell	Smith, Minn.
Brown, W. Va.	Haugen	Montague	Smith, Saml. W.
Browne, Wis.	Hay	Moon	Sparkman
Bruckner	Helgesen	Morgan, La.	Stanley
Burgess	Helm	Morin	Stedman
Burke, Pa.	Henry	Morrison	Steenerson
Calder	Hensley	Moss, Ind.	Stephens, Tex.
Cantor	Hinds	Moss, W. Va.	Stevens, Minn.
Cantrill	Hinebaugh	Mott	Stevens, N. H.
Carr	Hobson	Mulkey	Stout
Cary	Howard	Murdock	Stringer
Chandler, N. Y.	Howell	Nelson	Talbott, Md.
Church	Hoxworth	Nolan, J. I.	Taylor, Ala.
Clark, Fla.	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Claypool	Hull	Oglesby	Taylor, N. Y.
Coady	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Hair	Ten Eyck
Copley	Igoe	O'Shaunessy	Thomson, Ill.
Cox	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett	Towner
Crumpton	Johnson, S. C.	Page, N. C.	Townsend
Crosser	Johnson, Utah	Paige, Mass.	Treadway
Dale	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Tuttle
Danforth	Jones	Patten, N. Y.	Underhill
Davis	Kahn	Patton, Pa.	Vare
Decker	Kelley, Mich.	Peters	Vollmer
Deitrick	Kent	Peterson	Volstead
Dooling	Key, Ohio	Plumley	Walker
Driscoll	Kiess, Pa.	Porter	Wallin
Dunn	Korbly	Post	Weaver
Edmonds	Kreider	Pou	Webb
Elder	Lafferty	Powers	Whaley
Estopinal	Langham	Price	Whitacre
Evans	Langley	Prouty	White
Fairchild	Lazaro	Raker	Wilson, Fla.
Faison	Lee, Ga.	Rauch	Wilson, N. Y.
Fergusson	L'Engle	Rayburn	Wingo
Finley	Lenroot	Reed	Winslow
FitzHenry	Lever	Riordan	Witherspoon
Fowler	Levy	Roberts, Mass.	Woodruff
Gardner	Lewis, Md.	Roberts, Nev.	Woods
George	Lewis, Pa.	Rothermel	Young, N. Dak.
Gerry	Lindquist	Rucker	

During the calling of the roll Mr. DIFENDERFER occupied the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and thirteen Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. When the point of no quorum was made the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] had moved the previous question on the bill to its passage. That is the pending question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The ayes appear to have it; the ayes have it, and the bill is passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is a little late.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have moved to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is a little late, but the Chair wants to be on the safe side. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were refused, three Members, not a sufficient number, rising in support of the demand.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order that that motion is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is. It is only a minute since the roll call disclosed a quorum.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Texas has made the point of no quorum on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that, but the Chair thinks there is a quorum here, because the roll call has just disclosed one.

Mr. MANN. Well, the rules require the Chair to count, especially on the passage of a bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to be on the safe side, and will count.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman withhold his point a moment, to enable me to report an appropriation bill?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not withhold it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He can withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. He can withdraw it at any time before the count is made.

Mr. MANN. He can withdraw it, but he can not withhold it when the pending question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas withdraws the point of no quorum. The bill is passed.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 20562. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 2518. An act granting to the town of Nevadaville, Colo., the right to purchase certain lands for the protection of water supply; and

S. 5629. An act for the relief of certain persons who made entry under the provisions of section 6, act of May 29, 1908.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 7188. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Garden City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 7515. An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

CORRECTION OF A VOTE.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on page 4438 of the RECORD I am recorded as having failed to answer to my name. I was present and answered.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the correction will be made.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] was directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the fortifications appropriation bill. He was called away unexpectedly, and I present the bill in his behalf.

The bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WHALEY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL STATEMENT.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the necessity which compels me to submit a few remarks upon the subject about which I am about to speak. Two weeks from to-day I retire from the House, and I had hoped that I might retire in peace, with the good will of all of my colleagues here, including all of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania. I do not believe in fighting. I am a Quaker, though I ask no particular consideration at anybody's hands on that account. I hesitate and I dislike to engage in altercation or controversy about personal matters; but for the second time my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR], has seen fit to cast aspersions upon my honor and integrity as a man, as a lawyer, and as a Member of this House. I made no reference to him and his attack upon me was wholly unwarranted and uncalled for. He has declared, and in fact he calls it a charge, that I am the paid attorney of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railway Co., and that I have been the paid lobbyist before the Legislature of Pennsylvania representing that corporation. As to the insinuation and innuendo contained in that statement, I pronounce it to be absolutely false. As to my employment by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., the facts are simple and are these, as I stated once before upon this floor, and as all of my people in my district know, and as everybody who is interested in Pennsylvania knows: For many years the office with which I am associated has been the local counsel of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. I inherited that client along with others from a very distinguished partner, who had been for many years a Member of this House and who was a judge upon the bench in our State. I represented it in the courts of my county in the usual way, trying damage, personal-injury, and other like cases, and in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and nowhere else.

I have not tried a case for the company since I have been in Congress. I have performed no legal service for the company since I have been in Congress. Before I came here I felt it to be perfectly proper for a lawyer to accept a railroad corporation as a client in proper cases. I still think that; and when two weeks from to-day I return to the practice of law I hope that I may have opportunities in proper cases to represent such and all other clients. I make no bones about that; and no honest lawyer has ever held any other position. [Applause.]

The gentleman declares me also to have been the paid lobbyist of that corporation.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, I know what the gentleman said.

Mr. FARR. I yielded to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I decline to yield. The facts about that are these, that in the legislature of 1907, before I was elected to Congress, when every railroad corporation in Pennsylvania had been suffering from what is known as "strike legislation"—bills introduced by charlatans and crooks for the purpose of holding up railroad companies—they requested certain attorneys representing them to make legal arguments against these propositions before the committees of the house and senate. I was one of those lawyers. I never asked a member of the legislature to vote for or against any bill. I never interviewed any of them in the senate or the house personally about any bill.

I went before the committees of the legislature and made purely legal arguments upon proposed legislation in an open and public fashion. It was a part of my retainer that I should be permitted to oppose such measures as I believed to be vicious

and to support such measures as I believed to be right, and I got in very bad odor with the representatives of railroad companies engaged in that work, because as to the two great pieces of legislation much controverted before that legislature I took a position which every other railroad attorney opposed. The two leading bills were the bill to make a 2-cent fare law in Pennsylvania and an employer's liability law. I stated to the committee that not only would I not oppose the 2-cent law, but that I believed it ought to be enacted into law; and as to the liability law, it was introduced into that legislature by a gentleman who is now a Member of this House, Mr. CASEY, of Pennsylvania, and is known to-day on the statute books as the Casey employers' liability law, and out of all the numerous liability laws that were pending in that legislature I pronounced it to be the best and fairest, and gave it my support before the committee of the legislature. [Applause.] That was the extent of my activities at Harrisburg when retained by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.

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

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has stated that he went to Harrisburg primarily on a retainer for the railroad company to appear against certain bills.

Mr. PALMER. Such as I might deem bad.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has spoken of two bills which he favored. I judge those were not the bills he was paid a retainer to oppose. Will he not tell us about the bills that he appeared and lobbied against or argued against?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, well, there were a number of them——

Mr. FARR. You bet there were.

Mr. MANN. I would say that was in performance of the retainer. I do not think the other was.

Mr. PALMER. I do not mind saying. For instance, somebody introduced a bill requiring the railroads of Pennsylvania to abolish every grade crossing within the State upon the enactment of the law. I opposed that measure. It would have ruined every railroad company in Pennsylvania as drawn. Another bill, a very common one——

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. BLACKMON. I want to ask the gentleman a question, and that is if he believes that it is a reflection on a Member of Congress or a member of any other body to represent a railroad?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I think a lawyer has a perfect right——

Mr. BLACKMON. And I want to ask one further question.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). To be retained by a railroad company.

Mr. BLACKMON. I want to ask one further question, and that is if the gentleman ever heard of a man in his life who was always making a fight against a lawyer holding public office and representing a railroad who was not a man with a hickory-nut head?

Mr. PALMER. Well, as far as my observation goes, I think the description is accurate. There were other bills of the same character. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, all of my district has always known that my office has represented that company. It has never sought to influence my political or congressional action in any way, shape, or manner, and it knows me well enough to understand that it dare not do so. [Applause.]

The intimation of the gentleman, the innuendo of the gentleman, is a scandalous abuse of the proprieties of this House. [Applause.] That railroad company runs through my district only about 35 miles; perhaps 40. It has in my district in its employ, I expect, not more than 100 men. Politically it knows that it must keep its hand off PALMER'S fights in that district, and the only political connection I ever had with the railroad company or any of its officers—the only time I ever saw any officers go into a political canvass—was when its superintendent became a candidate for office in Lacakawanna County—in the county adjoining mine—upon the same ticket and at the same time the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] was running for Congress, and I went into the district and did everything I could do to lick them both, and I am sorry I did not do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. PALMER. That is how much the railroad controlled my political action.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have all the time he wants——

Mr. PALMER. I will not take much.

Mr. FARR. But I would like to have a few minutes to reply.

The SPEAKER. Well, is the gentleman objecting or not?

Mr. FARR. No; I do not want to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, this little business will not take long. So much for the political phase of that question. I have found it necessary, as other men have, to go to the Legislature of Pennsylvania to prevent things being done which were wrong. I have done it openly. The Legislature of Pennsylvania has been for many years of such a character that it is necessary for reputable men of the State to go down there and prevent them from abusing their power. Why, the same legislature three or four years ago which killed an up-to-date child-labor law passed a law protecting the tadpoles of Pennsylvania, and the Republican Party has ever since had a keen regard for that class of tadpole statesmen. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when I went to the Pennsylvania Legislature in open and public hearings to argue the cause of my client or my people I was representing them openly and frankly. I never went there to represent them or any like interest while I was drawing a salary out of the treasury of my State.

And when the Republican machine of Pennsylvania, finding its list of tadpole statesmen getting low, upon one occasion back in 1899, had to have somebody to preside over sessions of the house, it very properly picked my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] as its speaker. Mr. Speaker, that legislature and the succeeding ones were of such a character that the State rose in revolution and, a few years afterwards, despite the enormous Republican majority in the State, turned that party out of power and elected a Democrat to the State treasury, in order that he might put the Republican malefactors, who had been stealing the money of our State, in the penitentiary, where they belonged. My service has been open, public, and honest, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my people. And I am sorry that I can not say as much for all who have been active in and before the Pennsylvania Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of an attack on the part of the gentleman has been entirely uncalled for. This matter has been discussed in my district and in my State before, because he has made the charge before. And my people know that I am perfectly willing to let them judge that in my service here, as in my service in Pennsylvania, no corporation anywhere has controlled a single act of mine. But my service has been in behalf of those who are struggling for better conditions in a State where the great interests have denied those conditions. [Applause.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 8 or 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FARR. I think, Mr. Speaker, after hearing the defense of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that it is an admission of every charge that I made. He was in Harrisburg as the paid legal lobbyist of the corporations of Pennsylvania. That is what I said. As regards the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, the gentleman ought to know how that came on the floor of the House. He was responsible for it. I have not attacked his honor or his integrity or the fact that he had no right to represent a corporation. I have attacked him because of his hypocrisy, his wicked demagoguery, in pretending to be one thing here, when he knows he is another in his own State. Why, Mr. Speaker, when that gentleman assailed the mine officials of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western in Luzerne County, he was attacking the officials of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western who in his own county were helping to elect him, as I then said.

Mr. PALMER. There are no mine officials in my county.

Mr. FARR. I said the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western officials.

Mr. PALMER. There are no Delaware, Lackawanna & Western officials in the district.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] must not interrupt the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] without his consent.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the gall of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. Why, Mr. Speaker, he robbed you of two delegates in Luzerne because of his pre-

tenses, his demagoguery, his hypocrisy. They were your delegates. The Democrats of that district were for you. The people of Pennsylvania wanted you. They wanted you in my district, and that gentleman, under the pretense of reform, went all over the great State of Pennsylvania, and in every way possible, honorably and dishonorably——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] to order, and the demand that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] calls the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order and requests that the words be taken down.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this kind of talk.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter to be determined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] as to what he desires in this matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend a moment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] will take his seat until we get through with this business. Now the gentleman from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] to order and demand that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will take them down and report them. What words are they that are excepted to by the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The last two used by the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The shorthand reporter will report them. The rule is:

If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

The Official Reporter will read the words.

The Official Reporter read as follows:

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the gall of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. Why, Mr. Speaker, he robbed you of two delegates in Luzerne because of his pretenses, his demagoguery, his hypocrisy. They were your delegates. The people of Pennsylvania wanted you. They wanted you in my district, and that gentleman, under the pretense of reform, went all over the great State of Pennsylvania, and he in every way possible, honorably and dishonorably——

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike those words from the RECORD.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Which ones?

The SPEAKER. The ones just read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, both gentlemen, I think, have been out of order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has certainly been out of order a dozen times this afternoon and this evening in the language which he used.

They are very quick on that side of the House to make charges against somebody else; very quick to call everybody else names, and then very quick to kick if somebody replies in kind.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] ought not to have used the last word that was used. That is the only word that would be out of order. All the rest were strictly in order—all except the last word. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] but a moment ago referred to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] as "a tadpole statesman." That was strictly out of order. He has referred a dozen times to-day to other people out of order, and gentlemen on the other side have applauded those sentiments; and then they jump at once into the arena if somebody else has used a word out of order.

All debate ought to have been stopped when it began out of order. There has been no time when any of it was in order under the rules of the House, and there have been many words used in the debate which were wholly out of order. I think the gentlemen ought to have had their accession of virtue sometime ago on that side of the House, while the debate was proceeding.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely immaterial to me as to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] may think as to the proper time for the making of a proper motion. If the gentleman from Illinois regarded the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] as out of order, he of course had his rights under the rules to make the point of order. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois in one thought, and that is that this bitter debate should be ended. I move, Mr. Speaker, to strike from the RECORD the word used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Which word?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The word "dishonorable."

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out the words "or dishonorable."

Mr. BUTLER. There was only one word used to which you could take exception.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out the words "or dishonorable."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not yield to the gentleman for the purpose of offering an amendment. I move to strike out those words read by the Official Reporter from the desk.

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman from Tennessee gets through the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] to offer an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And upon that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike from the RECORD the words read by the Official Reporter, and on that he moves the previous question.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think probably the House will be in a better humor to decide this question in the morning, and it will not be as difficult to get a quorum. As I understand, the question will still be pending when the House meets in the morning if it adjourns now.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Friday, February 19, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims in relation to the vessel sloop *Ruby* (S. Doc. No. 948); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting items of legislation to be incorporated in the general deficiency appropriation bill now pending in the Committee on Appropriations (H. Doc. No. 1610); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, reporting claim of the Central Railroad of New Jersey for damage to coal dock of said company at Port Liberty, N. J., on account of damages occasioned by collision for which a tender of the Lighthouse Service has been found responsible, which has been considered, adjusted, and determined (H. Doc. No. 1611); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting lists of papers, documents on the files of Navy Department not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1612); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an item of legislation for consideration and inclusion in the general deficiency bill now pending before the Committee on Appropriations (H. Doc. No. 1613); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LOGUE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20243) to acquire a site and erect a building thereon for the use of the United States post office at Wildwood, N. J., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1413), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11299) to enlarge, extend, and make additions to, fireproof, and further improve the post-office building at Shenandoah, Iowa, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1414), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUDGER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18505) to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise additional land for the Federal building at Manchester, N. H., and to construct an addition thereon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1415), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18402) to provide for the erection of a public building at Long Beach, Cal., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1417), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21377) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1418), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 21486) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Court House; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 21487) providing for the continuance of the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 21488) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Havre, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 21489) authorizing the refunding to certain corporations and individuals part of amounts heretofore collected by the United States as a compromise of their delinquency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21490) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and for service, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 21492) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges of the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of act supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 21493) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 424) providing for the payment of the expenses of an expert and assistant in the fur-seal investigation in Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 425) declaring the attitude of the United States toward the "open-door" policy in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 426) providing that the Congress of the United States shall participate in the celebration of the opening of The Dalles-Celilo Canal; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, urging the passage of Senate bill 5042, entitled "A bill legalizing certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railroad Co. and others within the State of Nevada"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the second Legislature of the State of Arizona, for Congress to provide for the restoration and preservation of the ancient historic Spanish mission San Jose de Comacacori on the bank of the Santa Cruz River, in Santa Cruz County, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, asking that Congress provide for and maintain a Government fish hatchery in the State of Arizona to stock the streams with food fishes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the passage of the Keating bill, relative to placing veterans of the United States Army who fought in Indian wars from 1865 to 1891 on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: Memorial of the State Legislature of Nevada, favoring the passage of Senate bill 5042; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, urging Congress to authorize the Department of Agriculture to devise ways and means of destroying wild predatory animals in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KETTNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the passage of the Keating bill relative to placing veterans of the United States Army who fought in Indian wars from 1865 to 1891 on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Memorial of the Oregon Legislature, favoring rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, favoring an appropriation of $300,000 for suppression of predatory wild animals; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Oregon Legislature, favoring pensions for veterans of Modoc Indian wars of 1872 and 1873 and Indian wars of 1878; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning national navigation laws; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning reorganization of national militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning the building of roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning patenting of Carey Act segregations; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, relative to rabies-infected coyotes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 21494) granting a pension to Martha Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARR: A bill (H. R. 21495) granting a pension to Catharine Cocain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 21496) for the relief of Dr. E. V. Hailman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 21497) for the relief of the heirs of James Cloud; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 21498) granting an increase of pension to Levi Jackson Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 21499) granting a pension to James Chaffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21500) granting an increase of pension to George Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21501) granting an increase of pension to James F. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21502) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21503) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21504) for the relief of Henry C. Adams and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 21505) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 21506) for the relief of George Gillette; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: A bill (H. R. 21507) granting an increase of pension to Alfred R. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of citizens of Valley Park, Mo., and American Neutrality League, favoring embargo on war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States, urging reconsideration of the Deitrick amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of various citizens of Warrenton, Mo., protesting against bill to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 21467, for the relief of Silenus A. Simons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 21466, for the relief of Ellen Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of German Beneficial Union, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Gustav Betterman, of Johnstown, Pa., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of bakers of the twentieth congressional district of Pennsylvania, favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 31 bakers and grocers of York and Hanover, Pa., to prevent exportation of grain and foodstuffs, and request investigation as to cause of advance in price of grain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRYAN: Petition of citizens of Tacoma, Wash., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Charles W. Stauss and 42 other citizens of Glenbeulah, Sheboygan County, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of H. J. Res. 377, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by the American Neutrality League of Wisconsin at a mass meeting held at Milwaukee on February 11, 1915, asking for the passage of a law authorizing the President of the United States to levy an embargo on the exportation of arms and munitions to any of the belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of William Lindner and other residents of Kenosha, Wis., asking that legislation be enacted to place an embargo on the shipment of arms, etc., to the belligerent nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of E. K. Dupont and other citizens of Stockton, Cal., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of citizens of Benicia, Martinez, Stockton, Lodi, Elk Grove, and Galt, all in the State of California, favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 92 citizens of Stockton, Cal., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the board of directors of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, protesting against President vetoing the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVENPORT. Petitions of the Catholic Church at Pawhuska, Okla., and Knights of Columbus, Council No. 952, of Muskogee, Okla., favoring House bill 20644, to prohibit certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Sauk County (Wis.) Country Life Association, favoring present method of rural free delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Carpenters' Union No. 82, of Haverhill, Mass., relative to unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of St. James Council, No. 298, Knights of Columbus, relative to persecution of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of citizens of Virginia, protesting against passage of H. R. 20644; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of William E. Cadmus, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against tone of recent notes from the State Department to English and German foreign offices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Protest of citizens of Perryville, Ark., against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Coraopolis, Pa., protesting against bill to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: Petition from the members of the Lutheran St. Paul's Church, Beethoven Lodge, German-American Alliance, Torrington Lodge No. 462, D. O. H., all of Torrington, Conn., to prohibit the sale and export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John H. Rosenbeck and 60 others, of Torrington, Conn., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of Rev. L. D. Zimmerman and others, of Accident, Md., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petitions of St. Joseph German Society, Bristol, and Deutscher Radfaher Club Eichenlaub, of New Britain, Conn., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Socialist Party of Wichita, Kans., favoring legislation to meet the problem of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of board of directors, Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Mrs. M. J. Scroeder, 717 York Street, St. Paul, Minn., favoring exclusion of certain periodicals from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harmonia Lodge, O. D. H. S., of Meriden, Conn., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of New Jersey Turn Bezirk, of Hoboken, N. J., relative to the neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of A. L. Ortman and Monmouth County Federation of Patriotic and Religious Fraternities, against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of Chris Harrigfield and others, citizens of Squirrel; E. M. Frank and others, of American Falls; Theodore Goers and others, all of Idaho, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Rev. W. M. Care and 17 citizens of Caldwell, and Rev. J. S. Colvin and 44 citizens of Hampa, all in the State of Idaho, protesting against employment of child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Petition of members of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Norman, Okla., and of St. Joseph's Cathedral, Oklahoma City, Okla., relative to circulation of certain publications through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of mass meeting of Bellevue, Iowa, against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Regulation of Immigration—Veto Message.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. DILLINGHAM,

OF VERMONT,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

Thursday, February 11, and Friday, February 12, 1915.

The Senate had under consideration the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I think it was a week ago to-day that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] in speaking on the pending question made a most elaborate, carefully prepared, and eloquent address upon the subject of alien immigration. My purpose in what I have to say to-day is to confine myself to that phase of the pending question.

The President in his message, sent to Congress January 28, refusing his approval of House bill 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States," said:

> The literacy test and the tests and restrictions which accompany it constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation. Hitherto we have generously kept our doors open to all who were not unfitted by reason of disease or incapacity for self-support or such personal records and antecedents as were likely to make them a menace to our peace and order or to the wholesome and essential relationships of life.

He then proceeds:

> In this bill it is proposed to turn away from tests of character and of quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict, for the new tests here embodied are not tests of quality or of character or of personal fitness, but tests of opportunity. Those who come seeking opportunity are not to be admitted unless they have already had one of the chief of the opportunities they seek, the opportunity of education. The object of such provisions is restriction, not selection.

Then the President proceeds to say:

> If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.
>
> I have no pride of opinion in this question. I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them. I only want instruction direct from those whose fortunes, with ours and all men's, are involved.

IS THE SYSTEM OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT A FAILURE?

Mr. President, it has seemed to me from such examination of this subject as I have been able to make that the President is very much mistaken in the facts upon which he assumes to base his action; that he is mistaken in his conception of the laws of the United States bearing on this question; and that he is not fully informed regarding the policy which has been adopted by Congress upon this subject. In his message he also assumes a position which, to my mind, is absolutely new in the history of the Nation. It is new in its arrogation of Executive power. It is, in fact, a denial of all the principles of a representative government in the United States to-day.

Senators will remember that this same bill was introduced into this body in the Sixty-second Congress, that it was fully debated, received the fullest consideration, and passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to 8. It was then adopted in the House by a vote of 178 to 52, and was sent to the President for his approval. Instead of meeting the approval of President Taft the bill was returned to the House in which it originated, accompanied by a message in which he failed utterly to follow the Constitution by giving his reasons for refusing his approval of the act, basing his action upon the reasons which were stated in a letter written to him by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Mr. Nagel.

Upon the question whether the measure should become a law notwithstanding the objections of the President the Senate answered in the affirmative by more than the necessary two-thirds majority, and in the House it only failed to receive the requisite two-thirds majority by perhaps four or five votes, showing that the sentiment of that Congress was overwhelmingly in favor of the principles embodied in this measure.

The same bill, with hardly a change in its phraseology, was introduced into the present Congress, passed the House by a vote of 252 to 156, and, after three weeks' debate in the Senate of the United States, passed this body by a vote of 50 yeas to 7 nays.

This bill, having been thus indorsed by two separate Congresses each coming fresh from the people, has now met with the disapproval of President Wilson, and for the reasons given in his message, from which I have already quoted.

It seems to me, Mr. President, a strange thing that the President of the United States should thus utterly ignore the existence of the representative principle in government and say, in substance, that the House of Representatives is incapable of dealing with this question as a policy, or that it is incapable of representing the opinion of the people of the United States, from whom its Members received their election. By his action he has said substantially that Senators now composing this body are incapable of interpreting the public sentiment, the thought, the judgment, the conviction of the people of their respective States, and in order to be convinced that the people are really behind this measure he demands that action by some political party be taken in favor of the policy of restriction, and that the question shall in that way be brought directly to the attention of the people and their verdict solicited. Let me read what he says:

> It is because I doubt it—

That is, that the people approve this measure—

> It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered.

He says that he has a method of determining this question, and one only which will satisfy him. He says:

> Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish."

He says further:

> The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

Think of it, Mr. President! A matter of great national policy "too fundamental to be settled" by a House of Representatives, freshly chosen from the people every two years, and by the Senate of the United States, selected by the respective States to represent them in the legislative department of the Government.

POLITICAL PARTIES HAVE ALREADY SPOKEN.

The President seems to feel entirely justified in interposing a veto of this act upon the broad ground that he can only be convinced of what the people want when some one or the other of the great parties of this Nation shall have incorporated the principle of restriction into its platform, and have gone to the country upon that issue. It is a remarkable attitude to be assumed by a man who is an historian. In reply, I have only to call attention to the fact that as early as 1896—I shall have occasion to refer to this matter later on in my remarks—the Democratic national convention adopted the following plank in its platform:

> We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

In the reference to Eureopean pauper labor, they must, of course, refer to the labor that comes from those nations of Europe where the wages are infinitesimal in character, where the laboring masses are largely lacking in the proper means of support, and where the standard of living conditions which exist in the United States is unknown.

It was, however, not only the Democratic Party which so long ago as that assumed this attitude, for the Republican Party in its national convention of 1896 proposed this very measure, this very scheme for reducing the flow of immigration to this country of the classes indicated. In its platform in that year it declares:

> For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be throughly enforced and so extended—

Mark the words—

> *as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.*

That was the declaration of the Republican Party in 1896, and it was the expression of a public sentiment in favor of restriction which then existed and which has been growing from that day until the present time.

DIFFERENCE IN CONDITIONS AT HOME AND ABROAD.

Why, Mr. President, the President of the United States seems to have wholly overlooked the development of public sentiment upon this question. He seems also to have overlooked the

growth of a national policy, as expressed in various pieces of legislation, in which it has been sought to improve the quality and to restrict the flow of immigration to this country. He also utterly fails to recognize the difference in the conditions, industrial and legislative, existing prior to the year 1882 and since that time.

Up to 1882 we had received only about 9,000,000 immigrants, either before or after the Civil War. About 5,000,000 had come prior to that great conflict. During the busy years succeeding the Civil War, and down to 1882, we received that magnificent body of men, women, and children from northern and western Europe who, with those coming previously, have been so thoroughly assimilated and have so greatly helped to build up American institutions that their advent is counted as a national asset. We glory in the citizenship which they have developed.

The President, however, fails to understand, or perhaps fails to appreciate, the fact that since 1882 we have received not 9,000,000, which represented the immigration of all preceding years, but substantially 19,000,000 aliens, 11,000,000 of whom are of the new type, as we express it; a type differing from that which preceded it, one coming from eastern and southern Europe—Russia, Austria, Hungary, the Balkan States, southern Italy, and some nations farther east than those I have mentioned.

The President, when he spoke about the freedom of past immigration and of our generous spirit in receiving it, and in that part of his message where he refers to a denial of the generous spirit which has prevailed in the past, had in mind, I think, the immigration which came from Ireland between 1846 and 1854, during the period of the famine in that island, and that other body of immigrants which came from Germany at a later period, which in some part represented German revolutions and the dangers connected with citizenship in that country.

In the report of the Immigration Commission, volume 2, page 591, the commission, in discussing the steerage legislation, referred to this Irish immigration, and I beg leave to quote briefly from it:

> The potato famine in Ireland occurred in the year 1847, and in consequence there was a great increase in emigration from that country, as well as from other parts of the United Kingdom. During the first six months of 1847 a total of 174,048 emigrants sailed from British ports to the United States and British colonies in North America. Of these, 101,767 were destined to the United States and 72,281 to the British colonies, chiefly, of course, to Canada. During the whole of the preceding year, 1846, the emigrants embarking at British ports for the United States and for British colonies in North America numbered, according to Hon. A. Dudley Mann, 82,289 and 43,439, respectively; a total of 125,728.

CONJUGAL RELATIONS.

This immigration to which the commission refers was peculiar in character and attractive in quality in this, that it came in families; that it came to remain permanently, to seek citizenship, and to improve the condition of those who composed it; in other words, that body of immigrants came here with the purpose to make the United States its home.

I find, in examining the records, that in nine years, from 1846 to 1854, we received from Ireland from 105,000 up to 221,000 annually, and that substantially 43 per cent of that entire number were females. The proportion of the unmarried was comparatively small, and the proportion of those who were married but failed to bring their wives with them was negligible.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask leave to insert a table which gives the arrivals during each year and the percentage of females among them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

The volume of Irish immigration from 1846 to 1854, inclusive, and the percentages of females received.

Year.	Number.	Per cent.
1846	51,752	42.5
1847	105,536	42.1
1848	112,924	41.1
1849	159,398	40.0
1850	164,004	37.8
1851	221,250	42.3
1852	159,548	43.3
1853	162,649	42.4
1854	108,605	41.1
Average		43.3

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, as the question of the relative number of males and females is one which must be noticed as we examine the history of immigration, in order to determine for ourselves the purpose with which the different classes of immigrants have come, I want also to make a comparison of the relative number of females in the immigration from the several countries which have been our contributors during the period 1899 to 1909, inclusive. During that period we received of the old immigration, those coming from Great Britain, Germany, the Scandinavian States, Belgium, and France, 2,273,782; but of the new immigration, coming from southern and eastern Europe, we received 5,930,252—a number twice greater than those of the old immigration, and among whom the proportion of females was vastly less. Let me give that proportion. Of the old immigration the proportion of females was 41.5 per cent of the whole, while of the new immigration it was only 27 per cent of the whole.

In connection with that I wish to introduce a table showing the relative number of males and females from each individual nation, constituting both the old immigration and the new, which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

The immigration during the 12 years 1899–1909, inclusive.

Nationality.	Number.	Male.	Female.
		Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Old immigration	2,273,782	58.5	41.5
New immigration	5,930,252	73.0	27.0
Southern Italian	1,719,260	78.6	21.4
Hebrew	990,182	56.7	43.3
Polish	820,716	69.2	30.8
Slovak	345,111	70.3	29.7
Northern Italian	341,888	78.4	21.6
Magyar	310,049	72.7	27.3
Croatian and Slovenian	295,981	85.1	14.9
Lithuanian	152,544	71.1	28.9
Greek	177,827	95.4	4.6
Finnish	136,038	65.8	34.2
Ruthuanian	119,438	74.0	26.0
Russian	66,280	84.6	15.4
German	682,995	59.4	40.6
Scandinavian	534,269	61.3	38.7
Irish	401,342	47.2	52.8
English	355,116	61.7	38.3

CONDITIONS WHICH INVITED OLD IMMIGRATION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It seems to me also, Mr. President, that in considering this matter the Chief Executive overlooks the wonderful development which occurred in this country during the period of the Germanic invasion. In some remarks submitted in the Senate when this bill was under consideration I called attention to the fact that between 1866 and 1882 we opened up a new agricultural area substantially as great as the whole area of Great Britain, of Switzerland, and of Greece combined. To resort to statistics and to state the matter accurately, let me say that during the 40 years succeeding the close of the Civil War the number of the farms operated in this country increased from 2,500,000 to 6,000,000.

During that same period there also came that great development in the railroad systems of the United States. We had passed a homestead law during the Civil War and opened our great Northwest to actual settlers and we had built the Pacific railroads. The result was that, with the confidence inspired by the restoration of the Union, capital was released and found investment in railroad construction and equipment to such an extent that during a period of 20 years succeeding the close of the Civil War no week day passed without witnessing the expenditure of a million dollars in such work.

It was the lure of the land, the attraction which the enterprises of America held out that invited this immigration from Germany, from Great Britain, and from the Scandinavian States, and they came with the full intention to become citizens of the United States, to take upon themselves the responsibilities of government as well as the privileges to be found under our institutions. They brought their wives, they brought their children, and they found permanent residences in the great new West. It was easy for them to acquire the English language. They came from the same racial stock which then constituted the population of the United States; acquaintances were soon formed; friendships followed; they very soon fitted into the social and political life of the Nation, and to-day their names are represented in this body and in the other body of this Congress in such large numbers that everyone can see just what an addition to the wealth of the Nation they constitute.

RELATIVE GROWTH OF OLD AND NEW IMMIGRATION.

It seems to me also that in the position which he has assumed the President has failed to contrast the conditions existing prior to 1882 and the conditions since that time in respect of the class and the quality of those who have sought our shores. Had he examined the records and studied them carefully he would have

found that in a period of 62 years, extending from 1820 to 1882, 96 per cent of the entire body of immigrants admitted to the United States came from northern and western Europe, and that they constitute what the Immigration Commission has termed the "old immigration," to distinguish it from that new type of immigration which has been coming in such large bodies since that time.

Let me contrast that immigration coming from northern and western Europe during that period of 62 years, numbering 9,578,000—an immigration which, as I have said, was made up so largely of families and which came with the purpose to make homes in this country, to better their condition, and to cast their lot with us in every respect—let me contrast that, if you please, with the immigration which has followed in the last 33 years, a period only half as long as the other, during which time we have received 19,526,163 immigrants. Of this vast number only 7,566,000, or 38 per cent, came from the nations of northern and western Europe, while 11,960,000, or 61.2 per cent of the whole, came from Russia, Austria-Hungary, the Balkan States, Italy, and some of the smaller nations or principalities of southern and eastern Europe.

CONDITIONS WHICH INVITED THE NEW IMMIGRATION.

Have the latter class come with the purpose of making the United States their residence? Have they come with the purpose to assume the responsibilities of government, as well as to enjoy its advantages? Have they brought their wives? Have they brought their children? Are they actuated by a desire to enter into our life and to find their development under American institutions? In other words, have they sought the soil, or are they the denizens of the cities, belonging to a floating population, unrecognized by the permanent population except as so many labor units? Some have; some have not. Let us see about it.

I have already spoken of the large number of the old immigration that sought the soil and opened up farms. What about the new? If you will examine the census of 1910 you will find that during a period of 30 years, extending from 1880 to 1909, inclusive, we received of the new immigration from Austria-Hungary 2,850,222 immigrants; from Italy, 2,801,976; and from Russia, 2,134,100; making a total of 7,786,218.

Where have they gone? What has been their occupation? The census enumerators tell us that in the year 1909 they found only nine-tenths of 1 per cent of these nationalities operating farms in the United States, either as owners or as tenants. Think of it! After 30 years' inflow of these nationalities less than 1 per cent of the men could be found operating farms in the United States. It indicates but one thing, that these millions have gone to the great centers of population; that they came here as common laborers, to take advantage of our superior conditions, to live low, hoard their savings, and eventually, in large numbers, to return to the countries from whence they came. They came here because of the phenomenal growth in the manufactures and in the mining industries of the United States.

Prior to 1860 manufactures had never flourished in the United States. The output of our mills for that year was only about $2,000,000,000; but the confidence inspired by the result of the Civil War and by a belief in the legislative policies adopted by the American Congress, manufactures were encouraged, and in 1870 our output was equal to that of France. At the end of another 10 years it was equal to that of Great Britain or of Germany. In another 10 years, in 1890, the products of our mills were equal to those of Great Britain and France combined, and in 1900 they amounted to more than the combined manufactured products of Great Britain, Germany, and France. Since that time, in the last 10 years, the increase in the manufactured products of the United States alone has been more than seven thousand millions of dollars, while between 1880 and 1909, a period of 29 years, the products of our mines and quarries advanced from $252,000,000 to $1,238,000,000 annually.

It is unnecessary that I should go further into statistics. This growth in manufactures and mining has been phenomenal—something that the world has never witnessed in any other nation. As early as 1870 it was known that labor was demanded in these industries, and this new immigration began to flow into the United States to supply the demand. It naturally went to the seats of the industries. Since that time every succeeding influx of immigrants has followed that of the same nationality which came before; and you may lay it down as a rule, I think, they will continue to do so. They come to a large extent in consequence of letters which they have received from their friends. That has been observed among all nationalities, and it has continued from year to year, until you can demonstrate the fact that wherever the first from a country or from a portion of a country settled others from that same section have also settled in the succeeding years.

To illustrate what I am saying and as a proof of the fact, let me say that 80 per cent of all the immigrants admitted in the year when a record was kept had in their possession when they landed railroad tickets from New York to the point of their destination, which had been sent to them from the United States, presumably by their friends, with whom they had been in correspondence. That explains why one generation follows another of the same nationality in seeking homes in this country. Substantially 94 per cent of all who were admitted during a given year gave as a reason for coming that they were to join friends or relatives. That is an additional circumstance indicating that the proposition I have made is correct.

MOVEMENT OF THE NEW IMMIGRATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

Where has this large immigration come from, and where has it gone? I have indicated in a general manner that it has gone to the cities, and that is true. I have in my hand a table showing the countries from which immigrants came for the fiscal year 1913, ending on June 30, from which I find that the whole immigration of that year amounted to 1,197,892. Of that vast number 899,308 were of the new immigration. Only 263,226 represented the old immigration, and only 35,358 represented that coming from the Asiatic countries. Of this immigration only 13,469 out of 1,197,000 were professional men, and only 160,108 out of that entire body were skilled laborers. All of the rest, 1,024,315, were either unskilled laborers or without occupation. That represents, of course, women and children.

Where did the immigration of 1913 go? I have chosen this particular year as indicative of others. I will speak of the immigration movement as a whole later on. Of the 1,197,000 immigrants of 1913, 168,952 went to the New England States; 574,633 went to the Middle Atlantic States, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey; 265,355 went to the east North Central States, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin. So, it appears that 1,008,940 out of the entire number went to the States east of the Mississippi River, north of the Ohio, and north of Maryland. Almost the entire body, you may say more than 75 per cent of the whole, went to an area that constitutes only about 13½ per cent of the area of continental United States. That is the area in which, in round numbers, 75 if not 80 per cent of all the wages earned in manufactures in the United States are paid. It represents the district in which from 75 to 80 per cent of the manufactured products of the United States are produced; and it is to that area, east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio, that the great bulk of this new immigration has gone.

Mr. President, I have full tables upon this subject, which I ask leave to insert.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Countries from which immigrants came for year of 1913, ending on June 30.

NEW IMMIGRATION.

Austria	137,245
Hungary	117,580
Bulgaria, Servia, and Montenegro	1,753
Greece	22,817
Italy	265,542
Portugal	14,171
Roumania	2,155
Russian Empire	291,040
Turkey in Europe	14,128
Africa	1,409
Australia	1,229
Mexico	11,926
South America	4,248
West Indies	12,458
Pacific islands	111
Central America	1,473
Miscellaneous	23
Total	899,308

OLD IMMIGRATION.

Belgium	7,405
Denmark	6,478
France	9,675
German Empire	34,329
Netherlands	6,902
Norway	8,587
Spain	6,167
Sweden	17,202
Switzerland	4,104
England	43,363
Ireland	27,876
Scotland	14,220
Wales	2,745
Other Europe	371
British North America	73,802
Total	263,226

ASIATIC.	
China	2,105
Japan	8,281
India	179
Turkey in Asia	23,955
Other Asia	838
Total	35,358

Emigrants have departed from our shores for the countries comprising the "new immigration" to the number of 229,194 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913; for the countries comprising the "old immigration" to the number of 74,572 (of this number, 46,981 went to Canada) and 3,301 to Asiatic countries.

Of these, only 13,469 were professional men, 160,108 were skilled laborers, and 1,024,315 were unskilled or without occupation.

WHERE HAVE THESE IMMIGRANTS GONE TO?

Sections.	Arrived.	Departed.
New England States:		
Maine	6,624	655
New Hampshire	8,230	1,622
Vermont	3,608	557
Massachusetts	101,674	17,070
Connecticut	35,138	6,259
Rhode Island	13,678	2,593
Middle Atlantic States:		
New York	330,531	83,608
Pennsylvania	182,744	43,836
New Jersey	61,358	12,401
East North Central:		
Michigan	59,192	7,529
Ohio	63,007	13,238
Indiana	13,005	3,860
Illinois	107,060	24,178
Wisconsin	23,091	4,037
West North Central:		
North Dakota	4,285	229
South Dakota	1,641	196
Nebraska	6,266	695
Kansas	3,663	595
Minnesota	18,693	2,933
Iowa	8,666	1,387
Missouri	11,509	3,386
Mountain States:		
Montana	5,796	955
Idaho	1,682	385
Wyoming	1,160	505
Nevada	1,000	402
Utah	2,932	1,349
Colorado	5,673	1,664
Arizona	3,945	613
New Mexico	758	243
Pacific States:		
Washington	18,313	2,827
Oregon	4,994	1,385
California	32,277	8,120
West South Central:		
Texas	11,214	806
Oklahoma	1,018	235
Arkansas	353	56
Louisiana	1,774	423
East South Central:		
Kentucky	761	176
Tennessee	818	134
Mississippi	415	41
Alabama	1,170	375
South Atlantic:		
Delaware	1,810	242
Maryland	8,168	1,146
Virginia	1,822	407
West Virginia	10,472	3,492
North Carolina	429	80
South Carolina	258	53
Georgia	787	158
Florida	5,352	2,520

Races admitted into the United States for year ending June 30, 1913.

NEW IMMIGRATION.	
Armenians	9,353
Bohemians and Moravians	11,091
Bulgarians, Servians, and Montenegrins	9,087
Croatian and Slovenian	42,499
Cubans	3,099
Dalmatian, Bosnian, and Herzegovinian	4,520
East Indians	188
Finnish	12,756
Greeks	38,644
Hebrews	101,330
Italian (south)	231,613
Italian (north)	42,534
Lithuanian	24,647
Magyars	30,610
Polish	174,365
Portuguese	13,566
Roumanians	13,451
Russians	51,472
Ruthenians	30,588
Slovak	27,234
Syrians	9,210
Turkish	2,015
Africans	6,634
Mexicans	10,954
West Indians	1,171
Total	902,631

OLD IMMIGRATION.	
Dutch and Flemish	14,507
English	55,522
French	20,652
German	80,865
Irish	37,023
Scotch	21,293
Spanish	9,042
Spanish-American	1,363
Welsh	2,820
Scandinavians	38,737
Total	281,824

ASIATIC.	
Chinese	2,022
Japanese	8,302
Korean	64
Total	10,388

New immigration	902,631
Old immigration	281,824
Asiatic	10,388
Whole immigration	1,194,843

RELATIVE INCREASE OF NEW RACES WHO DWELL IN CITIES.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The impress which this new immigration is making upon the character of the population of the United States is very clearly shown by the census of 1910, covering the census years between the years 1900 and 1910, from which it appears that there was an actual decrease in the number of foreign-born population of the United States which came from Germany of 11.1 per cent, a decrease in those born in Ireland of 16.3 per cent, and a decrease of those born in Wales of 11.8 per cent. On the other hand, what was the increase coming from the nationalities of the new immigration? It was as follows: Those from Greece, 1,089 per cent; those from Italy, 175.5 per cent; those from Russia and from Finland, 170.4 per cent; those from Austria, 139.2 per cent; Hungary, 240.1 per cent; and of this vast number 75 per cent went to the cities of the Nation.

[At this point Mr. DILLINGHAM yielded the floor for the day.]

Friday, February 12, 1915.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Just prior to the adjournment last evening I had been calling the attention of the Senate to the decrease in the percentage of those races in the United States which were born in northern and western Europe and the unexampled increase which had occurred during the 10 years between 1900 and 1910 in the numbers of those races coming from eastern and southern Europe. I had also called attention to the fact that of the 11,000,000 immigrants who had been admitted from eastern and southern Europe in the preceding 17 years probably 75 per cent had gone directly to the industrial centers of the United States and were to be found in our cities. Conditions in the cities had not been so much changed when President Cleveland interposed his veto against a similar bill in 1897.

He said:

It can not be shown, however, that it affects all cities, nor that it is permanent—

He is speaking about the influx of men of foreign nations—

nor does it appear that this condition, where it exists, demands as its remedy the reversal of our present immigration policy.

The fact that the increase in the population of our cities has largely come by reason of foreign immigration during the last two decades has been sharply challenged in debate in this body during the present session. For that reason I beg leave to call the attention of the Senate to some facts which I have gleaned from the census of 1910, and among them the following: I find that in 1900, 64.6 per cent of all those born abroad residing in New England and the Middle Atlantic States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey were in the cities, and I find that 10 years later, in 1910, 70 per cent of the foreign born in that vast territory were found in the cities. The same authority states that in the Middle Atlantic States, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, 83.9 per cent of the foreign-born population were found in the cities. Going to the New England States and considering them alone, it is found that 92.4 per cent of the entire foreign-born population are residents in the great centers of society.

I quote from the census of 1910, volume 1, page 171, where it is stated that—

The conditions in the New England and Middle Atlantic divisions are especially noteworthy. Only about one-third (33.9 and 34.4 per cent, respectively) of the urban population of these divisions in 1910 consisted of native whites of native parentage, while over two-thirds of the rural population (69.8 per cent and 67 per cent, respectively) were of that class. Broadly speaking, of the urban population of these divisions almost one-third were foreign-born whites, fully one-third (includ-

ing persons of mixed parentage) were native children of foreign-born whites, and about one-third were native whites of native parentage.

In this connection it is interesting to note that in this rapid movement of the foreign-born population toward the centers there has been a vast increase in the population of the cities as contrasted with the population of the rural districts. The census of 1880 showed that only 29½ per cent of the entire population of the United States were in the cities, while the census of 1910, 30 years later, shows that 46.3 per cent of the entire population were found in the cities. It also shows that the increase in the urban population during the period from 1900 to 1910 was 11,013,738, or 38.8 per cent, while in the rural sections of the country the increase is only 4,963,953, or 11 per cent. In other words, the increase in the population of the cities of the United States was more than three times as great in percentage as the increase of the population in the rural districts.

It has also been claimed, Mr. President, in this debate that the growth of the cities was more to be accounted for by the migration from the country districts to the city than by the movement of the immigrant class toward such centers. To show that that is not true I have selected the 10 principal cities of the United States, and beg to quote from the census regarding them.

It appears from the census of 1910 that during the 10 preceding years the increase in the native white population of New York City was 30 per cent, while the increase in the foreign population of that city was 52.9 per cent.

In Chicago the native white population increased 25.5 per cent; the foreign-born population, 33.4 per cent.

In Philadelphia the native white population increased 15.5 per cent; the foreign-born population, 30.3 per cent.

In St. Louis the increase in the native white was 20.6 per cent, while that of the foreign born was only 13.3 per cent.

In Boston the increase in the native white population was 17.5 per cent, while that in the foreign-born population was 23.5 per cent.

In Cleveland the increase in the native white was 41.7 per cent; that of the foreign-born white 57.4 per cent.

In Baltimore the increase in the native white was 9.7 per cent, and 13.4 per cent of the foreign-born white.

In Pittsburgh the increase in the first class was 16.3 per cent; that of the foreign-born white 22.7 per cent.

In Detroit the increase in the native white was 63.5 per cent and in the foreign born 63 per cent, while in Buffalo the increase in native white was 23 per cent and in the foreign-born white it was only 13.1 per cent.

From this table it appears that the increase in population among the foreign born in the larger cities has been much greater than in the country, exceptions being St. Louis, Detroit, and Buffalo, the difference in Detroit not being appreciable.

But, to throw still greater light upon this question, I want further to quote from the census of 1910, from which it appears that in that year in New York City the percentage of those of native parentage was only 19.3 per cent. In Chicago those born of native parents was 20.4 per cent; in Philadelphia, 37.7 per cent; in St. Louis, 39.3 per cent; in Boston, 23.5 per cent; in Cleveland, 23.6 per cent; in Baltimore, 46.8 per cent; in Pittsburgh, 33 per cent; in Detroit, 24.7 per cent; and in Buffalo, 28.2 per cent.

Now, going to some of the manufacturing cities of the country, I call attention to the fact that those of native-born parentage residing in Lowell, Mass., constituted only 19.5 per cent of the population of the city; in Paterson, N. J., 22.6 per cent; in Providence, R. I., 26.7 per cent; in Worcester, Mass., 28.4 per cent; in Rochester, N. Y., 34.2 per cent; in Brockton, Mass., 45.5 per cent; in Lawrence, 13.6 per cent; and in Waterbury, Conn., 24.9 per cent.

In connection with this statement I ask leave to insert tables taken from the census which not only give the information which I have stated but also give the percentages of those of foreign birth and those whose parents, one or the other of them, were foreign born. It is a most interesting table and one to which some Senators may wish to refer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair). Without objection leave will be granted.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Foreign born, foreign or mixed parentage, and native parentage in cities (whites).

[Census 1910, vol. 1, pp. 178, 179.]

	Per cent.
New York:	
Foreign born	40.4
Foreign or mixed parentage	38.2
Native parentage	19.3
Chicago:	
Foreign born	35.7
Foreign or mixed parentage	40.8
Native parentage	20.4
Philadelphia:	
Foreign born	24.7
Foreign or mixed parentage	32.1
Native parentage	37.7
St. Louis:	
Foreign born	18.3
Foreign or mixed parentage	35.9
Native parentage	39.3
Boston:	
Foreign born	35.9
Foreign or mixed parentage	38.3
Native parentage	23.5
Cleveland:	
Foreign born	34.9
Foreign or mixed parentage	39.9
Native parentage	23.6
Baltimore:	
Foreign born	13.8
Foreign or mixed parentage	24.1
Native parentage	46.8
Pittsburgh:	
Foreign born	26.3
Foreign or mixed parentage	35.9
Native parentage	33.0
Detroit:	
Foreign born	33.6
Foreign or mixed parentage	40.4
Native parentage	24.7
Buffalo:	
Foreign born	28.0
Foreign or mixed parentage	43.3
Native parentage	28.2
Lowell, Mass.:	
Foreign born	40.9
Foreign or mixed parentage	39.5
Native parentage	19.5
Paterson, N. J.:	
Foreign born	36.1
Foreign or mixed parentage	40.0
Native parentage	22.6
Providence, R. I.:	
Foreign born	34.0
Foreign or mixed parentage	36.7
Native parentage	26.7
Worcester, Mass.:	
Foreign born	33.2
Foreign or mixed parentage	37.5
Native parentage	28.4
Rochester, N. Y.:	
Foreign born	27.0
Foreign or mixed parentage	38.4
Native parentage	34.2
Brockton, Mass.:	
Foreign born	27.1
Foreign or mixed parentage	31.4
Native parentage	40.5
Lawrence, Mass.:	
Foreign born	48.1
Foreign or mixed parentage	37.9
Native parentage	13.6
Waterbury, Conn.:	
Foreign born	24.9
Foreign or mixed parentage	39.1
Native parentage	24.9

RESTRICTION NOT A NEW POLICY.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. But President Wilson based his veto upon the fact that this bill is what he denominates a radical departure from the well-established policy of the Government. I hardly think that statement is correct; but even if it be correct, does it furnish a basis for a veto of a measure of this character at this time?

I think he must have overlooked the fact that for 20 years the Nation has been demanding just this type of legislation; he must have overlooked the fact that 30 years ago we began the restrictive policy in the adoption of the contract-labor law, and we adopted that law because we did not want unfair competition against the labor element of the United States by those coming from foreign nations. That law was intended, undoubtedly, more to protect the skilled labor of the United States than any other, because at that time the demands for common labor had not become as great as later on; but, nevertheless, the principle of restriction was just as firmly asserted in that legislation as it is in the legislation the purpose of which is to restrict in some measure the flow of immigration into this country at the present time, consisting as it does of unskilled common or farm labor, among the males to the extent of 90 per cent of the whole, competing as it does with the common labor of this country at all the great centers of our industries, and in such a way as to reduce the earning capacity of this class of wage earners and to destroy the American standard of living.

The restrictive legislation of 1885 to which I have referred is found rewritten in the bill which has been vetoed. It is known as the contract-labor clause. Among the excluded classes are "persons hereinafter called contract laborers, who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; persons

who have come in consequence of advertisements for laborers printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country."

That, Mr. President, in substance, was the legislation adopted 30 years ago, and was absolutely restrictive in its character and was based upon the rights of the United States in the protection of its own citizens and their well-being to forbid the solicitation and the bringing into this country of men who would actually compete against the laboring men of this country in the labor market of the Nation.

So then a restrictive measure when applied to common labor stands upon precisely the same principle, a principle that has been recognized by this Government, and one which has been in operation during the last three decades of its history.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator from Vermont may intend to cover in his discussion the point to which I should like to call his attention.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. STERLING. The President, as the Senator will recall, places his objection to the bill on two grounds, the first of which is in the following language, quoting from the President's message:

> It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men.

The question I should like to ask the Senator is, what particular language of the bill is referred to by the President here?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Such language does not exist, Mr. President. I know of no language in the bill which will bear that construction.

Mr. STERLING. Does not the present law exclude anarchists or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of government?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It does; and the present bill strengthens that law and makes it much more effective.

I want to say in connection with the Senator's inquiry that this bill, in addition to the literacy test, embraces all the recommendations that were made by the Immigration Commission of 1907, no one of which has ever as yet been enacted into law, sadly as they are needed, simply because President Taft, on the recommendation of a Cabinet officer, vetoed the former bill and because the veto in this case has been interposed by President Wilson. The country has been waiting for the last four years for legislation that will strengthen the existing law and make it more effective. The President admits this in his message, because he says it has many admirable features.

I have a list of many of those things which I might incorporate in my remarks except for the time it would take to read them, but I state broadly that all the advantages intended to have flowed from the action of the Immigration Commission, which gave three years of hard study to this work and gathered a fund of information which had never before been brought together on this subject or any other, I think, in the history of our legislation. All, I say, of the commission's recommendations have been incorporated in this bill, and they go down with the literacy test. Speaking in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota as to the right of asylum, let me add that the bill itself provides:

> That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude.

The right of asylum is fully protected in this measure.

GROWTH OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

Mr. President, in 1889 there was a strong and increasing interest in this question of immigration. One political party or the other in 23 different States had placed in their platforms a plank demanding a more rigid execution of the laws and the adoption of additional measures for the purposes of regulating and restricting immigration. And yet at that time the new immigration, as we style it, that was coming from eastern and southern Europe had not amounted to a million souls, but it was coming in largely increasing numbers. We had then admitted only about 700,000, but even that number had aroused the attention of thinking men. Both legislators and people were startled by the fact that the census of 1890 showed that in the last decade the increase in the native-born citizens of this country had been only 22.1 per cent, while the increase in the percentage of those born abroad had been 31.7 per cent.

I ought to say in this connection that in 1888 a report had been made by what was known as the Ford committee, appointed under authority of Congress, recommending many amendments intended to strengthen the law. The bill so recommended did not become a law, but Congress became deeply interested in the question.

A DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION AT THAT TIME.

I now read from the report of the Immigration Commission:

> The subject of immigration continued to be a matter of interest, and in 1889 a standing Committee on Immigration in the Senate and a select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in the House were established. In 1890 these committees were authorized jointly to make an inquiry relative to immigration and to investigate the workings of the various laws of the United States and of the several States relative to immigration.

The importance the country attached to legislation upon this subject will be understood when it is remembered that a standing committee of this body was instituted, and a similar one in the House.

The commission proceed by saying:

> Various reports were submitted, and the conclusion of the committee was that a radical change in the immigration laws was not advisable, although it had been found that throughout the country there existed a demand for a stricter enforcement of the immigration laws. During 1890 one or more political parties in 23 States had demanded additional regulations of immigration.

Then they go on to say what the investigation of the joint committee was, and they state that—

> The bill presented by the committee aimed to correct faults in existing law. As it was presented it received rather general favor, the only opposition to it being on the part of ultrarestrictionists, who tried to have substituted a bill which raised the head tax from 50 cents to $1 and provided for a thorough consular examination.

As a result of this agitation Congress in 1891 adopted an act concerning which the commission speak as follows:

> The contract-labor law was strengthened by prohibiting the encouragement of immigration by promises of employment through advertisements published in any foreign country, and transportation companies were forbidden to solicit or encourage immigration.

I ask leave, to save time at this point, to quote further from the report bearing upon that subject, on page 571.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

> Under the law of 1891 the office of Superintendent of Immigration was authorized, and for the first time Federal control of immigration was completely and definitely established, United States officials exercising the functions which under the law of 1882 had been delegated to the States. It now became the duty of the commanding officer of every vessel bringing alien immigrants to report to the proper inspection officials the name, nationality, last residence, and destination of all such aliens; all decisions of the inspection officials refusing any alien the right to land were final unless appeal was taken to the Secretary of the Treasury; the medical examination of immigrants at United States ports was to be made by surgeons of the United States Marine-Hospital Service; and for the first time an inspection of immigrants on the borders of Canada and Mexico was provided for.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The bill presented as the result of the committee's work passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 125 to 48, and passed this body unanimously. That was a bill markedly in advance of anything that had been previously enacted looking toward the restriction of immigration.

Returning again to the question of restriction of immigration let us inquire whether the literacy test is new, as the President seems to think it is, and whether it is a radical departure, as he says, from the policy of the Government. He is not sure that the people have ever heard of or seriously considered it as a policy and bases his action in vetoing this bill upon the assumption that such a proposition has never been sharply called to their attention. He seems not to have known that as early as 1892 this very test was demanded.

Let me read from volume 2, page 572, what the commission say:

> The other bill presented by the Senate committee is interesting in that for the first time *restriction of immigration by means of an educational test was recommended by a congressional committee.*

The report goes on to tell how the proposition was presented, what lines the debate took, and states that although the bill failed of passage a board of inquiry was constituted by Congress to further investigate the matter and report.

The President seems also to be unaware of the fact that, following that agitation and the filing of the report of that board of inquiry, both of the great political parties of the Nation demanded through their national conventions restrictive legislation of positive type. The people also demanded such legislation, and at the polls emphasized such demands. I called attention last evening, I think, to the platforms of the two great parties of this country in that year; but let me repeat. The Democratic Party in its national platform said:

> We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

What did they refer to as the pauper labor? It was this new immigration of which we had received in all perhaps a million souls from eastern and southern Europe.

The Republican national platform of the same year contains this clause:

> For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor, we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and *so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.*

It is apparent that President Wilson is unacquainted with the political history of that period. He challenges Congress with the direct inquiry, "Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter—gone to the country on it and been commissioned to control legislation?"

Yes, Mr. President, the Republican Party did this in 1896. It not only declared for a reading test but for a test embracing the ability to both write and read. They went to the country on it, and in the election which followed were commissioned to control legislation by an overwhelming plurality. Heeding the voice of the people, an immigration bill in 1896 was adopted by both branches of Congress the chief feature of which was the reading and writing test, and this went to President Cleveland during the last days of his administration, and it was returned with his veto on the very day before he went out of office—March 3. And yet, in spite of the shortness of time in which to do so, that bill was taken up by the House of Representatives and passed over the President's veto by a vote of 193 to 37; but no action could be taken upon it in the Senate because of the expiration of the Congress by limitation of law.

It is evident, Mr. President, that the policy of restriction is not new, either to the American people or the American Congress; and I may add incidentally that two years later the Senate of the United States passed another measure containing the literacy test, but that bill failed to receive consideration in the other House because of the pressure of business connected with the War with Spain. Let me again quote the language of the President, when he says:

> Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

Surely the historic facts to which I have called attention must have been overlooked by President Wilson when he penned the lines which I have quoted from his veto message. It is still more remarkable that he is avowedly unwilling to admit that the present Congress fairly represents the thought, feeling, and opinion of the people, though its Members have been in the main selected through the medium of direct elections by the people to whom he refers. But if we must go back to party platforms to ascertain public sentiment, it still appears that the country has already spoken upon this question, and spoken emphatically.

IS RESTRICTION NECESSARY?

Now, Mr. President, I propose to discuss for a little while the question whether or not a general restriction of immigration has become necessary. In doing so I want to say that the Immigration Commission, which recommended this as the one most feasible method of reducing the number of the least desirable classes of immigrants, did not do so with any prejudice against any nationality, against any religious faith, against any class or condition of people that was mentally, physically, and morally sound. They based their recommendation upon the ground that the supply of common labor in the United States was so great that the immigrants were not only competing successfully against American labor but were competing against themselves as well, and to such a degree that they were securing for themselves labor only for a portion of the time, as the result of which they were compelled to live under un-American conditions.

But, coming back to this question, is it necessary? And if necessary in the case of skilled labor, why is it not necessary in the case of unskilled labor if there is such an oversupply that it is creating the same danger that the contract skilled labor would produce if permitted to come in. Mr. President, we want a sufficient number of this class of immigrants to do the rough work of the country. As a rule, the recent immigration represents conditions which can only be improved by coming to this country. We want them in proper numbers, and I am glad to say that in point of age they are admirable. It is undoubtedly true that 85 per cent of those whom we admit are between the ages of 14 and 45, and are capable of doing good work. They are subjected to strict medical examinations. In that way we have succeeded in eliminating those who suffer from diseases that can readily be detected. It is unfortunate, however, that in rejecting the reading test the President has also rejected the most important of the medical examinations—that relating to the mental conditions.

Everybody knows that in the nations of Europe most highly civilized there will be found the highest percentage of insanity, and the evidence taken before the Immigration Commission shows that one of the greatest evils with which we have now to contend is that so many of the aliens admitted become insane and that the asylums in New York and in other seaport cities are unduly crowded with this class. This bill contains a provision for examinations by experts on insanity, and that provision goes down under this veto with every other proposed amendment to existing law that was recommended by the Immigration Commission as a result of their three years' work.

I repeat that we want as many of these people as are necessary to fairly do the work of the country; but it is a cruelty to them as well as to our own people to allow them to come in such numbers as that they will overcrowd one another, as we think they have done.

THE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION—ITS ORGANIZATION AND WORK.

Returning to the question of restrictive immigration legislation, let me say that in 1907 there was a general revision of the immigration laws. The bill was one which I had the honor to introduce in this body. I did not in that bill, as I presented it, include the literacy test. As I have frequently stated, I entered the Senate with the conviction that this country was large enough and broad enough and possessed resources of such magnitude that we would be able to properly care for and assimilate all who would naturally come to improve their condition. I was really very much opposed to the literacy test, although it was strongly advocated by most of my associates, until subsequent study convinced me that it had become vitally necessary. So, I say, when I introduced the bill which became the law in 1907, it did not contain the literacy test; but on the floor of the Senate it was offered—I think by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—as an amendment, and was adopted. The bill went to the House, when that provision was eliminated that there might be a full and impartial investigation of immigration conditions before final action was taken in that direction. The following amendment was substituted for it:

> That a commission is hereby created, consisting of three Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and three persons, to be appointed by the President of the United States. Said commission shall make full inquiry, examination, and investigation by subcommittee or otherwise into the subject of immigration. For the purpose of said inquiry, examination, and investigation, said commission is authorized to send for persons and papers, make all necessary travel, either in the United States or any foreign country, and, through the chairman of the commission or any member thereof, to administer oaths and to examine witnesses and papers respecting all matters pertaining to the subject, and to employ necessary clerical and other assistance. Said commission shall report to the Congress the conclusions reached by it and make such recommendations as in its judgment may seem proper. Such sums of money as may be necessary for the said inquiry, examination, and investigation are hereby appropriated and authorized to be paid out of the "immigrant fund" on the certificate of the chairman of said commission, including all expenses of the commissioners and a reasonable compensation, to be fixed by the President of the United States, for those members of the commission who are not Members of Congress.

It will be seen that an immigration commission with broad powers was provided for, and no limit was placed upon the expense which they might incur in making that study. It consisted of three Senators, appointed by the Vice President, three Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, and three civilians, selected by the President.

The commission at first consisted of Senators DILLINGHAM of Vermont, LODGE of Massachusetts, McLaurin of Mississippi, all of whom were members of the Senate Committee on Immigration. Mr. McLaurin, on his own motion, was excused, and Senator Latimer, of South Carolina, who was also a member of that committee, was appointed in his stead. The Speaker of the House appointed Mr. Howell, of New Jersey; Mr. Bennet, of New York; and Mr. BURNETT, of Alabama. Mr. Howell was the chairman, and the other members on the part of the House of Representatives on the commission were members of the Committee on Immigration of the House of Representatives.

The President of the United States appointed Hon. Charles P. Neill, of Texas, who was then United States Commissoiner of Labor; the next was Prof. Jeremiah W. Jenks, of Cornell University; the other was Mr. William R. Wheeler, of California. After the death of Senator Latimer, Senator Percy, of Mississippi, took his place. That constituted the membership of the commission which made these inquries.

The general scope of the commission's work is well stated on page 14 of their report, as follows:

The main subjects considered in the European inquiry were as follows:

1. Causes of emigration, natural and artificial.
2. Economic conditions in Europe and the effect on emigration to the United States.
3. Steamship companies and their agents as factors in promoting emigration.
4. Classes and character of European emigrants.
5. Emigration of criminals.
6. Attitude of European Governments toward emigration.
7. Laws of the various countries respecting emigration and emigrants.
8. Effect of the United States immigration law in preventing the embarkation of undesirable emigrants.
9. Medical examination of intending emigrants at ports of embarkation and elsewhere, and practicability of having such examinations made by United States medical officers.
10. United States consular officers as a factor in regulating immigration.
11. International regulation of emigration and immigration.

The following was the plan adopted for the work in the United States:

The plan of work under which the field investigations of the commission were carried on contemplated an extensive inquiry into the status of the new immigrants and including the following subjects:

1. Congestion of immigrants in New York, Chicago, Boston, and other large cities.
2. Immigrants as industrial workers in the leading industries, including effect on wages, employment of native-born workers, conditions of work, etc.
3. Effect of recent immigration on wages and other conditions in various trades, from the standpoint of native-born and older immigrant workers in such trades.
4. Progress of immigrant industrial workers.
5. Recent immigrants as residents of industrial communities.
6. Recent immigrants in agriculture.
7. Immigrant children and the children of immigrants in schools.
8. Extent of which recent immigrants and their children are becoming assimilated or Americanized and agencies promoting or retarding Americanization.
9. The physical assimilation of immigrants.
10. Alien criminality.
11. Immigrants in penal and reformatory institutions.
12. Immigrants in institutions for the insane.
13. Immigrants as charity seekers in various cities.
14. Immigrants in charity hospital.

Other features included in the commission's plan of work and which required the collection of original data through field agents were:

1. An inquiry concerning the importation of women for immoral purposes—the "white-slave" traffic.

I may say in this connection that the report which I presented to the Senate upon that subject was the beginning of the movement in this country against that great evil.

2. An investigation of immigrant homes, aid societies, and employment agencies.
3. An investigation of the immigrant bank system, which included also an inquiry relative to the amount of money sent abroad by immigrants.
4. An investigation of conditions under which immigrants are carried at sea.

I omit reading other classes of information that was sought by the commission because of the time it would take to do so and the space it would occupy in the RECORD, but it may be found on pages 15 and 16 of volume 1 of these reports.

FINDINGS AND REPORTS OF COMMISSION.

These reports as completed constitute 41 volumes substantially of the size of the volume I hold in my hand [exhibiting], a summary of all the reports being found in the first two volumes, from one of which I am now reading. In pursuing their work and in securing the information desired the commission's agents came in contact with more than 3,000,000 individuals.

I want to call attention to what the commission have to say regarding the two principal types of immigration, which will be found on page 23 of volume 1. They say:

From 1820 to 1883 more than 95 per cent of the total immigration from Europe originated in the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Switzerland. In what follows the movement from these countries will be referred to as the "old immigration." Following 1883 there was a rapid change in the ethnical character of European immigration, and in recent years more than 70 per cent of the movement has originated in southern and eastern Europe. The change geographically, however, has been somewhat greater than the change in the racial character of the immigration, this being due very largely to the number of Germans who have come from Austria-Hungary and Russia. The movement from southern and eastern Europe will be referred to as the "new immigration." In a single generation Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia have succeeded the United Kingdom and Germany as the chief sources of immigration. In fact, each of the three countries first named furnished more immigrants to the United States in 1907 than came in the same year from the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Switzerland combined.

Then the commission discusses the old and the new immigration in a general way, and says:

The old immigration movement in recent years has rapidly declined, both numerically and relatively, and under present conditions there are no indications that it will materially increase. The new immigration movement is very large, and there are few, if any, indications of its natural abatement. The new immigration, coming in such large numbers, has provoked a widespread feeling of apprehension as to its effect on the economic and social welfare of the country. Because of this the commission's investigations have been mainly directed toward a study of its general status as part of the population of the country.

The old immigration movement was essentially one of permanent settlers. The new immigration is very largely one of individuals a considerable proportion of whom apparently have no intention of permanently changing their residence, their only purpose in coming to America being to temporarily take advantage of the greater wages paid for industrial labor in this country. This, of course, is not true of all the new immigrants, but the practice is sufficiently common to warrant referring to it as a characteristic of them as a class. From all data that are available it appears that nearly 40 per cent of the new immigration movement returns to Europe, and that about two-thirds of those who go remain there. This does not mean that all of these immigrants have acquired a competence and returned to live on it. Among the immigrants who return permanently are those who have failed, as well as those who have succeeded. Thousands of those returning have, under unusual conditions of climate, work, and food, contracted tuberculosis and other diseases.

Further on the commission says:

The old immigration came to the United States during a period of general development and was an important factor in that development, while the new immigration has come during a period of great industrial expansion and has furnished a practically unlimited supply of labor to that expansion.

As a class, the new immigrants are largely unskilled laborers coming from countries where the highest wage is small compared with the lowest wage in the United States.

I may say, in passing, that when I was in Europe with the commission, substantially one-fourth of the entire immigration to the United States came from Italy, and we there learned that the very men who constituted that vast immigration from southern Italy were almost wholly farm laborers and until the emigration movement began had never received more than 25 cents a day for their labor; but owing to the vast number who had come to this country the price had advanced, so that the landowners were then paying substantially 40 cents a day for labor. I proceed with the reading:

About 83 per cent are between the ages of 14 and 45 years, and consequently are producers rather than dependents. They bring little money into the country and send or take a considerable part of their earnings out. More than 35 per cent are illiterate, as compared with less than 3 per cent of the old immigrant class.

It is upon that statement of the percentage of illiteracy that the recommendation for the reading test is based. The reading test will but little affect England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, the Scandinavian States, and Belgium, because, as here stated, the degree of illiteracy among immigrants from these countries is less than 3 per cent; but it will naturally affect the classes of common laborers who come in such vast numbers from eastern and southern Europe as to overcrowd our labor markets. It is a test intended to produce restriction.

INCREASE OF NEW IMMIGRATION.

To what extent has this immigration grown? Is restriction desirable? I have in my hands voluminous tables showing the immigration from Europe, including Asian Turkey, since 1882 by periods, the countries named in order by periods, under division, including the countries in southern and eastern Europe furnishing the greater part of the recent immigration, and countries of western and northern Europe furnishing what is called the old immigration.

It should be remembered that between 1820 and 1882 we had received about 9,000,000 aliens, about 5,000,000 coming prior to the Civil War, and this included the great Irish immigration resulting from the potato famine in Ireland, as well as the German immigration which followed the Civil War, during which time occurred a marvelously great development of the agricultural area of the Central West.

From these tables it appears that in the period 1882 to 1889 the old immigration admitted numbered 3,019,696 and the new immigration only 708,357, making a total of 3,728,053. Now, mark the increase during the next seven years, from 1890 to 1896, inclusive. The new immigration had increased in number and the old immigration had decreased, so that there was very little difference between the two, the old immigration amounting to 1,562,797 and the new immigration to 1,194,189, which combined makes a total of 2,756,986.

But it appears that between 1897 and 1914, a period of 18 years, there was an unprecedented increase in the volume of alien immigration, particularly among the races constituting the new immigration. During that period the old immigration amounted to only 2,983,548, while the new immigration from eastern and southern Europe jumped to 10,057,576.

To recapitulate, the total old immigration for the period of 33 years from 1882 to 1914 has been only 7,566,041, while the total new immigration for the period of 33 years has been 11,960,122. So that the total immigration from Europe, old and now, during that period has been over 19,500,000 souls.

It is utterly impossible that the Nation can receive in so short a time almost 12,000,000 immigrants from non-English speaking nations, over 90 per cent of whom are common labor-

ers, without feeling its influence and without noting a strong impress upon labor and social conditions in the country; and it was because of the changed conditions which the commission discovered in its investigations that the recommendation has been made for the adoption of some measure of restriction.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask leave to insert in the RECORD such portions of the tables which I hold in my hand as may be deemed necessary to illustrate the text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). The Chair hearing no objection, permission is granted.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Immigration from Europe by countries, 33 years (1882–1914).

OLD IMMIGRATION.

Germany	2,219,047
Ireland	1,418,176
England	1,352,307
Sweden	883,286
Norway	478,942
Scotland	357,634
Denmark	221,017
France	185,007
Switzerland	152,204
Netherlands	148,324
Belgium	101,211
Wales	48,886
	7,566,041

NEW IMMIGRATION.

Austria-Hungary	3,934,673
Italy	3,878,074
Russia	3,179,663
Greece	292,111
Turkey in Asia	175,104
Portugal	156,093
Turkey in Europe	136,338
Roumania	82,782
Spain	65,760
Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro	59,524
	11,960,122

Old immigration	7,566,041
New immigration	11,960,122
Total	19,526,163

Immigration from Europe, including Turkey in Asia, since 1882, by periods. Countries named in order by periods under divisions including countries of southern and eastern Europe, furnishing the greater part of the recent immigration, and countries of western and northern Europe furnishing what is called the "old immigration":

Immigration for the 8-year period, 1882–1889.

OLD IMMIGRATION.

Germany	1,150,058
Ireland	530,116
England	522,483
Sweden	312,384
Norway	142,511
Scotland	122,660
Denmark	69,649
Switzerland	63,702
Netherlands	40,778
France	38,652
Belgium	15,740
Wales	10,963
Total	3,019,696

NEW IMMIGRATION.

Austria-Hungary	269,585
Italy	239,905
Russia	172,643
Portugal	13,163
Roumania	5,801
Spain	3,122
Greece	1,765
Turkey in Europe	1,284
Turkey in Asia	1,089
Total	708,357

Immigration for the 7-year period, 1890–1896.

OLD IMMIGRATION.

Germany	521,952
Ireland	320,488
England	229,542
Sweden	198,891
Norway	79,325
Denmark	49,950
Scotland	49,033
Switzerland	33,012
France	29,825
Netherlands	26,663
Belgium	17,086
Wales	7,030
Total	1,562,797

NEW IMMIGRATION.

Italy	408,298
Austria-Hungary	398,740
Russia	334,475
Portugal	20,229
Turkey in Asia	10,529
Spain	7,779
Greece	7,489
Roumania	3,511
Turkey in Europe	3,139
Total	1,194,189

Immigration for the 18-year period, 1897–1914.

OLD IMMIGRATION.

England	600,282
Ireland	567,572
Germany	547,037
Sweden	372,011
Norway	257,106
Scotland	185,941
France	116,530
Denmark	101,418
Netherlands	80,883
Belgium	68,385
Switzerland	55,490
Wales	30,893
Total	2,983,548

NEW IMMIGRATION.

Austria-Hungary	3,266,348
Italy	3,229,871
Russia	2,672,545
Greece	282,857
Turkey in Asia	163,486
Turkey in Europe	131,915
Portugal	122,701
Roumania	73,470
Spain	54,859
Bulgaria, Servia, and Montenegro	59,524
Total	10,057,576

8 YEARS (1882–1889).

Old immigration	3,019,696
New immigration	708,357
	3,728,053

7 YEARS (1890–1896).

Old immigration	1,562,797
New immigration	1,194,189
	2,756,986

18 YEARS (1897–1914).

Old immigration	2,983,548
New immigration	10,057,576
	13,041,124

Total old immigration for the whole three periods, 33 years (1882–1914)	7,566,041
Total new immigration for the whole three periods, 33 years (1882–1914)	11,960,122
Total immigration from Europe, old and new (1882–1914)	19,526,163

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It is very commonly stated that we have not sufficiently guarded the rights of those of foreign nations who seek an asylum in this country, and it is intimated, if not asserted, that a very large proportion of the classes that have been coming have been impelled to do so by political or religious persecution; but the commission did not find that to be the fact. They found that in every instance where they came in contact with the different classes of the new immigration such classes had emigrated to improve their general living conditions. They were induced to come by reason of information received from this country indicating that wages were high; that conditions were favorable; that their advantages would be greater, and in a general way that it would be to their advantage to make the change. They have come to take advantage of these conditions, and for no other purpose. They have returned to their homes in large numbers, as they would not have otherwise done.

I have taken pains to examine the outward movement of these classes from this country during the year 1914, and I find that one out of five of the Armenians, who are supposed to have been more oppressed, perhaps, by Turkey than the people of any other part of Europe—I find that one in five of all who came have returned. Of the Hebrews, I find that in the year 1914, 4,147 returned to Russia on their own motion, willingly and freely; and of the Poles I find that 18,779 returned voluntarily to Russia; and that of the 10,000 Finns 2,250, or one in four, returned. Coming to Austria, and looking at the movement of the Croatians and the Slovenians, who are Slavic races under the domination of Austria, I found that 8,500 went back in the year 1914, substantially one-half of the number coming of that class; and so in the case of Hungary, the Slovaks, who are a Slavic race upon which the Hungarian language is being forced, one of the poorest people of Europe, I found in 1914 that one in three of the number received were returning to their home country. Everything points to the fact that these people have sought admission to the United States because of our superior industrial conditions.

A fact which I think I have before mentioned strengthens my opinion that such is the case, to wit: That 80 per cent of all of whom I am now speaking, who landed at Ellis Island in a full year, had in their possession when they landed railroad tickets from New York to the point of their destination, which indicates that their coming was the result of correspondence and prearrangement with friends already in the United States. Moreover, 94 per cent of all admitted that year reported that they were going to join friends or relatives. This shows for what purpose they had come as well as the agencies through which their journeys had been arranged.

MANUFACTURES AND MINING.

Now, Mr. President, I propose to spend a little time in discussing the work of the commission in its investigation of conditions in the manufactures and in the mining industries of the country, because it was in such investigations that we received the information upon which we based our findings. That investigation was thoroughly organized and covered 37 of the principal industries of the country east of the Rocky Mountains. In pursuing it the commission's agents came in personal touch with 620,000 individual workers. They went into 200 different industrial communities, and made an intensive study of the family conditions in the case of 23,000 families. Of all with whom they came in contact in all the industries of America, 60 per cent were foreign born, and 15 per cent belonged to the second generation. There were only about 20 per cent of Americans of native-born parents employed either in manufacturing or in mining. The leading races so employed were as follows, the number of each being in the order named: Poles, south Italians, north Italians, Hungarians, Lithuanians, and Croatians.

In that investigation we tried to find a really American industrial community, one in which native-born Americans predominated in number, but failed to find such a community at the seats of any of our basic industries.

In the exhaustive investigation of the iron and steel industry the commission's agents came in contact with 86,000 individuals, of whom 57.7 per cent were foreign born and 13.4 per cent were their sons; so that 71.1 per cent of all the employees were either born abroad or were the children of those born abroad. I propose before I finish to give some statistics showing the extent of their employment and the extent of their annual incomes; but before doing so I want to state the net results coming from the investigation of the iron and steel industry.

We found that the average weekly wages paid to the men were not the subject of complaint. They amounted to $14.75 per week; and had the men had constant employment during the year they would have received upon the average $750 as the result of the year's work. As a matter of fact, however, we found that the 86,000 men averaged to receive only $326 instead of the $750, which they would have received at the prevailing rate of wages had they been employed all the time. It indicated that they had employment only one-half the time, upon an average. This results from the fact that the employers like to have a large number of men upon the pay roll in order that there may be no shortage of help in case of rush orders; and then when work is quiet they are able to lay off those not needed and the men are compelled to be idle. In the iron and steel industry this condition prevailed to a greater extent than in any other industry examined; and that furnishes the reason why the amount received upon an average by each of these employees amounted to only $326.

Because of the overcrowded condition of the labor market it appears that the men employed in the bituminous coal industry and in the manufacture of silk and woolens in the United States were compelled to remain idle about one-third of the time; those engaged in the manufacture of leather, clothing, and in oil refining, one-fourth of the time; while those employed in the manufacture of cotton, boots and shoes, and sugar were compelled to lose about one-fifth of their time.

Returning to a consideration of conditions in the steel and iron industries in the Middle West, the commission says:

> In the steel mills of this community it is found that positions of trust and those calling for skilled labor, such as clerks, draftsmen, foremen, switchmen, teamsters, and watchmen, are filled by the Americans, Germans, and Irish, while the positions for unskilled labor, such as unloading, floating gang, etc., are filled by negroes, Poles, Bulgarians, and Macedonians. In the smelting departments the skilled and responsible positions, such as melters, ladlemen, charging-machine men, bricklayers, and chemists, are filled by Americans, Germans, and Irish; while the positions calling for unskilled labor are occupied by Bulgarians and Slovaks. The same is true of the molding departments, where the foundry men, molders, foremen, and carpenters are Americans, Germans, and Irish, and the rammers, helpers, and common laborers are Macedonians, Bulgarians, and Armenians. In the pattern department no races but Americans and Germans are employed, as all the labor in this department is skilled.
>
> In the machinery and power department practically the same condition prevails, as all the occupations, such as blacksmiths, mechanics, pattern makers, electricians, pipe fitters, etc., call for skilled labor, and are occupied by Americans, Irish, and Germans. In the finishing department, where both skilled and unskilled labor is employed, the Americans, Germans, and Irish have the positions calling for skilled labor and the Macedonians, Bulgarians, Turks, Roumanians, and negroes the positions requiring only unskilled labor.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE RACES.

Regarding the relations between the races, I call attention to a statement in volume 9, page 66, which sheds some light upon conditions:

> In addition to not freely associating with one another, there is considerable friction between the Irish, Austrians, and Magyars on the one hand, and the Macedonians, Bulgarians, Roumanians, and other southeastern European and oriental races on the other hand growing out of the conditions under which employment is given. The unskilled and less skilled employees of the steel companies gather each morning at the gates of the different plants and are designated for work by the foremen. There is not much competition between the races so far as unskilled labor is concerned. The southeastern European peoples may be said to be practically without competition there. In the occupations which require some skill, however, and to which a large number of Macedonians and Bulgarians have attained, there is considerable direct competition. The Irish, Magyars, and Austrians frequently adopt the policy of driving the newcomers by force away from the mill gates. Oftentimes the recent arrivals resent such action and a general fight along racial lines ensues, the weapons employed being fists, stones and other missiles, and in some cases revolvers. This tendency is, of course, much intensified in seasons of slack employment or curtailment of work.

And this, I will say, Mr. President, is what the commission found.

> The immigrants, except the English, Germans, Irish, and Welsh, do not associate freely with the natives, but stay largely in the colonies of their fellow countrymen. There is a general dislike on the part of the English-speaking races for the "foreigner."
>
> The Magyars, Poles, and Slovaks are brought more or less into contact with American people and their habits of living. Their children attend the public schools, and they sometimes join trade-unions. With the Bulgarians, Roumanians, and Armenians the situation is different. A few representative men among editors, mercantile proprietors, and educated men live in American sections according to American standards, but the majority of these races are either unmarried or without their families in this country. Very few attend school or are receiving instruction in English. Practically none are members of labor unions. In their present mode of living they have little contact with American churches, schools, or business houses.

EARNING CAPACITY.

I wish now to refer to the entire body of employees in the manufacturing and mining industries of the United States with whom the agents came in contact, and to speak of the thrift, industry, and the earning capacity of these classes. Generally speaking, I find the statement in volume 1, page 413, to be correct. The statement is that upon comparing the yearly incomes of the two classes of immigrants it is seen that the highest average shown by any race of recent immigration is below the lowest average shown by any past immigration. I find, also, that under precisely equal conditions of birth the new immigration is inferior to the old in earning capacity.

Take, first, a study of households, where the native born of foreign father are classified by the race of the father. Among the races of the old immigration of that class the annual earnings were $569, while the annual earnings of the classes belonging to the new immigration were only $415. Then, coming to the actually foreign born, those who were born in northern and western Europe were receiving upon an average $657, while those born in eastern and southern Europe were receiving upon an average only $388; and the latter classes constitute nearly 12,000,000 of our immigration in the last 17 years. It shows that of those who were born abroad the old races are receiving almost twice as much as those of the new races.

I have, also, a table showing the proportional number of the two classes who are householders—that is, men owning homes—by which it appears that the men of the old immigration own homes to an extent twice or three times as great as that of the newer races. I ask leave to insert these tables in the record, or such portions of them as may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hearing no objection, and permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Annual earnings of male heads of families—Per cent of heads of families earnings under $400 each year.

	Per cent.
White of native birth and native father	9.6
Foreign birth	34.1
Old immigration:	
English	9.5
German	16.6
Irish	13.4
Norwegian	13.7
Swedish	3.1
Welsh	18.3
Dutch	18.1
Scotch	13.7
New immigration:	
Armenian	34.1
Croatian	32.3
Greeks	40.0
Hebrews	28.1
North Italian	30.4

New immigration—Continued.	Per cent.
South Italian	42.5
Lithuanian	27.4
Hungarian	35.2
Polish	34.8
Portuguese	48.6
Ruthenian	33.5
Slovak	35.2
Slovenian	24.9
Syrian	37.5

NATIVE BORN OF FOREIGN FATHER, BY RACE OF FATHER.

	Average earnings.
Old immigration:	
Canadian, foreign	$527
Canadian, other	744
Dutch	522
English	586
German	619
Irish	612
Scotch	465
Swedish	557
Welsh	486
Average	569
New immigration:	
Hebrew	492
Italian, north	402
Italian, south	408
Lithuanian	452
Magyar	395
Polish	537
Portuguese	408
Ruthenian	431
Slovak	362
Slovenian	263
Average	415

FOREIGN BORN.

Old immigration:	
Canadian, foreign	538
Danish	674
Dutch	555
English	673
German	579
Irish	636
Norwegian	872
Scotch	703
Swedish	722
Welsh	623
Average	657
New immigration:	
Armenian	454
Brava	426
Bulgarian	255
Croatian	410
Greek	300
Hebrew	513
Italian, north	480
Italian, south	396
Lithuanian	454
Macedonian	232
Magyar	395
Polish	428
Portuguese	410
Roumanian	402
Russian	400
Ruthenian	418
Servian	212
Slovak	442
Slovenian	484
Syrian	370
Turkish	281
Average	388

Per cent of families owning homes, by general nativity and race of head of family.

(Vol. 1, p. 469.)

	Per cent.
Old immigration:	
Danish	50.0
Dutch	70.3
English	15.6
German	39.7
Irish	30.2
Norwegian	50.0
Scotch	33.6
Swedish	44.5
Welsh	51.6
New immigration:	
Canadian, foreign	7.5
Croatian	23.5
Greek	1.5
Hebrew	6.3
Italian, north	27.8
Italian, south	14.9
Lithuanian	18.0
Magyar	13.7
Polish	18.1
Portuguese	19.5
Roumanian	2.6
Russian	1.2
Ruthenian	6.7
Servian	4.4
Slovak	17.6
Slovenian	25.3
Syrian	4.7

EFFECTS OF COMPETITION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I now wish to call attention, while I am upon this subject, to the effect of the competition of recent immigrants upon native Americans and older immigrant employees, found in volume 1, at page 500. I give these pages in order that they may be referred to by any person who is interested in the subject:

If the foregoing characteristics of the immigrant labor supply from southern and eastern Europe be borne in mind, the effect of the influx of recent immigrants upon native American wage earners and those of older immigration from Great Britain and northern Europe may be briefly stated. The remarkable expansion in manufacturing and mining during the past 30 years, by creating a constant demand for a relatively small number of additional places for experienced and trained employees in supervisory and skilled positions, has undoubtedly led to the advancement in the scale of occupations of a relatively small proportion of native Americans and of English, Irish, Scotch, Welsh, and members of other races who constituted the wage-earning classes before the arrival of recent immigrants. On the other hand, the entrance into the operating forces of American industries of such large numbers of wage earners of the races of southern and eastern Europe—

(1) Has exposed the original employees to unsafe and insanitary working conditions and has led to or continued the imposition of conditions of employment which the Americans and older immigrants have considered unsatisfactory and in many cases unbearable.

(2) Has brought about or continued living conditions and a standard of life with which the native American and older employees have been unwilling, or have found it extremely difficult, to compete.

(3) Has led to the voluntary or involuntary displacement from certain occupations and industries of the native American and older immigrant employees.

(4) Has weakened the labor organizations of the original employees, and in some industries has led to their entire demoralization and disruption.

The existence of unsatisfactory working and living conditions because of the competition of the recent immigrant has been due to his lack of industrial training abroad, his tractability or subserviency, and his low standard of living. When the older employees have found unsafe and insanitary working conditions prevailing in the mines and industrial establishments, and have protested, the recent immigrant employees, usually through ignorance of mining or other working methods, have manifested a willingness to accept the alleged unsatisfactory conditions. The southern and eastern European employee also, because of his tractability, necessitous condition, and low standards, has been inclined, as a rule, to acquiesce in the demand upon the part of employers for extra work or longer hours. The industrial workers of recent immigration have also accepted without protest the system of so-called company stores and houses which prevails so extensively in bituminous and anthracite coal, iron-ore, and copper mining and other industrial localities. The impossibility of competition between the older employees and those with standards of living like the standards of the recent immigrants may be readily inferred from what has already been said relative to the methods of domestic economy of immigrant households and the cost of living of their members.

EFFECT ON WAGES AND HOURS OF LABOR.

I call attention also to the effect of the employment of recent immigrants upon wages and hours of work, at page 540, where the commission says:

It has not appeared in the industries covered by this investigation of manufactures and mining that it is usual for employers to engage immigrants at wages actually lower than those prevailing at the time in the industry where they are employed, whatever the ultimate tendency of the large immigration may be. It is hardly open to doubt, however, that availability of the large supply of recent immigrant labor prevented the increase in wages which otherwise would have resulted during recent years from the increased demand for labor. The low standards of the southern and eastern European, his ready acceptance of a low wage and existing working conditions, his lack of permanent interest in the occupation and community in which he has been employed, his attitude toward labor organizations, his slow progress toward assimilation, and his willingness seemingly to accept indefinitely without protest certain wages and conditions of employment, have rendered it extremely difficult for the older classes of employees to secure improvements in conditions or advancement in wages since the arrival in considerable numbers of southern and eastern European wage earners. As a general proposition it may be said that all improvement in conditions and increases in rates of pay have been secured in spite of the presence of the recent immigrants. The recent immigrant, in other words, has not actively opposed the movements toward better conditions of employment and higher wages, but his availability and his general characteristics and attitude have constituted a passive opposition which has been most effective.

LIVING CONDITIONS.

As to the living conditions of these classes, I wish to refer to the report of the commission, in volume 1, page 499, where they are summarized. The commission says:

The standards of living of the recent industrial workers from the south and east of Europe have been low, and the conditions of employment, as well as the rates of remuneration in American industry, have not as a rule constituted to them grounds for dissatisfaction. During the earlier part, at least, of their residence in the United States they have been content with living and working conditions offered to them, and it has only been after the most earnest solicitation, or sometimes even coercion, upon the part of the older employees that they have been persuaded or forced into protest.

The living conditions of southern and eastern Europeans and the members of their household is shown in the detailed studies of the various industries, the most significant indication of congestion and unsatisfactory living arrangements being the low-rent payments each month per capita. The recent immigrant males being usually single, or if married having left their wives abroad, have been able to adopt in large measure a group instead of a family living arrangement, and thereby to reduce their cost of living to a point far below that of the American or older immigrant in the same industry or the same level of occupations. The method of living usually followed is that com-

monly known as the "boarding-boss system." Under this arrangement a married immigrant, or his wife, or a single man, constitutes the head of the household, which, in addition to the family of the head, will usually be made up of 2 to 20 boarders or lodgers. Each lodger pays the boarding boss a fixed sum, ordinarily from $2 to $3 per month, for lodging, cooking, and washing, the food being easily bought by the boarding boss and its cost shared equally by the individual members of the group. Another common arrangement is for each member of the household to purchase his own food and have it cooked separately. Under this general method of living, however, which prevails among the greater proportion of the immigrant household, the entire outlay for necessary living expenses of each adult member ranges from $9 to $15 each month.

Think of that, Mr. President and Senators—from $9 to $15 per month! That describes the living conditions of this class of laborers in the districts to which I have referred.

The commission add:

The additional expenditures of the recent immigrant wage earners have been small. Every effort has been made to save as much as possible. The life interest and activity of the average wage earner from southern and eastern Europe has seemed to revolve principally about three points: (1) To earn the largest possible amount of immediate earnings under existing conditions of work; (2) to live upon the basis of minimum cheapness; and (3) to save as much as possible. The ordinary comforts of life as insisted upon by the average American have been subordinated to the desire to reduce the cost of living to its lowest level.

Mr. President, in view of all these circumstances, and many more to which I might allude, the commission made certain findings and certain recommendations. In volume 1, page 45, the commission say:

OPINIONS OF COMMISSION.

As a result of the investigation the commission is unanimously of the opinion that in framing legislation emphasis should be laid upon the following principles:

1. While the American people, as in the past, welcome the oppressed of other lands, care should be taken that immigration be such both in quality and quantity as not to make too difficult the process of assimilation.

2. Since the existing law and further special legislation recommended in this report deal with the physically and morally unfit, further general legislation concerning the admission of aliens should be based primarily upon economic or business considerations touching the prosperity and economic well-being of our people.

3. The measure of the rational, healthy development of a country is not the extent of its investment of capital, its outputs of products, or its exports and imports, unless there is a corresponding economic opportunity afforded to the citizen dependent upon employment for his material, mental, and moral development.

4. The development of business may be brought about by means which lower the standard of living of the wage earners. A slow expansion of industry which would permit the adaptation and assimilation of the incoming labor supply is preferable to a very rapid industrial expansion which results in the immigration of laborers of low standards and efficiency, who imperil the American standard of wages and conditions of employment.

The commission agrees that:

1. To protect the United States more effectively against the immigration of criminal and certain other debarred classes—

(a) Aliens convicted of serious crimes within a period of five years after admission should be deported in accordance with the provisions of House bill 20980, Sixty-first Congress, second session.

(b) Under the provisions of section 39 of the immigration act of February 20, 1907, the President should appoint commissioners to make arrangements with such countries as have adequate police records to supply emigrants with copies of such records, and that thereafter immigrants from such countries should be admitted to the United States only upon the production of proper certificates, showing the absence of convictions for excludable crimes.

(c) So far as practicable the immigration laws should be so amended as to be made applicable to alien seamen.

(d) Any alien who becomes a public charge within three years after his arrival in this country should be subject to deportation, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Vermont permit the Chair to seek some information from him?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Gladly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the State where I live we have had lately a meeting protesting against the immigration bill. Among other things, the charge was sent to me in the form of resolutions to present to the Senate, that in the investigations which the Senate Members and the House Members had made, at no time had any representatives of the foreign nations been called before them except the toilers, the laborers. The commission, it was said, had none of their intelligent people before them who could speak for them, and they seemed to attach much importance to that.

While I recognize, as a Senator from Illinois, that the matter is not now before the Senate, I should like very much to have the present Senator's views, owing to his long connection with this subject, as to whether those are facts or whether those are grievances without foundation in fact.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, the investigation to which I have been referring was conducted by trained men. The commission had a very large body of men, selected because of their intelligence and their character and their training, as investigators. We sent them out into all of these industrial communities with instructions not to overdraw nor underdraw conditions but to present them just as they found them. In that connection, if anyone who is interested in the matter will look in the closing pages of volume 2 of the report, he will find copies of all of the blanks, all of the cards, all of the instrumentalities employed by the commission upon which and through which they secured the information they sought.

For instance, in the iron and steel industry the corporations aided us in distributing those cards among the heads of families and among their male workers, and such cards were received by our agents signed by the individuals. The results secured on those cards were compiled, and the results are found in large number in the volumes of the report of the commission, and the commission's findings are based upon the general result.

In the case of the families a really intensive study of family conditions was made by our agents, not only through the statements made by the families, but by going to the grocery stores where they traded, taking the individual accounts, and finding what the purchases were each month, of what they consisted, and the prices paid. This is only a general statement of the methods of the commission in doing that work.

When that work, which was really scientifically conducted, was completed invitations were issued to all the various representative bodies of the different races to present to the commission their views; and in these reports will be found the papers that were filed by the leaders of the leading races of immigrants in the United States. It never has been claimed to us that there was a lack of opportunity on the part of any of them to be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to thank the Senator.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Now, resuming, Mr. President, the report of the commission makes quite a good many recommendations which are not pertinent to the question I am discussing to-day, but which for the continuity of the story it may be well to have appear, and, with the permission of the Senate, I will insert them in the RECORD:

2. Sufficient appropriation should be regularly made to enforce vigorously the provisions of the laws previously recommended by the commission and enacted by Congress regarding the importation of women for immoral purposes.

3. As the new statute relative to steerage conditions took effect so recently as January 1, 1909, and as the most modern steerage fully complies with all that is demanded under the law, the commission's only recommendation in this connection is that a statute be immediately enacted providing for the placing of Government officials, both men and women, on vessels carrying third-class or steerage passengers for the enforcement of the law and the protection of the immigrant. The system inaugurated by the commission of sending investigators in the steerage in the guise of immigrants should be continued at intervals by the Bureau of Immigration.

4. To strengthen the certainty of just and humane decisions of doubtful cases at ports of entry it is recommended—

That section 25 of the immigration act of 1907 be amended to provide that boards of special inquiry should be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, and that they should be composed of men whose ability and training qualify them for the performance of judicial functions; that the provisions compelling their hearings to be separate and apart from the public should be repealed; and that the office of an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor to assist in reviewing such appeals be created.

5. To protect the immigrant against exploitation; to discourage sending savings abroad; to encourage permanent residence and naturalization; and to secure better distribution of alien immigrants throughout the country—

(a) The States should enact laws strictly regulating immigrant banks.

(b) Proper State legislation should be enacted for the regulation of employment agencies.

(c) Since numerous aliens make it their business to keep immigrants from influences that may tend toward their assimilation and naturalization as American citizens, with the purpose of using their funds, of encouraging investment of their savings abroad, and their return to their home land, aliens who attempt to persuade immigrants not to become American citizens should be made subject to deportation.

(d) Since the distribution of the thrifty immigrant to sections of the country where he may secure a permanent residence to the best advantage, and especially where he may invest his savings in farms or engage in agricultural pursuits, is most desirable, the division of information should be so conducted as to cooperate with States desiring immigrant settlers; and information concerning the opportunities for settlement should be brought to the attention of immigrants in industrial centers who have been here for sometime and who might be thus induced to invest their savings in this country and become permanent agricultural settlers. The division might also secure and furnish to all laborers alike information showing opportunities for permanent employment in various sections of the country, together with the economic conditions in such places.

6. One of the provisions of section 2 of the act of 1907 reads as follows:

"*And provided further*, That skilled labor may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country."

Instances occasionally arise, especially in the establishment of new industries in the United States, where labor of the kind desired, unemployed, can not be found in this country and it becomes necessary to import such labor. Under the law the Secretary of Commerce and Labor has no authority to determine the questions of the necessity for importing such labor in advance of the importation, and it is recommended that an amendment to the law be adopted by adding to the clause cited above a provision to the effect that the question of the necessity of importing such skilled labor in any particular instance may be determined by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor upon the application of any person interested prior to any action in

that direction by such person; such determination by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to be reached after a full hearing and an investigation into the facts of the case.

7. The general policy adopted by Congress in 1882 of excluding Chinese laborers should be continued.

The question of Japanese and Korean immigration should be permitted to stand without further legislation so long as the present method of restriction proves to be effective.

An understanding should be reached with the British Government whereby East Indian laborers would be effectively prevented from coming to the United States.

8. The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, and therefore demand legislation which will at the present time restrict the further admission of such unskilled labor.

I call attention especially to their eighth recommendation or finding. They say:

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, a condition which demands legislation restricting the further admission of such unskilled labor.

In this connection I want to say that their report was coincided in by every member of the commission; it was absolutely unanimous. Then the commission makes the further suggestion:

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

(a) A sufficient number be debarred to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

(b) As far as possible the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough, by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living, to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

(c) As far as possible the aliens excluded should also be those who by reason of their personal qualities or habits would least readily be assimilated or would make the least desirable citizens.

It will be observed, Mr. President, that in these suggestions the commission is not recommending exclusion of any nationality or any class excepting those who are least desirable. They are not charging that the new immigration as a whole is undesirable, but that the immigration as a whole needs reduction, and for the purpose of securing that reduction they recommend that legislation be so framed as to exclude a portion of those who are least desirable among them as a whole.

The commission adds that the following methods of restricting immigration have been suggested.

(a) The exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language.

(b) The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.

(c) The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.

(d) The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.

(e) The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.

(f) The material increase of the head tax.

(g) The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of men with families.

READING TEST.

All these methods would be effective in one way or another in securing restrictions in a greater or less degree.

Then they say:

A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

I am betraying no secret of the commission when I say that eight out of the nine members of the commission made that recommendation. Mr. Bennett, of New York, filed a separate report under the head "Views of the minority." It may be found on page 49 of volume 1. Then the commission adds:

The commission as a whole recommends restriction—

In that Mr. Bennett joined—

The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations, furnishes in its report reasons for such restriction, and points out methods by which Congress can attain the desired result, if its judgment coincides with that of the commission.

It will be observed that the recommendation of the commission is that the reading and writing test is the most feasible single method of restricting the least desirable element in this recent immigration.

The bill does not provide for a reading and writing test, but simply provides that those over 14 years of age in order to be admitted shall be able to read in some language, not the English language necessarily, but shall be required to read in some language, a test that is perfectly reasonable, a test which it seems to me can not be considered unreasonable by any person in any foreign land who has character and stamina enough to make a good citizen of the United States if admitted. It is something which such a person can easily acquire.

But how would such a test as that operate? What classes will it reach? I have read extensively from the reports of the commission to show that it is among those employed in the basic industries that the overcrowding occurs—that it is among those classes that the living conditions are insanitary and un-American, and that almost invariably such conditions exist among the classes of immigration that come from eastern and southern Europe, and not among those from the nations of northern and western Europe.

When we come to examine the record of those who have been admitted to the United States during the last 11 years, between 1899 and 1909, during which we have received many millions of immigrants, the statistics show that the degree of illiterates of the old classes—Great Britain, Germany, the Scandinavian States, Belgium, Holland, and France—is only 2.7, while, on the other hand, the average degree of illiteracy among the new immigrants is about 35.6 per cent. So the reading test, if it operates at all, will operate almost entirely upon the classes who produce the overcrowded conditions to which I have referred, and who are found living under the conditions which are so deplorable.

So it was that the commission looked upon the reading test as the one most feasible single method of reaching the least desirable classes among the vast immigration which, in the main, is made up of strong men, of men who can be made exceedingly useful under proper conditions, but who when unemployed are not only undesirable, but a menace to good order.

In this connection I ask leave to introduce a table showing the degree of illiteracy of each of the nationalities:

Relative degree of illiteracy of the old and new immigration during period of 11 years, 1899–1909.

Over 14 years of age:	
Admitted—	
Old	7,199,060
Per cent illiterate	1,983,618
	2.7
New	5,215,442
Per cent illiterate	35.6

Percentage of illiterates of different races admitted to the United States during the 11 years, 1899–1909, inclusive.

Over 14 years of age:	Per cent.
Scandinavian	0.4
Scotch	0.7
English	0.7
Welsh	1.1
Irish	2.0
Dutch	2.7
German	4.7
French	5.4
Southern Italy	5.4
Polish	54.2
Hebrew	35.4
Slovak	25.7
Northern Italy	24.6
Hungarian	11.8
Croatian and Slovenian	11.4
Magars	36.4
Russian	11.4
	34.7

RESTRICTION SHOULD APPLY TO THE LEAST DESIRABLE CLASSES.

Who are the least desirable individually? Among those mentioned by the commission as being least desirable are those who are least readily assimilated into American life. In this connection permit me to read briefly from volume 1, pages 38 and 39, where the commission say:

Like most of the immigration from southern and eastern Europe, those who entered the leading industries were largely single men or married men unaccompanied by their families.

That is a point which can not be too strongly emphasized. I will give figures before I have completed my remarks, indicating how largely that is true.

There is, of course, in practically all industrial communities a large number of families of the various races, but the majority of the employes are men without families here and whose standard of living is so far below that of the native American or older immigrant workman that it is impossible for the latter to successfully compete with them. They usually live in cooperative groups and crowd together. Consequently, they are able to save a great part of their earnings, much of which is sent or carried abroad. Moreover, there is a strong tendency on the part of these unaccompanied men to return to their native countries after a few years of labor here. These groups have little contact with American life, learn little of American institutions, and aside from the wages earned profit little by their stay in this country. During their early years in the United States they usually rely for assistance and advice on some member of their race, frequently a saloon keeper or grocer, and almost always a steamship ticket agent and "immigrant banker," who, because of superior intelligence and better knowledge of American ways, commands their confidence. Usually after a longer residence they become more self-reliant, but their progress toward assimilation is generally slow. Immigrant families in the industrial centers are more permanent and usually exhibit a stronger tendency toward advancement, although, in most cases, it is a long time before they even approach the ordinary standard of the American or the older immigrant families in the same grade of occupation. This description, of course, is not universally true, but it fairly represents a great part of the recent immigrant population in the United States. Their numbers are so great and the influx is so continuous that even with the remarkable expansion of industry during the past few years there has been created an oversupply of unskilled labor, and in some of the industries this is reflected in a curtailed number of working days and a consequent yearly income among the unskilled workers

which is very much less than is indicated by the daily wage rates paid; and while it may not have lowered in a marked degree the American standard of living, it has introduced a lower standard which has become prevalent in the unskilled industry at large.

Again, on page 106 of volume 7, the commission say:

The south Italians are slow in becoming Americanized, and many in the coal regions who have been in this country from 15 to 20 years are scarcely able to speak English. They live in colonies, have very little association with natives, and show little interest outside of their own immediate neighborhood. They are suspicious of Americans, do not trust their money to the banks, and trade at American shops as little as possible. They are making little progress toward Americanization. Each year the south Italians are investing more money in homes and real estate, and in becoming property owners they are naturally led to take more interest in civic affairs. Even after the south Italian, however, has made his permanent home in the Southwest he seems to make little effort to adopt American ways. He does not encourage his children in attending school, but takes them away at an early age, thus preventing the second generation from having the opportunity of becoming assimilated. The children hear only Italian spoken in the colony and in the home, and their only opportunity to learn English is at school.

The Poles, Slovaks, and Magyars are almost as backward as south Italians, but are more popular with natives. They are very slow in learning to speak English and associate little with people outside of their own races. No civic interest is shown, and a very small percentage are naturalized.

* * * * * * *

Mexicans show less progress than any other immigrants. They have adopted no American ideas or customs, but live as they do in their own country. Although many of the Mexicans in the coal mines of Oklahome were born in the United States, they are little nearer Americanization than those directly from Mexico.

I will not take the time to read more from this report, although I might do it with profit.

This great body of immigrants, concerning which I have spoken, is almost wholly made up of unskilled laborers, and are coming in such vast numbers that they are overcrowding labor at the bases of the great industries.

As evidence of this, let me call attention to the fact that of the Italians admitted, 85.4 per cent have been common or farm laborers; of the Hebrews, 32.9 per cent—they are largely classed as skilled laborers and most of them work in the clothing manufactories of the country. But coming to the Polish, one of the most numerous classes, 93.7 per cent are either common or farm laborers; of the Slovak, 95.6 per cent; of the north Italian, 79.6 per cent; of the Magyars, 91.4 per cent; of the Croatians and Slovenians, 95 per cent; of the Greeks, 92.3 per cent; of the Lithuanians, 93.3 per cent; of the Ruthenians, 79.5 per cent; of the Bulgarian, Montenegrin, and Servian, 96.7 per cent; of the Finnish, 94 per cent; of the Roumanian, 97.3 per cent; of the Portuguese, 93.7 per cent.

It thus appears that taking all these races together the percentage of that class goes considerably above 90 per cent, and yet with all the industry of the Bureau of Distribution, with all the inducements that are held out by the farmers of America, in spite of all the advantages the aliens might enjoy if they would go to the country districts, it is utterly impossible to turn any one of them away from the group with which he is admitted and of which he forms a part. All recent immigrants move in racial groups, and the group from one locality follows the group which last left that locality. So you will find one particular race largely predominating in one place and another particular race largely predominating in another, but they are all at the centers of industries.

NO INTENTION TO BECOME CITIZENS.

Another of the least desirable classes which the commission thought might well be restricted is the class who have come here without having an intention of becoming citizens of the United States.

Senators will remember that it has always been the policy of our Government to encourage the admission of families. It is an admitted fact in our civilization that the family is the basic unit upon which good citizenship finds its best development. When a European immigrant is accompanied by his family it is evident that he has come to cast his lot with ours, to become a part of us, to enjoy our privileges, and to share in our responsibilities. It is the man who comes with his family who becomes a valuable asset in the American system; and it follows that if any are to be excluded it should be those who, though married, leave their wives in Europe.

I have before me a table covering those who have been in the United States more than 10 years. That I may be entirely fair in my discussion of the characteristics of the different race and nationalities, I have confined myself in this examination to those classes of immigrants who have been residents of the United States long enough so that their intentions and purposes can be clearly determined.

Of those who have become citizens of the United States, there have been of the Danish, 77.3 per cent; of the Dutch, 64.7 per cent; of the English, 67 per cent; of the French, 64.8 per cent; of the German, 81.5 per cent; of the Irish, 80 per cent; and of the Norwegian, 77.5 per cent.

Compare these percentages with those representing those classes which constitute the new immigration. Of the Polish who have resided in the United States 10 years or over, 39.8 per cent have become naturalized citizens; of the Slovaks, 25.3 per cent; of the north Italians, 49.3 per cent; of the south Italians, 34 per cent; of the Hungarians, 26.9 per cent; of the Croatians, 26.8 per cent; of the Slovenians, 35.3 per cent; and of the Russians, 33.6 per cent.

It will be seen from these figures that there are about three times as many from those nationalities constituting the old immigration who become naturalized citizens as there are from the same number of individuals among the races from eastern and southern Europe.

I have, Mr. President, another table showing the citizenship of employees who have been in the United States for different periods of time, from 5 to 10 years, and for a period of 10 years or over, which I ask leave to insert in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

CITIZENSHIP.

Citizenship of employees who have been in the United States for different periods of time (Vol. I, pp. 485–489), page 488.

Per cent of those who have been here from 5 to 9 years having first papers only:

Old immigration:	
Danish	45.6
Dutch	31.7
English	42.4
French	31.5
German	40.2
Irish	30.8
Scotch	32.1
Swedish	57.3
Welsh	46.2
Norwegian	59.0
New immigration:	
Armenian	24.1
Bohemian and Moravian	46.5
Croatian	11.4
Finnish	30.1
Greek	12.8
Russian Hebrew	44.4
Other Hebrew	42.0
Italian, north	21.5
Italian, south	14.1
Lithuanian	10.3
Hungarian	15.2
Polish	11.3
Portuguese	1.6
Roumanian	10.9
Russian	11.2
Ruthenian	10.3
Servian	6.4
Slovak	8.6
Slovenian	22.6
Spanish	2.2
Syrian	10.8

Of the total number, 32,142, who had a residence here of from 5 to 9 years 6.2 per cent were fully naturalized.

The lack of political or civic interest of southern and eastern European wage earners is shown by the percentage of fully naturalized representatives of some of the principal races with a residence of 10 years or longer:

Croatian	26.8
Hebrew, Russian	48.3
Italian, north	49.3
Italian, south	34.0
Lithuanian	41.1
Magyar	26.9
Polish	39.8
Russian	33.6
Slovak	25.3

PERCENTAGE PLAN AS A MEASURE OF RESTRICTION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Another plan suggested by the commission for restricting immigration was the limitation of the number admitted of each nationality arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race resident in continental United States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. At the time this report was made there was no basis upon which to submit an estimate of the operation of such a proposition if enacted into law; but the census of 1910 disclosed by nationalities the number of each in this country in that year. With that before us we are able to make an estimate at this time of how such a test as that might apply and what results would follow. Although it has not been discussed in the Senate or elsewhere, it may be of interest to call attention to the plan, and I will do so as briefly as possible.

Some time during the present Congress—I do not remember just when—I introduced an immigration bill into this body containing this proposition. That bill has not yet been considered by the Committee on Immigration, though I hope it may

be; but the salient feature of the restrictive measure in that bill was this:

Provided, That the number of aliens of any nationality who may be admitted to continental United States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico in any fiscal year shall be limited to 10 per cent of the number of such persons of such nationality resident in continental United States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico at the time of the United States census next preceding; but the minimum number of aliens of any nationality admissible in any fiscal year shall not be less than 5,000.

Then follow various conditions regulating the admission of aliens under the principle of a 10 per cent basis upon the number of each of those nationalities resident here in the last preceding census year.

This proposition has caused some comment, and it may be of interest to the Senate to observe what its operation might be. I have before me a comparative statement showing the number of aliens admitted to the United States in 1913, by countries, the number who would have been admitted under the literacy test, and the number who would have been admitted under the percentage test.

Take southern and eastern Europe. The number of aliens admitted for 1913, by countries, from that section amounted to 896,553. The approximate number of this class who would have been admitted under the literacy test in 1913 is 614,082, and the approximate number who would have been admitted under the 10 per cent test, which I have suggested, is 529,553. In other words, the number admitted that year would have been decreased under the literacy test 31.5 per cent, and under the percentage test 40.9 per cent.

In the immigration coming from northern and western Europe the results would be unique. The number admitted from Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom was 182,886. The number of those who would have been admitted under the literacy test is 171,267, and under the percentage test 658,311. That is to say, there would have been an allowable increase in the number coming from those countries representing the races of the old immigration of 260 per cent under the percentage test. It will be remembered that, while the number coming from those nations in the last 30 years has been relatively small when compared with the number coming from eastern and southern Europe, there are so many in numbers representing the races of the old immigration resident in the United States who were admitted years ago that the percentage system would not operate to cut down the number of admissions from those countries. I will make that clear as I proceed.

As over 90 per cent of the immigrant aliens from the southern and eastern group came from the three countries, Russia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary, a comparison similar to the one above confined to these three countries is interesting:

Number admitted 1913:

Russia	291,040
Italy	265,542
Austria-Hungary	254,825
Total	811,407

Literacy test:

Russia	210,796
Italy	151,825
Austria-Hungary	197,796
Total	560,417

Decrease, 31 per cent.

Percentage test:

Russia	173,520
Italy	134,426
Austria-Hungary	167,195
Total	475,141

Decrease, 41 per cent.

Thus it will be seen, there would have been a considerable difference between the number admitted under these two tests from Russia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary. The literacy test would have cut down the immigration from these three countries from 811,408 to 560,417, or 31 per cent. The percentage test would have cut down the immigration from these three countries from 811,408 to 475,141, or 41 per cent.

It thus appears, taking the year 1913 as an illustration, that the actual immigration from each one of the countries comprising the southern and eastern Europe group would be cut down by the application of the principle in the percentage test, with the exception of that from Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania, and that the cut would be greatest in the number of immigrant aliens admitted from Russia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary, which three countries furnished in 1913 over 75 per cent of the immigration to this country from all the countries in Europe, not only those in the southern and eastern group but those in the northern and western group as well. To indicate the large number of immigrants coming from these three last-mentioned countries, and how effective the 10 per cent system would prove in reducing such immigration, it may be stated that the decrease in the number of immigrants admitted from Russia and Austria-Hungary alone would be greater by 20,000 than the whole number of immigrants admitted from all the countries of the northern and western group. And yet the adoption of this system would not reduce or restrict the immigration from any country in northern or western Europe except Belgium.

To recapitulate: Basing computation upon the immigration of 1913, the literacy test would have reduced the number admitted from Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro, Greece, Italy, Partugal, Roumania, Russia, Spain, Turkey in Europe, and Turkey in Asia, 31.5 per cent, while the percentage test would have reduced the immigration of those countries 40.9 per cent; on the other hand, the literacy test would have reduced the number of immigrants from the northern and western group, including the United Kingdom, Germany, and Scandanavian States, France, Belgium, Switzerland, and the Netherlands only 6.4 per cent. Under the percentage test the number coming from the last-named countries might have been increased 2,304,090.

TABLE A.—*A comparative statement showing the number of aliens admitted to the United States in 1913 by countries, the number who would have been admitted under the literacy test, and the number who would have been admitted under the percentage test.*

SOUTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

Country.	Number of aliens admitted for 1913, by countries.	Approximate number who would have been admitted under literacy test in 1913.	Number of aliens admissible under 10 percentage test.
Austria-Hungary	254,825	197,796	167,195
Bulgaria			5,000
Servia	1,753	1,072	5,000
Montenegro			5,000
Greece	22,817	17,280	10,151
Italy	265,542	151,825	134,426
Portugal	14,171	5,856	6,696
Roumania	2,155	1,437	6,592
Russia	291,040	210,796	173,520
Spain	6,167	4,947	5,000
Turkey in Europe	14,128	9,524	5,000
Turkey in Asia	23,955	13,549	5,973
Total	896,553	[1] 614,082	[2] 529,553

[1] Decrease (literacy test), 31.5 per cent.
[2] Decrease (10 per cent system), 40.9 per cent.

NORTHERN AND WESTERN EUROPE.

Belgium	7,405	7,074	5,000
Denmark	6,478	6,275	18,230
France	9,675	7,894	11,836
Germany	34,329	28,460	250,398
Netherlands	6,902	6,661	12,014
Norway	8,587	8,485	[2] 23,724
Sweden	17,202	16,956	66,806
Switzerland	4,104	3,640	12,506
United Kingdom	88,204	85,822	257,797
Total	182,886	[1] 171,267	[2] 658,311

[1] Decrease (literacy test), 6.35 per cent.
[2] Allowable increase (10 per cent system), 260 per cent.

So it will be seen that, under the percentage test, western and northern Europe would not be affected at all; in fact, they would be entitled to come in much larger numbers than they have done in the past; but, on the other hand, the numbers coming from eastern and southern Europe would be quite a little less than under the literacy test.

UNSKILLED WORKMEN UNACCOMPANIED BY WIVES.

The commission also suggested that the exclusion of unskilled workmen who come unaccompanied by their wives and families might be desirable, and for that reason I call particular attention to the result of my examination of the character of the immigration during the period from 1899 to 1910, inclusive.

I have already stated, Mr. President, how desirable it is that if we are to receive immigration from foreign countries it shall consist of those who come with the definite purpose to remain and who as evidence of such purpose bring their wives and children with them. To how large an extent have males

predominated among the races coming from eastern and southern Europe during the 12-year period 1899–1910, inclusive?

Of those coming from south Italy, 78.6 per cent were males; of the Hebrews, 56.6 per cent; of the Polish, 69.5 per cent; of the Slovaks, 70.5 per cent; of those from north Italy, 78.3 per cent; of the Hungarians, 72.2 per cent; of the Croatians, 84.9 per cent; of the Slovenians, 70.5 per cent; of the Greeks, 95.1 per cent; and of the Lithuanians, 70.6 per cent. In this fact—that from 75 to 80 per cent of this entire immigration were males—we find a reason for the deplorable living conditions discovered by the commission, and a reason why these races do not become assimilated to American institutions.

Now, Mr. President, I call attention to what seem to me to be astounding facts, facts that ought to startle the American people and lead them to seriously consider the future of the Nation. During the last five years, 1910–1914, 2,337,557 foreign-born males, 14 years of age or over, have been admitted to the United States from southern and eastern Europe, more than 90 per cent of whom were unskilled workmen. Of this vast number 1,234,531, or 52.9 per cent, were single men and 1,102,631, or 47.1 per cent, were married men.

But the startling fact appears that of this vast body of married men, 39 per cent had left their wives abroad, and we are compelled to recognize the fact that 70.1 per cent of all the males over 14 years of age coming in the last five years and numbering 2,337,557 are leading single lives. These facts will more fully appear from the following table:

TABLE B.—*Table showing the number of males, 14 years of age or over, coming to the United States in the last five years, 1910–1914, from southern and eastern Europe, by countries, the number of single men, the number of married men, and the number who were widowed or divorced.*

Nationality.	Males 14 years or over.	Single.	Married.	Widowed or divorced.
South Italian	658,732	314,883	337,685	6,164
Polish	342,824	196,086	145,370	1,368
Hebrew	211,007	125,705	82,440	2,862
Greek	170,833	117,872	52,915	46
Russian	130,375	59,224	71,009	142
North Italian	121,652	70,375	50,427	850
Croatian and Slovenian	115,990	54,191	61,188	611
Ruthenian	84,189	37,222	46,697	270
Hungarian	76,771	21,525	52,417	2,829
Slovaks	75,419	29,218	45,863	338
Lithuanian	58,203	42,995	14,962	246
Bulgarian, Montenegrin, and Servian	53,405	19,123	33,785	497
Roumanian	51,924	11,825	39,409	295
Finnish	33,030	23,778	9,046	206
Spanish	31,602	20,473	10,824	305
Portuguese	26,348	13,107	12,934	307
Armenian	25,034	14,025	10,878	131
Bohemian and Moravian	21,929	13,249	8,454	226
Syrian	21,303	15,382	5,543	378
Dalmatian, Bosnian, and Herzegovinian	19,327	11,471	7,769	87
Turkish	7,660	4,620	3,016	24
Total	2,337,557	1,216,349	1,102,631	18,182

Single, widowed, or divorced, 1,234,531, or 52.9 per cent.

Married, 1,102,631, or 47.1 per cent.

Applying the percentages of the married men who reported leaving their wives abroad, by races, as found by the commission's study of the immigrants in mining and manufacturing, to the actual number of married men over 14 years of age coming to the Untied States during the last five years, it will appear that 431,553 of the whole number, 1,102,631, should really be classed with those leading single lives, 39 per cent of them as appears in the following table:

Five years, 1910–1914.

Nationality.	Males.	Per cent reporting leaving wives abroad.	Number leaving wives.
South Italian	337,685	36.9	134,606
Polish	145,370	23.0	33,405
Hebrew	82,440	12.5	10,305
Greek	52,915	74.7	39,528
Russian	71,009	45.5	32,309
North Italian	50,427	31.6	15,935
Croatian and Slovenian	61,188	46.5	28,452
Ruthenian	46,697	44.4	20,933
Hungarian	52,417	43.3	22,697
Slovak	45,863	34.2	15,885
Lithuanian	14,962	23.3	3,486
Bulgarian, Montenegrin, and Servian	33,785	76.9	25,981
Roumanian	39,409	73.9	29,123
Finnish	9,046	17.6	1,592
Spanish	10,824	3.6	390
Portuguese	12,934	15.9	2,057
Armenian	10,878	50.8	5,526

Five years, 1910–1914—Continued.

Nationality.	Males.	Per cent reporting leaving wives abroad.	Number leaving wives.
Bohemian and Moravian	8,454	8.1	685
Syrian	5,543	35.0	1,940
Dalmatian, Bosnian, and Herzegovinian	7,769	[1] 27.0	2,097
Turkish	3,016	83.6	2,521
Total	1,102,631		431,553

[1] Thirty-nine per cent of married males.

Single men	1,216,349
Widowed or divorced	18,182
Married, leaving wives abroad	431,553
Leading single lives	1,666,084

Seventy and one-tenth per cent o all the males over 14 years of age coming in the last 5 years, 2,337,557.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does that mean that these men had deserted their families?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Not necessarily; no. Many of them returned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They were maintaining their homes on the other side of the water?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Undoubtedly; and many of them returned. But what is the condition in this country where there has been an influx of such a vast number of unskilled male laborers, 86 per cent of whom are leading single lives and living under the boarding-boss system, with perhaps 20 in a family? Of course these people who have failed to bring their families have no children in our public schools. The common schools, the great agency in this country for bringing the newcomers in contact with the old, can not serve their purpose as an assimilating agency under such conditions. These people live in parts of cities hardly ever invaded by the old residents. What does this mean? It means that this vast body of people are living, as I have indicated, under conditions which are undesirable, with no interest in the municipality where they reside, no pride in the State where they find their employment, and, as a rule, knowing very little of and having no interest in the General Government of which we are so proud and so fond.

I have in this connection, Mr. President, a table showing the percentage of those who, being married men, reported to the commission that they had left their wives in Europe, which I ask may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

EMPLOYED IN MANUFACTURES.

Men who reported to the commission that their wives were abroad:

	Per cent.
German	4.3
English	3.4
Irish	1.2
Swedish	5.3
Scotch	3.2
Welsh	1.4
Dutch	3.8
Danish	3.2
Average	3.2
Polish	23.0
Slovak	34.2
South Italian	36.9
Hungarian	43.3
North Italian	31.6
Croatian	59.3
Lithuanian	23.3
Russian	45.5
Bohemian, Moravian	8.2
Hebrew, Russian	12.5
Finnish	17.6
Portuguese	15.9
Greek	74.7
Austrian	27.0
Average	32.2

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mark the difference between the nationalities which constitute the old and the new immigration.

APPLICATION OF THE READING TEST.

Mr. President, the reading test, to which I have referred, will apply substantially as follows: I will take the immigration of the last 11 years as a basis for the discussion.

During that time we admitted substantially 7,000,000 aliens. Of the old immigration 2.7 per cent would have been excluded, and of the new immigration, amounting to 5,215,000, 35.6 per cent would have been excluded.

Let me say also that in comparison with other means of restriction the literacy test is essentially humane to the immigrating classes of Europe. It is so simple and direct that the right of a person to admission into the United States can be determined in advance, and it will not subject individual immigrants to that uncertainty and loss which would attend a less definite method of restriction.

I venture, also, to suggest that the requirement that one be able to read in some language is not unreasonable. The ability to read in one's own language is not a difficult acquirement, particularly in the case of a person who in point of intelligence or character will make a desirable citizen, and the effort that might be required is not too high a price to pay for the benefits which will accrue to the individual in securing for himself the American standard of living and wages. Not only that, but the application of this test will prove a benefit to the countries from which they come, because it will stimulate elementary education among the masses.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks I wish to call attention to what seems to me to be a most remarkable condition in this country, disclosed by the last census, and one which must not be overlooked. It indicates a danger to which we should not close our eyes—a fact of which the President could have had no knowledge when preparing his veto message.

It is a startling fact that in the census year 1900 there were found within our borders 900,000 foreign-born male whites, 21 years of age or over, who had taken no steps to become citizens of the United States, but who, under our naturalization laws, were entitled to do so at once.

The census of 1910 discloses the alarming fact that in a single decade the number of foreign-born males who were over 21 years of age and who had then taken no steps to become citizens of the United States had increased from 900,000 to 2,260,000.

What does this vast increase signify? What does the presence in the United States of 2,260,000 male whites of foreign birth of more than 21 years of age portend?

While it is not probable that such results will follow, it is possible for this entire body to become naturalized citizens of the United States within a period of five years. Should that be done, who can measure the influence of the addition of this vast number of voters upon the policies and the progress of our Nation?

Do you realize that 2,260,000 men represent a number equal to one-seventh of the entire vote cast in the United States in the presidential election of 1912?

The possibilities suggested by the presence in this country of this vast number of prospective voters can be better understood when I call attention to the fact that the entire presidential vote of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas in the election of 1912 amounted only to about 2,280,000, while this body of prospective citizens in the United States in 1910 numbered 2,260,000. Further comment is unnecessary.

Mr. President, I am strongly impressed with the conviction that the time has come when the policy of restricting immigration by means of a literacy test should be inaugurated. It is a policy that was demanded as early as 1896 by both parties of the Nation. It is a policy which has been approved by affirmative legislation by three separate Congresses of the United States, chosen by the people of the Nation at three several elections, and this is conclusive evidence that the subject is one which has met the "conscious and universal assent of the American people."

And yet the President of the United States says:

> Let the platforms of the parties speak out on this policy, and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

Woman Suffrage.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURTON L. FRENCH,
OF IDAHO,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 18, 1915.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave that has been granted to me I am placing in the RECORD remarks made by myself before the Committee on Election of the President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress upon H. R. 9393, "A bill to protect the rights of women citizens of the United States to register and vote for Senators of the United States and Members of the House of Representatives."

That my remarks may be better understood, I shall insert here a copy of the bill itself:

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

I can not claim originality in the preparation of this measure, for a bill involving the same principle is now pending in the Senate, introduced by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. SHAFROTH, and at numerous times bills involving the same principles as applied to the election of the Members of the House of Representatives have been presented.

I offered the bill at the request of the United States Federal Suffrage Association, an organization made up of men and women from all parts of the United States, among whom are found many distinguished lawyers, which oragnization for more than 20 years has urged upon Congress that the grant to Congress by the Constitution of the control of the manner of electing the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives is broad enough to authorize Congress to grant by legislation to the women of the United States the right of suffrage as respects the election of Senators and Members of the House. My remarks before the committee were made on March 24, 1914, and are as follows:

"Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as I understand it the committee at this time desires to hear some statement with regard to the constitutional features of the bill and not so much with regard to the general question of the advisability of extending the franchise to women throughout the United States. The bill itself is very similar to one introduced by myself in the last Congress, and at the time the hearings were held upon it I spoke somewhat with regard to the operation of woman's suffrage in the State that I represent, and in other committee meetings I have spoken with regard to the advisability of extending woman's suffrage from the broad standpoint and not from the technical constitutional standpoint of this particular bill. That being the case, I want at this time to call attention to a few features of the Constitution and to a few decisions that it seems to me have a bearing upon this particular measure. Mr. Chairman, whether or not this bill is constitutional must be determined by the express or implied powers and limitations placed upon the Congress of the United States and upon the States themselves by the Constitution. There is no line in that great instrument that says that women of the States shall not have the right of suffrage; there is none that says they shall have that right; there is none that says that men shall have the right of suffrage, and there is none that says that men shall not have that right. It is important in considering this question to outline what the Constitution really does say on this question. Section 2 of Article I of the Constitution provides:

> "The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States.

"It further says in section 2, Article I, that—

> "The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

"The Constitution further says in section 4 of the same article that—

> "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof.

"Further, it says:

> "But the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senators.

"Beyond that is the general power conferred upon each Congress to be the judge of the qualifications and elections of its own Members. These, gentlemen, are the essential parts of the Constitution upon which you must base your decision as to the validity of the proposed measure. The Constitution declares, first, that Members of Congress shall be chosen by the people; second, that the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature; third, that Congress may determine by law the manner of their election; and, fourth, that each House is made the judge of the qualifications and election of its Members.

"Now, let us turn to the first guaranty, that 'Members of Congress shall be chosen by the people.' The important point to be determined here is who are the people. If women are not included as a part of the people, then manifestly we need go no further. Who, then, are the people? At the time of the adoption of the Constitution slaves were not included, apparently, as a part of the people and Indians who were not taxed were not

included, apparently. With regard to slaves, the Dred Scott decision clearly points that out. In section 2, Article I, of the Constitution, it is provided that the representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States upon the basis of the number of free persons, excluding Indians who are not taxed and three-fifths of all other persons—that is, slaves. More than that, Congress immediately, from the beginning, in the enactment of naturalization laws, recognized women of the white race as a part of the people. Congress from the very beginning recognized women as a part of the people and as citizens.

"The United States guarantees to citizens of one State the right to bring suit against citizens of another State, and the courts have uniformly held that that same guaranty pertains to women just as much as it pertains to men. Who, then, were included? Why, men were included and women were included, and men were included no more than women. Both free men and free women were people within the meaning of the Constitution when it was framed. Both were citizens. The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States declared that—

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States.

"That amendment did not seek to modify the status of women. Women are already citizens. That amendment applies, and was intended to apply, to negroes, although it is broad enough to include not only negroes but people of the yellow or brown races, people of the white race, and men and women of all races. The fact is that it was not necessary to pass the amendment so far as the white race was concerned. Both men and women of that race were citizens, and both were people within the meaning of the Constitution. (See Dred Scott decision.)

"In the well-known case of Minor *v.* Happersett (21 Wallace), this very question was considered. In 1874 Mrs. Virginia M. Minor, a citizen of Missouri, attempted to vote, but was denied the privilege. She brought an action in the courts of the State and finally, on appeal, carried the question to the Supreme Court of the United States. In that case the Supreme Court, after discoursing on how the Congress has recognized women as citizens, says:

"Other proof of like character might be found, but certainly more can not be necessary to establish the fact that sex has never been made one of the elements of citizenship in the United States. In this respect men have never had an advantage over women. The same laws precisely apply to both. The fourteenth amendment did not affect the citizenship of women any more than it did of men. In this particular, therefore, the rights of Mrs. Minor do not depend upon the amendment. She has always been a citizen from her birth and entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizenship. The amendment prohibited the State of which she is a citizen from abridging any of her privileges and immunities as a citizen of the United States; but it did not confer citizenship on her. That she had before its adoption.

"Of course the members of the committee know that the court decided that the contention of Mrs. Minor could not be sustained, but it was not because of the fact of anything within the Constitution, and it was not upon her raising her claim to vote under any law enacted by Congress similar to this granting to women generally the right to vote. The proponents of this measure urge that the authorization was in the Constitution at that time if Congress had seen fit to enact a law, but Congress had not done so, and it was in the absence of a statute upon the subject that the court made that decision.

"The CHAIRMAN. Did the court base its decision upon that ground?

"Mr. FRENCH. No, sir; the court did not go into that particular question. The court, as I recall it, let its decision turn more especially on what it contended was the fact that suffrage was not necessarily a component part of citizenship.

"The CHAIRMAN. That is what I thought.

"Mr. FRENCH. However, there are decisions that are counter to that and that suggest a different view.

"I submit that one of the basic elements of political conditions in any country such as ours is the right to have a part in the government of that country, or, in other words, the right of suffrage.

"What, then, do we have? First, that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens.

"Second. That sex is not an element of citizenship.

"It follows, then, that without the necessity of any further constitutional amendment the pending measure is constitutional, unless within the Constitution itself there may be some limitations upon the Congress.

"I have already called attention to the chief provisions upon which those rely who insist that this measure is not constitutional. They insist that since the States may fix the qualifications of electors for the most numerous branch of the State legislatures, these qualifications become at once the qualifications of those who may vote for Members of Congress. This would be true if there were not another limitation placed upon the States in the form of a power conferred upon the Congress. That limitation, in part, lies in the words, 'The Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter' the regulations of States touching the 'manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives.' Gentlemen of the committee, when that particular clause was considered in the course of framing the Constitution in the Constitutional Convention, the first draft of it simply gave the Congress the power to 'make' the laws. After it had been referred to the committee for final revision, the committee seemed to be controlled by the idea that that power was not broad enough as conferred upon Congress and feared that after the States had themselves passed laws Congress would not be permitted to modify or amend those laws. I think that contention or fear was not sound. Nevertheless, in the abundance of caution which was in their minds, the committee rewrote the clause and inserted in it the privilege of 'altering' the regulations of the States touching the manner of holding the elections of Senators and Representatives.

"The CHAIRMAN. What does the word 'manner' there mean?

"Mr. FRENCH. I will come to that. I would say right now that right in that word there is wrapped up all there is involved in this particular question. The question involved is not one that has been passed upon fully by the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, under this provision of the Constitution the Federal Congress has not enacted much legislation that has brought cases to the Supreme Court that would to a very voluminous extent outline or define more particularly the meaning of the framers of the Constitution. I think the very first act of Congress that was passed under this clause of the Constitution was in 1842, when it was provided that Members of Congress should be elected from districts and not from the States themselves in mass. Another important law under this provision of the Constitution was passed in 1872, when the time was fixed for the election of Members of Congress. Other important acts of Congress under this provision probably include the one that the chairman of this committee reported within a recent Congress providing for the purification of elections in the United States so far as those elections concern Members of Congress.

"Aside from those laws, my judgment is that the only other important laws ever passed by Congress under this particular clause of the Constitution were laws that were passed during and following the Civil War and that had to do with the rights of persons who participated in the Civil War in opposition to the Union. It must also be said that all of those laws that were passed by the Congress, as urged in the forum of public opinion throughout the country and as urged before the Supreme Court by counsel, undoubtedly were modified by prejudice upon the part of people in the North and by prejudice upon the part of just as earnest people in the South. Here is a question, however, that need not involve that question. It is true that in part there is involved the same authority that Congress relied upon when it enacted the legislation that was considered then, but it is a question that need not involve the North or the South, but we may, all untrammeled by prejudices on account of former positions, consider candidly the constitutionality of this measure. What, then, is the meaning of the language of the Constitution? How broad is the language and what is meant by it? The relative power of the Government and the States has been the subject of much consideration. It was a subject of discussion when the question of ratifying the Constitution was debated in the conventions of the several States convened for the consideration of the question.

"I think, from an examination of the debates that occurred in the different conventions of the States convened for the purpose of ratifying the Constitution, that in nearly every one of them that particular paragraph was debated most earnestly—the paragraph that gave to Congress the power to make or alter, etc. I have examined the opinions of the prominent men who were instrumental in urging the ratification of the Constitution with that particular amendment included in it, and there is no doubt that there was jealousy upon the part of the States of the power of the Federal Government. But, on the other band, there is no doubt that among profound thinkers there was a strong feeling that the Government itself ought to be given the power to control the general manner of conducting elections in this country. That question was debated in the Virginia convention. In that convention James Madison, who was one of the framers of the Constitution, declared that the manner of

holding elections was properly reserved to the Federal Government. He said:

"Should the people of any State by any means be deprived of the right of suffrage, it was judged proper it should be remedied by the Federal Government. It was found to be impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments, as being best acquainted with the true situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution. And considering the State governments and the General Government as distinct bodies, acting in different and independent capacities for the people, it was thought that the particular regulations should be submitted to the former—that is, to the States—and the general regulations to the latter—

"That is, to the General Government. For further consideration of this feature, I call attention in this connection to Elliott's Debates, pages 366 and 367.

"Now, that is what Madison thought. He declared that should the people of any State by any means be 'deprived of the right of suffrage' it was judged proper that it should be 'remedied by the Federal Government'; and he pointed out the place where this power to remedy was lodged in the Constitution. He pointed it out as the paragraph conferring upon Congress the power to regulate the manner of electing Senators and Representatives. He was quite willing that minor regulations, 'particular regulations,' to use his exact words, should be left to the States. This might include age; it might include property qualifications; it might include length of residence in a voting precinct; and it might include a multitude of minor matters that the States thought important. But he thought that the general regulations should be left to the Federal Government. He thought that if the people of any State by any means were to be deprived of the right of suffrage it was judged proper it should be remedied by the Federal Government. This he included under the heading 'General regulations.'

"Suppose a State were to pass a law denying suffrage generally to the citizens of the State, in so far as it concerns the election of Members of Congress, and conferring it upon, say, members of certain professions, such as lawyers, professors in universities, and members of the ministry. Would it not be under this clause of the Constitution that the citizens of our country would rely in seeking relief, in connection with that other clause in section 2 of Article I, which declares that the House of Representatives shall be chosen by the people? Or, rather, would it not have been so prior to the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments? The fact is that the suggestion or illustration I have made is not an unreasonable one. Go, if you please, to Japan, a country that has a splendid Government and that recognizes suffrage in a very extensive manner, but at the same time provides that in the Parliament there shall sit members who are the representatives of learned bodies, universities, etc. The Japanese people believe that these people have superior qualifications for the administration of governmental affairs.

"Now, suppose, I say, that in one of the States of this Union this idea should so impress itself upon the people of the State or the legislative body that in that State they should limit suffrage as it pertains to the election of the legislature and so to the election of Members of Congress—that is, to the Senate and the House—to lawyers and to professors in universities and to the ministry. Under what clause of the Constitution would the people of that State ask that their rights be protected? We do not have a parallel to that in the actual experience of this country, but I submit that it is within the reasonable bounds of possibiliy that it might occur, and I submit, further, that it was to prevent just such an occurrence as that that Madison and the other framers of the Constitution felt that the Federal Government should be clothed with the general power of regulating the manner of holding elections.

"But the court has said in the case of Minor *v.* Happersett, heretofore referred to, that the fourteenth amendment did not affect the citizenship of women any more than it did the citizenship of men. So would it not be possible for the citizens of our country to claim their rights through the constitutional guarantee alone that Members of the House of Representatives shall be chosen by the people? And would the Congress not invoke the authority of Article I, section 4, conferring upon it power to determine the manner of holding elections, to say that the rights of the people shall be protected? If so, would that be carrying the definition of the word 'manner' further than is proposed in the pending bill? Absolutely not.

"I do not rely upon my own reasoning. A few cases have been considered by the Supreme Court of the United States that involve in some degree the question of the extent to which the Congress may go in determining the meaning of the word 'manner' and the inherent right that exists in the Federal Government to deal broadly with the question of suffrage as it concerns those who may participate in the election of Members of Congress. Likewise the Congress itself in election cases has given some attention to this matter and in the passage of bills bearing upon the rights of people within the United States touching suffrage.

"In the case entitled 'Ex parte Yarbrough' (110 U. S., 651) there is much in the opinion of the court that is highly interesting. In that case Yarbrough and certain associates were charged in the indictment with conspiracy to intimidate a negro in the exercise of his right to vote for a Member of Congress, and in the execution of their conspiracy they wounded and otherwise maltreated him.

"It is true that this case arose out of the amendment to the Constitution conferring suffrage upon the negro race, but much that was said by the court is pertinent to this question. In that case counsel had insisted upon express authority in the Constitution, and the court restated the contention and then answered it:

"Because there is no express power to provide for preventing violence exercised on the voter as a means of controlling his vote, no such law can be enacted. It destroys at one blow, in construing the Constitution of the United States, the doctrine universally applied to all instruments of writing, that what is implied is as much a part of the instrument as what is expressed. This principle, in its application to the Constitution of the United States, more than to almost any other writing, is a necessity, by reason of the inherent inability to put into words all derivative powers—a difficulty which the instrument itself recognizes by conferring on Congress the authority to pass all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution the powers expressly granted and all other powers vested in the Government or any branch of it by the Constitution. (Art. I, sec. 8, clause 18.)

"We know of no express authority to pass laws to punish theft or burglary of the Treasury of the United States. Is there, therefore, no power in the Congress to protect the Treasury by punishing such theft and burglary?

"Further on in the decision the court said:

"It is not true, therefore, that electors for Members of Congress owe their right to vote to the State law in any sense which makes the exercise of the right to depend exclusively on the law of the State.

"Counsel for petitioners, seizing upon the expression found in the opinion of the court in the case of Minor *v.* Happersett (21 Wall., 162), that 'the Constitution of the United States does not confer the right of suffrage upon anyone,' without reference to the connection in which it is used, insists that the voters in this case do not owe their right to vote in any sense to that instrument.

"But the court was combating the argument that this right was conferred on all citizens, and therefore upon women as well as men.

"In opposition to that idea it was said that the Constitution adopts as the qualification for voters for Members of Congress that which prevails in the State where the voting is to be done; therefore, said the opinion, the right is not definitely conferred on any person or class of persons by the Constitution alone, because you have to look to the law of the State for the description of the class. But the court did not intend to say that when the class or the person is thus ascertained his right to vote for a Member of Congress was not fundamentally based upon the Constitution, which created the office of Member of Congress and declared it should be elective, and pointed to the means of ascertaining who should be electors.

"Again, in that opinion the court said, in reference to the right conferred upon the negro by the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution:

"This new constitutional right was mainly designed for citizens of African descent. The principle, however, that the protection of the exercise of this right is within the power of Congress is as necessary to the right of other citizens to vote as to the colored citizen, and to the right to vote in general as to the right to be protected against discrimination.

"The exercise of the right in both instances is guaranteed by the Constitution and should be kept free and pure by congressional enactments whenever that is necessary.

"And again:

"But it is a waste of time to seek for specific sources of the power to pass these laws. Chancellor Kent, in the opening words of that part of his Commentaries which treats of the Government and constitutional jurisprudence of the United States, says:

"'The Government of the United States was created by the free voice and joint will of the people of America for their common defense and general welfare. Its powers apply to those great interests which relate to this country in its national capacity, and which depend for their protection on the consolidation of the Union. It is clothed with the principal attributes of political sovereignty, and it is justly deemed the guardian of our best rights, the source of our highest civil and political duties, and the sure means of national greatness.' (1 Kent's Com., 201.)

"It is essential to the successful working of this Government that the great organisms of its executive and legislative branches should be the free choice of the people as that the original form of it should be so. In absolute governments, where the monarch is the source of all power, it is still held to be important that the exercise of that power shall be free from the influence of extraneous violence and internal corruption.

"In a republican government, like ours, where political power is reposed in representatives of the entire body of the people, chosen at short intervals by popular elections, the temptations to control these elections by violence and by corruption is a constant source of danger.

"Such has been the history of all republics, and, though ours has been comparatively free from both of these evils in the past, no lover of his country can shut his eyes to the fear of future danger from both sources.

"If the recurrence of such acts as these prisoners stand convicted of are too common in one quarter of the country, and give omen of danger from lawless violence, the free use of money in elections, arising from the vast growth of recent wealth in other quarters, presents equal cause for anxiety.

"If the Government of the United States had within its constitutional domain no authority to provide against these evils, if the very sources of power may be poisoned by corruption or controlled by violence and outrage, without legal restraint, then, indeed, is the country in danger, and its best powers, its highest purposes, the hopes which it inspires, and the love which enshrines it, are at the mercy of the combinations of those who respect no right but brute force, on the one hand, and unprincipled corruptionists on the other.

"Bearing upon the power of Congress to enact legislation that has to do with the exercise of the right of suffrage and the right of citizens to be protected, I call the committee's attention to the case of Ex parte Clarke (100 U. S., 103) and to the case of Wiley *v.* Sinkler (179 U. S., 62). In the latter case the court said:

"The right to vote for Members of the Congress of the United States is not derived merely from the constitution and laws of the State in which they are chosen, but has its foundation in the Constitution of the United States.

"I also call the committee's attention to Ex parte Siebold (100 U. S., 383), in which the court, in discussing this general question, gave expression to its view of the power of Congress in the following language:

"So in the case of laws for regulating the elections of Representatives to Congress. The State may make regulations on the subject; Congress may make regulations on the same subject or may alter or add to those already made. The paramount character of those made by Congress has the effect to supersede those made by the State, so far as the two are inconsistent, and no further. There is no such conflict between them as to prevent their forming a harmonious system perfectly capable of being administered and carried out as such.

"And again:

"If Congress does not interfere, of course, they may be made wholly by the State; but if it chooses to interfere, there is nothing in the words to prevent its doing so, either wholly or partially. On the contrary, their necessary implication is that it may do either. It may either make the regulations or it may alter them. If it only alters, leaving, as manifest convenience requires, the general organization of the polls to the State, there results a necessary cooperation of the two Governments in regulating the subject. But no repugnance in the system of regulations can arise thence, for the power of Congress over the subject is paramount. It may be exercised as and when Congress sees fit to exercise it. When exercised, the action of Congress, so far as it extends and conflicts with the regulations of the States, necessarily supersedes them. This is implied in the power to 'make or alter.'

"And again:

"It is the duty of the States to elect Representatives to Congress. The due and fair election of these Representatives is of vital importance to the United States. The Government of the United States is no less cerned in the transaction than the State government is.

"And further:

"This power to enforce its laws and to execute its functions in all places does not derogate from the power of the State to execute its laws at the same time and in the same places. The one does not exclude the other, except where both can not be executed at the same time. In that case the words of the Constitution itself show which is to yield. 'This Constitution, and all laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof, * * * shall be the supreme law of the land.'

"But let us see how Congress has construed the power conferred upon it of directing the manner of holding elections. The House of Representatives in the Twenty-eighth Congress, in the election case of Botts *v.* Jones, from Virginia (Hinds' Precedents, Vol. I, p. 811) considered this question. Votes were cast for the contestant, Butts, and they were thrown out upon the ground that they were votes cast by persons of foreign birth, who, while they had taken the oath of fidelity to the Commonwealth of Virginia, and consequently were eligible to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, were not citizens of the United States. The Congress evidently felt that they were not 'people of one of the several States,' even though they were citizens of Virginia and eligible to vote. The committee making the report was not unanimous. The majority, however, contended that the power of the Federal Government to enact naturalization laws was a limitation upon the provision of the Constitution defining electors of Members of Congress as those who were eligible to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The minority report earnestly contended that the Constitution gave to the States the power to confer the right to vote—just as people have urged since, that it has—notwithstanding the naturalization provision of the Constitution. The majority report was sustained. And I would say further that until the constitutional amendment No. 14 was passed there never was in the Constitution or amendments a definition of 'citizens' within the United States, and yet the House of Representatives, following the election, refused to recognize as controlling that guaranty to the States, that they had the right to fix the qualifications of those who could vote for Members of Congress as those who were eligible to vote for members of the most numerour branch of the State Legislature of Virginia.

"Oh, but it is urged Congress took this position because of that other clause of the Constitution which confers upon each House the right to be the judge of the qualifications and elections of its own Members. The Constitution says, article 1, section 5, 'Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members.' Those who take this position that the House acted upon its authority contained in that paragraph will hardly contend that the language used is any broader than the language used in article 1, section 4, that confers upon the Congress the power at any time to 'make or alter such regulations' touching the 'manner' of holding elections.

"If the language is not broader, and it strikes me that it is not, then it means either that Congress does have the right in a large sense to determine who shall be eligible to vote for Members of Congress, the same as many believe section 4 of article 1 means, or else the House arbitrarily refused to seat the Member and relied upon no higher authority than its 'will' or 'decree' in a matter from which there was no appeal.

"Another case that is most interesting as involving the question of how far the Congress may go in passing laws abridging the suffrage of people as regards voting for Members of Congress who are eligible to vote in the several States for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature is the Kentucky election case of McKee *v.* Young in the Fortieth Congress. (Hinds, Vol. I, p. 451.) Upon the face of the returns Young received the majority of the votes cast. In the contest against him it was established to the satisfaction of the committee that Young was not himself entitled to membership in the House of Representatives because of his having been under the disqualification of aiding those who were in arms against the United States. It was urged, however, that the votes that were cast for Young were in large part the votes of soldiers who had participated in the rebellion, and that these votes ought not to be counted, and if not counted that McKee be seated.

"Congress some two years before this case was considered, or on March 3, 1865, had passed an act which decitizenized by their own voluntary act certain persons who had deserted from the military or naval service of the United States. Of the votes that were cast for Young and which were rejected were 625 votes of former Confederate soldiers and 8 votes of deserters from the Union forces. Kentucky had not been the subject of reconstruction legislation; Kentucky had not seceded from the Union, and the persons I have referred to, including those who had served in the Confederate Army and those who had deserted from the Union Army, were eligible to vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the Kentucky State Legislature. It was vehemently urged that the constitutional guaranty touching the eligibility of those who might be permitted to vote for Members of Congress was being violated. It was urged most strongly that the Constitution gave to the States the power to determine who should vote for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In the minority report from the Committee on Elections, Messrs. Kerr and Chanler, in referring to these votes, declared, 'They were still, under the constitution and laws of Kentucky, qualified electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, and had as much right to vote for a Member of Congress under the Constitution of the United States as the candidates themselves.'

"In spite of this the Congress of the United States upheld the act of Congress of March 3, 1865. In spite of this the House rejected all of these votes, 633 in number, of persons who were eligible to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature of Kentucky. Mr. McKee was awarded his seat in Congress.

"Here is a case in which the Congress by law did limit the right of suffrage notwithstanding the guarantee to the several States and to those eligible to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Here is a case in which the House affirmed, in spite of bitter contentions, the power of Congress so to act, and the right of the House to inquire not only into the qualifications and elections of persons presenting themselves to membership in the House, but to inquire, in the broad sense, into the qualifications of those who voted for the candidates for Congress under an act that the Congress had passed.

"The bill that I have introduced involves the same principle of whether or not the Congress may assume under the Constitution to define in a general way those who may be entitled to vote for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"Would not the act of Congress of March 3, 1865, be regarded as the result of the exercise by Congress of what Madison termed the power of 'general regulation' conferred upon Congress and would not the present bill fall in the same class?

"If this Congress is clothed with the power to determine the manner of election of Members of the Senate and the House, if each body is clothed with the power to be the sole judge of the qualifications and elections of Members that may constitute each body, and if, as I have shown, one or the other of these

great bodies has absolutely refused to recognize as entitled to membership in the Congress men elected by persons who were qualified to vote in the States in which their votes were cast, for the members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, may we not conclude that Congress has already passed upon this question so far as the broad principle may be concerned and has determined that it has far more authority than those who are urging against this measure are willing to concede?

"Indeed, if the Congress has the power, each body acting by itself, to reject the credentials of men who claim to be elected by the votes of people who are eligible to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislature of the State in which their vote has been cast, may we not suppose that in the interest of orderly system alone the Congress would have the power prior to the casting of the votes to declare what votes would be regarded in the election of a Member of either House or Senate? Surely this would be in the interest of orderly procedure, and such a course as this would mean that every State would understand what votes would and what would not be regarded as satisfactory in supporting the credentials of a Member elected to either body.

"Touching the opinion of Congress as indicated by later expressions of opinion found in committee reports, I beg to call the attention of the committee to the majority and minority report in the Fifty-third Congress on H. R. 2331, a bill for the repeal of Federal election laws. The report is No. 18, and and Mr. Tucker, in presenting the majority report, strongly contends for the greatest latitude touching the right and conditions of suffrage as resting in the States.

"Mr. Johnson, of North Dakota, who presented the minority report, reviews the other side of the question very fully, and points out some of the views entertained by those who had to do with the writing of the Constitution and some of the views that have been entertained by the courts since that time.

"The report of Senator LODGE, when a Member of the House in the Fifty-first Congress, first session, upon H. R. 11045, report No. 2493, likewise reviews the question with great care. The report does not pretend to touch upon the question of the right of women to vote under the Constitution. It deals with the power of Congress under the clause conferring upon Congress the right to make or alter laws touching the manner of elections.

"Let me quote briefly a few excerpts from the report:

"This necessary power is found in section 4, Article I, of the Constitution of the United States, which is as follows:

"'The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.'

"The language employed in this section is so plain that it would seem almost superfluous to enter into argument or discussion as to its meaning. If words mean anything those just quoted mean that the power of Congress over the conduct of elections of Members of this body is absolute and complete. The Constitution says that Congress may make all regulations in regard to the election of Representatives, and the power to 'make regulations' thus conferred is in terms exclusive and paramount. But out of abundance of caution the framers of the Constitution went further and added to the word 'make' the words 'to alter'; that is, under the Constitution Congress has power to assume complete control of elections of its Members and conduct them at such times and places and through such officers and under such rules as it may see fit. On the other hand, Congress may under this clause leave the entire regulation of the election of Representatives to the States, or it may take a partial control of a part of the necessary procedure and leave what remains to the State, or it may alter and amend the State regulations and supervise and enforce their execution.

* * * * * * *

"And again:

"On the contrary, as already said, we think it clear that the clause of the Constitution relating to the regulation of such elections contemplates such cooperation whenever Congress deems it expedient to interfere merely to alter or add to existing regulations of the State. If the two Governments had an entire equality of jurisdiction there might be an intrinsic difficulty in such cooperation. Then the adoption by the State government of a system of regulations might exclude the action of Congress. By first taking jurisdiction of the subject the State would acquire exclusive jurisdiction in virtue of a well-known principle applicable to courts having coordinate jurisdiction over the same matter. But no such equality exists in the present case. The power of Congress, as we have seen, is paramount, and may be exercised at any time and to any extent which it deems expedient; and so far as it is exercised, and no further, the regulations effected supersede those of the State which are inconsistent therewith.

"And again:

"On a matter of such importance, however, it will not be amiss to cite a few controlling authorities and to show that the power of Congress in regard to the election of Representatives is not only paramount but that it can be exercised to any degree, from total control downward, which Congress may deem wise. In the convention of 1787, on the 9th of August, Mr. Pinckney and Mr. Rutledge moved to strike out the words which in the draft then before the convention conferred this power upon Congress. The motion was lost, apparently, without a division, and, if we may judge from Mr. Madison's notes, had no serious support in the convention. The remarks made, however, in opposition to the motion of Mr. Pinckney show clearly the view taken of this clause by the framers of the Constitution and the paramount character of the power conveyed by it, although in the draft then under consideration the clause was much less sweeping than it afterwards became in the instrument as adopted.

"I want to call attention briefly to some of the objections to this bill.

"Mr. MAPES. May I ask you a concrete question?

"Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

"Mr. MAPES. Whether the gist of your argument is that the fourteenth amendment was not necessary to authorize Congress to pass a law to the same effect as the fourteenth amendment?

"Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I think not; the fifteenth amendment, not the fourteenth.

"Mr. MAPES. The race, color, or previous condition of servitude amendment?

"Mr. FRENCH. The fifteenth amendment, not the fourteenth. I think the fourteenth was necessary, but I think that the fifteenth amendment can very properly be classed as surplusage, and that is was passed as an overabundance of assurance to the negro race at that particular time.

"Mr. MAPES. In your opinion, Congress could have passed a law to the same effect and it would have been constitutional?

"Mr. FRENCH. That is my judgment of it. That is a question that is not necessarily original with me; at the same time, it is a view of the question that I have concurred in. The constitutionality of this bill does not necessarily rest upon the fourteenth amendment. It rests upon the other provisions of the Constitution to which I have referred.

"It is urged that this bill is not constitutional because of the fourteenth amendment granting to slaves the right of citizenship. The fact is that that is not a parallel case. At the time the Constitution was framed slaves were not permitted to vote in any State of the Union, they were not citizens, while on the other hand women were citizens of all States and were permitted to vote in at least one State—I am reminded that it was in two States—but at least in the State of New Jersey they were permitted to vote until 1807, whereas negroes, who were slaves, were not permitted to vote in any State.

"I want in this connection to insert, in brief, the qualifications of suffrage in all the States.

"When the Federal Constitution was adopted, all the States, with the exception of Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. These two continued to act under their charters from the Crown. Upon an examination of those constitutions we find that in no State were all citizens permitted to vote. Each State determined for itself who should have that power. Thus, in New Hampshire, 'every male inhabitant of each town and parish with town privileges, and places unincorporated in the State, of 21 years of age and upward, excepting paupers and persons excused from paying taxes at their own request,' were its voters. In Massachusetts 'every male inhabitant of 21 years of age and upward, having a freehold estate within the Commonwealth of the annual income of £3, or any estate of the value of £60.' In Rhode Island 'such as are admitted free of the company and society' of the colony. In Connecticut such persons as had 'maturity in years, quiet and peaceable behavior, a civil conversation, and 40 shillings freehold or £40 personal estate,' if so certified by the selectmen.

"In New York 'every male inhabitant of full age who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State for 6 months immediately preceding the day of election * * * if, during the time aforesaid, he shall have been a freeholder, possessing a freehold of the value of £20 within the county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of 40 shillings, and been rated and actually paid taxes to the State.' In New Jersey 'all inhabitants * * * of full age who are worth £50, proclamation money, clear estate in the same, and have resided in the county in which they claim a vote for 12 months immediately preceding the election.' In Pennsylvania 'every freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in the State 2 years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election.' In Delaware and Virginia 'as exercised by law at present.' In Maryland 'all freemen above 21 years of age having a freehold of 50 acres of land in the county in which they offer to vote and residing therein, and all freemen having property in the State above the value of £30 current money, and having resided in the county in which they offer to vote 1 whole year next preceding the election.' In North Carolina, for senators, 'all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants of any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of election, and possessed of a freehold within the same county of 50 acres of land for 6 months next before and at the day of election,' and for members of the house of commons 'all freemen of the age of 21 years who have been inhabitants in any one county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of any election, and shall have paid public taxes.'

"In South Carolina 'every free white man of the age of 21 years, being a citizen of the State and having resided therein 2 years previous to the day of election, and who hath a freehold of 50 acres of land, or a town lot of which he hath been legally seized and possessed at least 6 months before such election; or (not having such freehold or town lot), hath been a resident within the election district in which he offers to give his vote 6 months before said election, and hath paid a tax the preceding year of 3 shillings sterling toward the support of the Government'; and in Georgia such 'citizens and inhabitants of the State as shall have attained to the age of 21 years, and shall have paid tax for the year next preceding the election, and shall have resided 6 months within the county.' (Minor *v.* Happersett, 88 U. S., pp. 172–173.)"

Physicians' Prescriptions.

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. YOUNG,

OF NORTH DAKOTA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 18, 1915.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a bill has been introduced into the Legislature of North Dakota providing that the prescriptions of all physicians shall be written in English. I presume there was a time when such a law might have been necessary. There was a time when the standards of ethics in the medical profession were not as high as they are now. Even the younger men here can remember when the doctor handed out a prescription in a mysterious way, containing the words "hydrocarbonate" and "aqua pura," meaning sugar and water. Or perhaps the prescription included the words "magnesium sulphate," which is high brow for epsom salts.

At that time we had a great many more quacks in the medical profession than we have now. I have a profound respect and admiration for the medical profession, and would not want to be understood as criticizing them. No one, however, despises a quack more than does an honest practitioner. A quack has been defined in the Century Dictionary as follows:

> One who make vain and loud protestations; one who pretends to skill or knowledge of any kind which he does not possess; an impudent and fraudulent pretender to medical skill.
> To tamper with dishonestly; to use fraudulently.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there are quacks outside of the medical profession. Perhaps the best illustration is found in the people who do the grading of grain, who are responsible for the grading system of the State of Minnesota.

Ten years ago I was serving in the Legislature of North Dakota. Shortly previous to that the wheat crop across the line, in Canada, was supposed to have been very seriously damaged. A snowstorm came during the early part of September, 1903, and was supposed to have done very great damage to the quality of the wheat that was raised there, to such an extent that while the wheat was being marketed those who sold it were docked 10 cents per bushel. It was called "shock frozen." Afterwards chemists examined this grain; that is to say, after the grain had gotten out of the country, the results of the experiments became known, and it was found that this frozen wheat which they had graded as No. 3 northern made more bread, and of just as good quality, as No. 1 hard. That bulletin was sent to me by a constituent, Mr. Wylie Nielson, while the legislature was in session, and as a result I introduced a bill providing that at the agricultural college there should be chemical tests made of wheat and baking tests of flour to determine the real intrinsic value of the wheats which were grown in our State.

After much opposition the bill was finally passed. The bill, which I shall not stop to read, but insert in the RECORD, if there is no objection, made it the duty of the agricultural college, at Fargo, to make chemical tests of wheat and baking tests of flour, and to publish in bulletins the result of the tests. A copy of the bill follows:

CHAPTER 113—LAWS OF NORTH DAKOTA—1903.

(S. B. 163—George M. Young.)

An act to provide for the making of tests of wheat and flour to determine the comparative milling values of the different grades of wheat.

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota: It shall be the duty of the North Dakota Government Agricultural Experiment Station to conduct experiments and determine the comparative milling values of the different grades of wheat and baking tests of the flour made therefrom. A record shall be kept and published of the different grades of wheat received and by whom graded, the name of the person from whom received, with adress, the nature of the soil, previous cropping, and number of years which the land has been cropped, unless it appears that the wheat tested has been received from a dealer and consists of blended or mixed wheat, in which case the record shall so state. The result of the chemical analysis of each sample shall be kept, which shall show the total weight of the sample, total weight of flour, total weight of feed, total weight recovered and per cent of flour, also data as to the moisture and proteids in the different grades of wheat, and analysis of the flour made from the different grades of wheat, and the yield and quality of bread made from the different grades of wheat. In addition to such information it shall be the duty of the said North Dakota Government Agricultural Experiment Station to obtain, tabulate, and publish such other and further information in relation to the comparative values of the different grades of wheat and flour made therefrom as shall be of value to the wheat growers of this State.

The experiments made under this law were conducted by Dr. E. F. Ladd, one of the greatest chemists in the United States; one who has been called to Washington frequently in consultation; and in Bulletin No. 14, issued in January, 1915, the results of certain investigations made last year are set forth. It will not be possible to read this report fully, or even to give all the figures contained in the tables, but I think it is well worth while to anyone who is interested either in selling wheat or in buying bread, wherever he lives in the United States, to examine these tables. Their significance can not be appreciated from a mere reading, but a study of them will show that as a matter of fact there is not any very great difference in the milling value of wheats that are graded No. 1 northern, No. 2 northern, No. 3 northern, No. 4 northern, and rejected, although, as everybody knows, these numbers make a tremendous difference when a man has any wheat to sell. And it is of interest to every man who buys bread, or buys flour, because the middleman's profit is made excessively large by reason of this supposed difference in the actual value of the grades, as shown by the Minnesota grading system, but which does not exist, as shown by these experiments with the actual wheat itself.

I will say that at the agricultural college at Fargo they have a complete flour milling plant, from which the flour is made, and a laboratory that is very complete, in which these experiments are made.

Does the producer receive a fair price for all grades of wheat, asks Dr. Ladd.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. Do these experiments with regard to the bread-making value of these different wheats show the value per bushel of the different grades of wheat, or per pound, or on what are they based?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The tables are given first on the basis of bushels and then afterwards in other figures to make it easier to carry in the mind on the basis of 100 pounds.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman mean to say that there is very little difference between No. 1 hard and No. 4 wheat per pound as to their value for bread making?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is precisely what I claim, and that is precisely what is demonstrated in this bulletin.

Mr. PLATT. Do not the poorer grades of wheat contain more weeds or something else that makes them grade low? Or what is the basis?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; that is an element that should be considered, and it is considered in this bulletin. Dr. Ladd, in determining the value of the wheat, attempts to show how much flour it will make and shows exactly what the by-products are and what their value is in the market and what the entire value of the wheat is on account of its content of flour, bran, shorts, and even the value of the screenings.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is quoting Prof. Ladd?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; I am quoting Dr. E. F. Ladd. To show the basis of the calculation of Dr. Ladd, permit me to read a few lines from the report:

> Results from five different grades of wheat have been studied, namely, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 northern and rejected grades. Ten samples of each of these have been received from the crop of 1914, except No. 1 northern, of which only four samples were received, and our conclusions are based on the average of each of these 10 samples, which confirm the findings of previous years.

In other words, this bulletin confirms experiments made in former years by Dr. Ladd.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CLINE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Dr. Ladd continues:

> A comparative study of the data presented for the several grades show that there is practically no difference in the money value for the higher as compared with the lower grades. The wheat buyer, however, will raise several objections. He will immediately call attention to the weight per bushel and the small per cent flour produced by the light-weight wheat. He might also mention the color score for the baked product. The grounds for this objection appear to be sound, and the majority of wheat buyers would make the same objections—their reasons being based upon previous experience and the requirements of grade which have been established under conditions not now existing. For this reason the rule has been generally accepted until it has become firmly established and has given us our present system for the grading of wheats.

Now, coming to his first table in which he gives certain results of the grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 northern, and rejected, which is a separate grade, I want to read a few of those results. As to the milling tests the percentage of flour in No. 1 northern is 67; No. 2, 67; No. 3, 68; No. 4, 63; and rejected, 63 per cent.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is of flour content?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes. Now, then, as to bran. In No. 1 northern, it is 16 per cent; No. 2 northern, 16½ per cent; No. 3 northern, 17½ per cent; No. 4 northern, 18 per cent. The figures are quoted in round numbers. Rejected, 18.64. In other words, the rejected produces more bran than No. 1 northern, and the same is also true of No. 4 northern and No. 3 northern.

Now, as to the contents of shorts. No. 1 northern, 15.32; No. 2 northern, 14.69; No. 3 northern, 14; No. 4 northern, 18.83; rejected, 17.34.

Now, as to water absorption. The bakers who buy flour always want a flour that will be capable of large absorption; that is one of the points that a buyer of flour to be made into bread and sold commercially always takes into account.

Absorption of No. 1 northern is 58.87; No. 2 northern, 56.31; No. 3 northern, 59.91; No. 4 northern, 59.22; rejected, 58.98.

You will see from these figures that the water absorption of No. 4 northern and rejected is greater than in the higher grades.

Now, as to the volume of the loaf. It will be seen by figures that I am going to read that the lower grades are superior in that respect: No. 1 northern, 2451; No. 2 northern, 2425; No. 3 northern, 2514; No. 4 northern, 2600; rejected, 2885.

It will be seen in the size of the loaf the so-called lower grades of wheat—and I put the accent on the word "so-called"—produce a larger loaf than the so-called higher grades.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. In these baking tests which the gentleman is giving, does not the matter of nutriment enter into it largely; is not that an essential part of the test outside of the volume of the loaf?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is gotten by taking into account the gluten and the proteids, and so forth. Those matters are all given consideration by Dr. Ladd.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does he find that the amount of nutriment in the low grades of wheat is perceptibly less than in the higher grades of wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; he says not. In this bulletin the results of his experiments are not given in detail, but in a former bulletin he goes into that question very thoroughly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say that there is no greater mystery in the world than this mystery of bread. The Minneapolis mills take Canadian and Minnesota wheat and mix it with Kansas wheat and claim that it makes a better baking test than wheat of one variety.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Dr. Ladd would agree with them in that. This bulletin shows that by the admixture of a hard wheat with a soft wheat a better bread is produced.

Following this table further as to the color, No. 1 northern is quoted at 100; No. 2 northern, 96.04. This is as to color.

Mr. NORTON. The color of the wheat or the flour?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The color of the bread. They do not make flour from bran, and that is the only thing that a man can see with the naked eye when he looks at wheat. No. 3 northern, 94.02; No. 4 northern, 95; rejected, 94.5. There is a slight difference in these percentages, but very little, as between No. 1 northern and rejected.

But it must be borne in mind that with the bakers the lower limit of the standard as to color is 88, and all of these grades, even the rejected grades, produce flour that is considerably above 88. The rejected shows up in this test at 94.5. The bulletin gives valuable information as to the value of the mill products, giving the market quotations for bran, standard middlings, flour middlings, and screenings. Then the calculation is carried further to show the value of the wheat and mill products for the several grades. It gives the value of the flour and the bran and the shorts and the screenings, and the results of this second table, which I will put in the RECORD, show that the value per 100 pounds of No. 1 northern was $2.28; No. 2 northern, $2.27; No. 3 northern, $2.34; No. 4 northern, $2.31; rejected, $2.31½.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. It seems to me that the gentleman has proved, if he has proved anything, that it is not worth while to grade wheat at all. Does the gentleman maintain that?

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

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be much fairer to the farmer and very much fairer to the average flour mill that buys wheat if there was no grading of the wheat at all. That is the chief cause, it seems to me, of all this manipulation by which the middleman is getting an excessive profit.

Mr. PLATT. And the gentleman actually contends that No. 1 northern is not any better wheat than rejected wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I commend the gentleman to a careful study of this bulletin prepared by Dr. Ladd, who is not only a great chemist but a man of integrity and honesty.

Mr. PLATT. If that is true, then there is no reason for giving any attention to improving the quality of wheat at all.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly there is.

Mr. PLATT. That can hardly be true. I think the gentleman is proving too much.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think it is important to always raise the best quality of wheat.

Mr. PLATT. But the gentleman says there is no difference in the quality.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the Government grades wheat this year and next year and from year to year, the standard of value of the wheat, based upon its value for making flour and the value of its by-products, would have to be determined by the Government, and if the quality of wheat were gradually on the increase from year to year, the Government would naturally take that into account. The purpose of grading it seems to me would be to simply state what the different grades of wheat are, where there is any real difference, and it would not be to create a lot of grades to represent a lot of imaginary differences such as are now in operation in Minnesota, but just have enough grades to represent what the real differences are, so that when the flour mill buys it, or when anyone buys it, to make into flour, he will know what he is getting, and the farmer who raises it will know what he is selling.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not a fact that No. 1 hard and No. 1 northern will make more flour at a less cost than any other grade?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is not the fact. I commend again the gentleman to a careful study of this bulletin, which clearly demonstrates that it is not a fact.

This analysis also attempts to show what it has cost the farmers in our State for the crop of 1914, because of this manipulation, and it runs into the millions. Of course, Dr. Ladd does not attempt to show what it costs as applied to the entire wheat crop of the United States. I think this is a subject to which Congress ought to give its attention, because I think it concerns every man who has a bushel of wheat to sell and every man who buys a loaf of bread. It is not a sectional question. It is not a question that is of interest only to the people of the Northwest.

Mr. KINDEL. Have you no terminals in your State which would give you a way of controlling the wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We have no terminals in North Dakota. That is one of the difficulties with us. We can not reach the situation by legislation in North Dakota, because our wheat is naturally graded at the place where it is emptied into the boats or where it reaches the big mills where it is ground into flour.

Mr. Chairman, the reading of this bulletin stirs the blood. It makes one feel like arming himself with a gun when he heads toward the elevator with a load of wheat. That is not the thing to do. There is no use and no justice in shooting the local wheat buyer. He is not responsible for grades fixed by the Minnesota authorities. It is the Minnesota grading system which we must fight, and that can not be done by State laws. The North Dakota Legislature can not change such grading laws, nor can the legislatures of South Dakota, Ohio, nor New York. The State legislatures are helpless to cope with this phase of the marketing problem. So it is the plain duty of Congress to enact a national grain-grading law.

Who gets the enormous toll disclosed by the figures of Dr. Ladd's bulletin? The time allotted to me will not permit me to go into that feature of this subject. The big fact which stands out is that somewhere in the middle a large slice is appropriated and that the farmers and consumers both suffer. The farmer wants what his wheat is really worth. The flour millers, taken as a whole, without stopping to consider exceptions, want the wheat as near as may be as it leaves the farm without mixing or juggling of grades. The cost of the wheat to him is passed on to the consumer. He wants honest wheat and prefers to buy it under a grade which will mean something. In a great trade, such as this is, which might be carried on

honorably and profitably by the two classes mentioned, it has been a matter of great surprise that the people of and general business interests of the great terminal centers have sided with the grain quacks as against the farmers, and that too, in spite of the fact that their very existence depends upon their general trade with the same farmers and their success is measured by the success of the farmers.

John McCutcheon told a good story a couple of years ago which at least reminds one of the Minnesota grain-grading quacks. It was about a band of highwaymen who had operated so long and so successfully that they became very bold. They plundered the people right and left and when the poor victims cried out in helpless despair the robbers uttered peal after peal of mocking laughter. [Pronounced lofter.] So powerful did the band become that they controlled by secret and sinister means the very Government itself, and thus enjoyed great prosperity. Some of the prosperity was distributed to quiet the people, but of course the robbers kept most of it themselves. When they pounced upon a hapless wayfarer the poor man would meekly yield because of his helplessness before such powerful enemies. He would raise his eyes in despair and sigh, "Let me have the sacks back." The sentiment of the people became very bitter, but what could they do? They could not express themselves except in helpless fury. But one fine day in June a determined farmer of stout heart walked down the highway toward the place where the robbers assembled, and when the latter perceived him they nearly split their sides laughing. They leaped upon him with loud shouts of merriment. They robbed him in broad daylight, so bold had they become. But to their surprise the victim, instead of submissively yielding as all the others had done, at once began to put up a mighty fight. He fought so vigorously that the robbers were quite taken aback. "What is this?" they gasped. "Who is this brash person who dares fight back?"

In the meantime the noise of the fight had attracted a great crowd of people who came rushing up and were muttering angry threats against them. "What do you think of this?" exclaimed the robbers, appealing to the crowd. "Here we were robbing and beating this person and he is setting up an awful roar. He's a poor loser. He's a poor sport. Why doesn't he take his medicine like a man instead of squealing? When a man gets robbed he ought to be a graceful loser and acknowledge that he has lost."

In other words, it is not good form to make an outcry when your substance is being taken.

There is a lesson, and perhaps a prophecy in this. The farmers have become aroused. They are alive to their interests, and they have stout, resolute hearts. They know that they are being victimized, and they know we can help them by national legislation. They are organizing. They mean business. But best of all the consumers of wheat products are waking up to the fact that they have been and are being held up. In the past the demand for a national grain-grading law, for that is our only relief, has been considered a sectional question, one of interest to a few grain-raising areas. That is far from true. It is of interest to every man, woman, and child in our great Nation. It concerns vitally every man who raises a bushel of wheat and every man who buys a loaf of bread. The poor factory worker who has difficulty in making his pay check cover the actual needs of his family, and the farmer, whose work is never done and whose problems are real and burdensome, excepting to the writer of poetry, have a like interest and should make common cause against State grain-inspection systems. They should work unitedly for a national grading law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This question concerns too many people to be lightly brushed aside. It must be settled, and it must be settled mighty soon. The farmers want it settled. The consumers want it settled. It is to the real interest of the flour millers that it should be settled. Commercial organizations in terminal cities, if they have breadth of view, should look to the welfare of the farming constituency, from whom their merchants and bankers draw custom, and take a stand for them rather than for the swollen profits of a comparative few. The time is coming when the farmers and the country merchants will deal only with those cities which will practice the golden rule. The time is coming, and I hope it will arrive quickly, when the flour manufacturers will cry loudly for relief from the monopolists who thrive under State grain-inspection systems. Perhaps it is too much to hope that these commercial bodies and the flour millers will see their permanent advantage, as well as duty, of standing by the wheat producers and flour consumers. If they do not, then let the struggle go on, anyway. Let the mighty army of farmers on one side and the city consumers on the other fight for this legislation and give no quarter to those who stand between, such as commercial organizations, that ought to know better. That kind of fight should win. That kind of fight will win. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask for permission to print Dr. Ladd's bulletin in full.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bulletin is as follows:

[North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, Agricultural College, N. Dak. Special bulletin, food department. Volume III. January, 1915. No. 14. E. F. Ladd, commissioner.]

IS THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF GRADING WHEAT EQUITABLE?

[By E. F. Ladd.]

NOTE.—This article contains data gathered as the "Joint cooperative work of the experiment station and the Office of Grain Standardization of the United States Department of Agriculture."

Does the producer receive a fair price for all grades of wheat? This question has been repeatedly asked, and in comparing the different types and grades of wheat coming under observation one has been forced to take note of this question in previous years, but never before has the question been so forcibly presented as with the 1914 crop.

From the data before us it seems safe to answer the question that the present system of grading wheat is unfair and that the purchaser does not get an adequate price for the so-called lower grades of wheat. If this be true, what is the reason for such a condition? Our present system of grading wheat is one of gradual evolution; one change after another has been added; and perhaps when a change was made in the classification for grading there existed sufficient reason for making such changes. When some of these changes were made the prices for mill products, feeds, etc., were relatively low as compared with what they are to-day. Other products were scarcely utilized, but to-day conditions are changed and each product has its market value, and should be considered in the adjustment of grades.

This is not wholly a new question. Other investigators have previously considered the same point. Saunders (Canadian Exp. Farm Bulletin No. 50) and Shutt state that "millers could pay relatively higher prices for the intermediate grades of wheat"; that is, the grades between No. 1 northern and the wheat that is so badly damaged as to render it fit only for feeding purposes.

Wilson (S. D. Exp. Station Bulletin No. 90) and Skinner show results with feeding experiments on hogs with wheat that weighed 44 pounds per bushel and 57 pounds per bushel. Their conclusion is that there is but 6 cents per bushel difference in feeding value between the two; that is, in favor of the heavyweight wheat.

Harcourt (3) gives as his opinion that there is very little difference in the real value of the different grades of wheat, and similar conclusions are arrived at in his studies of the comparative values of the different grades of wheat for 1903 and 1904.

If we study the data presented by other investigators who have laid no stress on this matter, we find their figures to confirm the same conclusion.

Results from five different grades of wheat have been studied, namely, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 northern and rejected grades. Ten samples of each of these have been received from the crop of 1914, except No. 1 northern, of which only 4 samples were received, and our conclusions are based on the average of each of these 10 samples, which confirm the findings of previous years. A comparative study of the data presented for the several grades shows that there is practically no difference in the money value for the higher as compared with the lower grades. The wheat buyer, however, will raise several objections. He will immediately call attention to the weight per bushel and the small per cent flour produced by the light-weight wheat. He might also mention the color score for the baked product. The grounds for his objection appear to be sound, and the majority of wheat buyers would make the same objections—their reasons being based upon previous experience and the requirements of grade which have been established under conditions not now existing. For this reason the rule has been generally accepted until it has become firmly established, and has given us our present system for the grading of wheats.

The rules generally followed are those issued by the Minnesota grain inspection department, and being governed by these rules our classification has been made on the same basis, and if there is any criticism it is that possibly we have given the highest possible grade to each wheat. The weight per bushel as given before cleaning is the weight as shown by a standard chronometer as the wheat was received, and the weight after cleaning was taken when the wheat had been cleaned over separators and scoured twice before tempering. This latter weight would show at least 1 pound, on the average, more than if cleaned by the methods usually employed by inspection departments. If we consider only the question of the low per cent of flour obtained, the objection appears quite reasonable, but this is an unfair comparison, and the value of all the mill products should be taken into consideration, as has been done in the preparation of this report.

The third objection of the wheat buyer, with regard to the color score, is not as great as would seem to be on first consideration. The color score as used here is fully up to the standard for the Minneapolis patent flour as tested in the commercial laboratories. The results from all these straight flours are well within the class of the Minneapolis standard patents in color, and when we consider all the other factors shown by the baking test, the texture, volume, etc., the bread from Nos. 3, 4, and rejected wheats are found to be superior to the bread produced from the flours of the Nos. 1 and 2 northern wheats. These facts are substantiated in the data which is presented.

With the foregoing conclusions accepted, as based on actual tests, the problem then resolves itself into one of simple mathematics. The true value of the different grades, computed according to the value of the different milling products obtained from each, will furnish the desired information.

Now let us see what the findings are for the milling and baking tests for the several grades of wheat, as shown by the average for all the

samples tested, 10 in each grade, except for No. 1 northern, where only 4 samples have been received this year.

Grade of wheat.	Weight per bushel.		Milling tests.					Baking tests.			
	Before cleaning.	After cleaning.	Per cent loss in cleaning.	Per cent flour.	Per cent bran.	Per cent shorts.	Per cent loss in milling.	Water absorbed, per cent.	Volume of loaf, c.c.	Color, per cent.	Texture, per cent.
No. 1 N	57.75	61.12	2.51	67.33	16.30	15.32	1.05	58.87	2,451	100	93.25
No. 2 N	55.8	59.10	3.72	67.02	16.68	14.69	1.61	56.31	2,425	96.4	93.4
No. 3 N	51.85	55.95	6.14	68.15	17.62	14.10	.13	59.91	2,514	94.2	90.45
No. 4 N	45.65	52.55	12.21	63.22	17.98	18.83	.03	59.22	2,600	95	94.7
Rejected	41.95	50.85	13.96	63.68	18.64	17.34	.34	58.98	2,685	94.5	94.7

[3] Annual Report Ontario A. C. and Exp. Farm No. 30, 1904, and No. 31, 1905.

From the data in table No. 1 it will be observed that in the baking tests the texture for Nos. 1 and 2 averages below that for the other three grades, considerably below the rejected even. In color Nos. 1 and 2 northern show somewhat better than the other three, but even here the rejected comes well above the lower limits for second patents, which is placed at 88 in the commercial laboratories. In volume of loaf the three lower grades are much superior to bread produced from Nos. 1 and 2 northern, the flour from the rejected making the largest volume.

The market prices for the various mill products are taken from the Northwestern Miller of Minneapolis, under date of December 9, 1914, where we find the following quotations:

Second patent (straight) per barrel ..... $5.45 to $5.85
Bran, per ton ..... 20.25 to 21.00
Standard middlings ..... 20.50 to 21.00
Flour middlings ..... 26.00 to 28.00
Red Dog ..... 30.00 to 30.50
Mill screenings ..... 12.00 to 14.00

The average for straight flour is, therefore, $5.65 per barrel of 196 pounds, or 2.88 cents per pound.

Mill products, in our case, have not been divided into just the same classes as quoted above; but for convenience, and that our figures may be low rather than high, we take the following:

Flour, per barrel, $5.65; per pound, 2.88 cents.
Bran, per ton, $20; per pound, 1 cent.
Shorts, per ton, $25; per pound, 1.25 cents.
Mill screenings, per ton, $12; per pound, 0.60 cent.

Or, to state these figures in another way, the market price for 100 pounds would be as follows:

Straight flour $2.88
Bran 1.00
Shorts 1.25
Screenings ..... .60

The foregoing will, therefore, serve as a basis for our conclusions.

In the same publication will be found the market quotation for eight days, the average being as follows:

	Per bushel.	Per 100 pounds.
No. 1 Northern	$1.17	$1.95
No. 2 Northern	1.143	1.905
No. 3 Northern	1.115	1.858
No. 4 Northern	1.073	1.789
Rejected	1.048	1.746

We may bring our data into a table for easier comparison, showing the value of the wheat and mill products for the several grades, as follows:

	Grades of wheat—average.				
	1 N.	2 N.	3 N.	4 N.	Rejected.
Average cost per bushel	$1.170	$1.143	$1.115	$1.073	$1.048
Cost per 100 pounds wheat	$1.950	$1.905	$1.858	$1.789	$1.746
Pounds of product per 100 pounds wheat:					
Flour	67.33	67.02	68.15	63.22	63.68
Bran	16.30	16.68	17.62	17.98	18.64
Shorts	15.32	14.69	14.10	18.83	17.34
Total recovered	98.95	98.39	99.87	100.03	99.66
Milling loss (pounds)	1.05	1.61	0.13	+0.25	0.34
Amount net from 100 pounds wheat:					
Flour	$1.9391	$1.9301	$1.9627	$1.8207	$1.8339
Bran	$0.1630	$0.1668	$0.1762	$0.1798	$0.1804
Shorts	$0.1915	$0.1836	$0.1762	$0.2353	$0.2167
Screenings	$0.01506	$0.0223	$0.0368	$0.0732	$0.0837
Total value	$2.3087	$2.3028	$2.3519	$2.3090	$2.3147
Loss or gain in milling	$0.02475	$0.0306	$0.0024	+0.0004	$0.0059
Net returns	$2.28391	$2.2722	$2.3495	$2.3094	$2.3148

The above gives the figures for the several grades in easy form for comparison, but they may be summarized to show the amount of increase in value for each 100 pounds of wheat and the mill products therefrom, as follows:

	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 3 northern.	No. 4 northern.	Rejected.
Cost per 100 pounds	$1.950	$1.905	$1.858	$1.789	$1.746
Receipts	2.28391	2.2722	2.3495	2.3094	2.3148
Increase per 100 pounds	.33391	.3672	.4915	.5204	.5688

It will be observed from the above that for each 100 pounds of wheat the returns above the original cost are as follows:

	Net receipts.
No. 1 northern	$0.33391
No. 2 northern	.3672
No. 3 northern	.4915
No. 4 northern	.5204
Rejected	.5688

The returns, therefore, for the rejected, or for Nos. 3, 4, and rejected, are considerably better than the returns for grades Nos. 1 and 2 of hard spring wheats.

We assume that the average profit on the grades for hard spring wheat, Nos. 1 and 2 northern, is enough to cover the charges of manufacture and the profit for the manufacturer, because grade No. 2 northern is generally accepted on contract.

On the same page of the same journal is to be found the quotations of receipts by car lots at Minneapolis for the several grades of wheat for the week ending Saturday. The receipts by cars were as follows:

Grade.	Cars received.				Per cent of different grades received for week ending—			
	Dec. 5.	Nov. 28.	Dec. 6, 1913.	Dec. 7, 1912.	Dec. 5.	Nov. 28.	Dec. 6, 1913.	Dec. 7, 1912.
No. 1 northern	506	381	801	1,424	24.57	20.78	65.90	46.75
No. 2 northern	480	448	292	1,251	23.30	24.40	24.05	41.07
No. 3 northern	587	564	105	279	28.49	30.70	8.65	9.16
No. 4 northern	417	360	.....	.....	20.25	19.60	.....	.....
Rejected	70	83	17	92	3.39	4.52	1.40	3.02
Total cars	2,060	1,836	1,215	3,046	100	100	100	100

If we assume that each car contained on an average 1,000 bushels, then the following table shows the number of bushels of wheat, price per bushel, and the amount that will be paid for the several grades for the week ending December 5, 1914.

	Number of bushels.	Price per bushel.	Amount paid.
No. 1 northern	506,000	$1.17	$592,020.00
No. 2 northern	480,000	1.143	548,640.00
No. 3 northern	587,000	1.115	654,505.00
No. 4 northern	417,000	1.073	447,441.00
Rejected	70,000	1.048	73,360.00
Total	2,060,000	.....	2,315,966.00

The following table shows the amount that would have been received for the products manufactured from each of these grades of wheat, excluding the screenings, together with the profit thereon:

	Amount per bushel.	Amount received.	Per cent profit.
No. 1 northern	$1.3613	$688,817.80	16.27
No. 2 northern	1.3499	647,952.00	18.01
No. 3 northern	1.3876	814,521.20	24.44
No. 4 northern	1.3417	559,488.50	25.04
Rejected	1.3386	93,702.00	27.73
Total	.....	2,804,481.90	.....

As showing what would be received for the same wheat, and the profit thereon, including the screenings which now have a market value, we present the following summary for the same samples:

	Amount per bushel.	Amount received.	Per cent profit.
No. 1 northern	$1.3703	$693,371.80	17.12
No. 2 northern	1.3633	654,384.00	19.27
No. 3 northern	1.4097	827,493.90	26.43
No. 4 northern	1.3856	577,795.20	29.13
Rejected	1.3789	96,523.00	31.47
Total	.....	2,849,567.90	.....

The average profit therefore for grades Nos. 1 and 2 northern, excluding the screenings, would be 17.14 per cent. If we include the screenings, then the profit on Nos. 1 and 2 northern would be 18.19 per cent, whereas the profit on the other grades ranges from 26.43 per cent to 31.47 per cent. The loss therefore to the farmer on this basis

would be, without the screenings, $91,459.33, or, including the screenings, $136,645.33—this on the report for a single week in one market. The range for other quotations for the several weeks is even far greater than indicated above.

In the same manner we might take the figures for each of the weeks and show the loss to the producer by the present method of grading wheat. If we assume that the crop, in round figures, would amount to 81,500,000, and that the entire crop would grade as shown from the calculated results of the data herewith given, we should have as follows:

	Per cent.
No. 1 northern	24.57
No. 2 northern	23.30
No. 3 northern	28.49
No. 4 northern	20.25
Rejected	3.39

Calculating in the same manner as in the preceding tables, and we have as the value for the 1914 crop, assuming the same per cents, as follows:

	Number of bushels.	Price paid.	Amount paid.
No. 1 northern	20,024,550	$1.17	$23,428,723.50
No. 2 northern	18,989,500	1.143	21,704,998.50
No. 3 northern	23,219,350	1.115	25,998,575.25
No. 4 northern	16,503,750	1.073	17,708,523.75
Rejected	2,762,850	1.048	2,894,466.80
Total	81,500,000	.....	91,735,287.80

In the same manner the amount received for the wheat without screenings and with screenings is shown as follows:

	Without screenings.	Including screenings.
No. 1 northern	$27,253,412.55	$27,439,640.86
No. 2 northern	25,633,926.05	25,880,385.35
No. 3 northern	32,219,170.06	32,732,317.69
No. 4 northern	22,143,081.37	22,867,326.00
Rejected	3,697,751.01	3,837,732.36
Total	110,947,341.04	112,765,262.27

The amount of profit in milling grades Nos. 1 and 2 northern was 17.18 per cent. On the basis as above given, therefore, Nos. 3, 4, and rejected wheat should have netted the producer, excluding the screenings, an additional $3,453,477; or, including the screenings, the additional value for these lower grades above that which was received for the same would be $5,271,398.23. If our figures are correct—and they are based on actual experiments and bear out the claims made by the other investigators already referred to—then the present system of grading wheat would appear to be antiquated; perhaps adequate for a time when mill products sold at from $8 to $10 per ton and the weight per bushel as now graded was first established. The advance in price of mill feed since that time has made no difference in the weight per bushel regarding grade of wheat. Consequently at the present time the method employed in grading and buying wheat does not seem to be as equitable as it was before there were any grades and wheat was just wheat, without any classification.

A large amount of additional data bearing on these questions will be found in part 3 of the twenty-third annual report of the food commissioner for 1912, page 391, tables 43 and 44, where there is shown the average grades for a period of four years.

In the milling of light-weight wheat, of course, there would, in the mills that are short on bolting surface, be reduced somewhat the capacity and a slight allowance might there be required. For the average mill, however, the difference would be very little, and, on the whole, would not amount to 1 per cent of the total cost of raw material. Even admitting that this would amount to as much as 1 per cent, we would still have a balance of $3,000,000 in favor of the light-weight wheat, and, if we consider the screenings, of over $5,000,000. The producer of wheat might well look to a saving of some of this enormous sum not only in the lower grades of wheat but for the screenings, and then to this would be added, were we to carefully consider the question, the cost of transportation from the farm to the terminal market; also, if the feed is to be used upon the farm, the item of freight charges back from the terminal market to the farm.

In this report our purpose has been to present the summarized data with regard to the relative value for the several grades of wheat as found in our experimental work, and to point out apparent discrepancies in the present system of wheat grading. It should also be borne in mind that the commercial mill is able to so blend different types and grades of wheat as to get more favorable end results than could be had in the milling of individual samples of wheat—that is, a rather starchy, soft spring wheat, grading No. 1 northern, would be improved by blending No. 4 and rejected grades of high gluten and large loaf volume, and the quality of all made better thereby.

There are many other problems in connection with wheat studies that need investigation, but lack of funds has prevented our enlarging the scope of work undertaken.

Again, it would be desirable to cooperate with the small mills of North Dakota in a way that might furnish them information with regard to the better utilization of the different grades of wheat produced in the State, thus encouraging the development of the milling industry within the State.

I am indebted to Mr. Sanderson, the miller, for the data gathered and presented in the foregoing article.

VELVET CHAFF AND DURUM WHEATS.

On several occasions we have pointed out the merits of Velvet Chaff and durum wheats as grown in North Dakota. In the past there has been considerable discrimination against these wheats, at times as much as 27 cents per bushel, some of which was due to a lack of knowledge as to how to handle durum in order to secure the best results in milling the same. The fact also that durum has come to be in demand for the manufacture of macaroni and semolina products has insured a better market for the better grades of durum wheats.

It is interesting to note that under date of December 25 the Sharon Reporter quotes the local price for the several wheats on the Sharon market as follows:

No. 1 northern	$1.12
No. 2 northern	1.09
No. 3 northern	1.06
Velvet Chaff	1.12
No. 1 macaroni (durum)	1.28

It is interesting to note that Velvet Chaff, in this quotation, stands the same as No. 1 northern and that Macaroni tops the prices.

At about the same date Minneapolis quoted the price of durum wheat for exportation at $1.45 per bushel.

We are just beginning to realize the real value of the durum wheat, and more and more as we understand its properties or come to manufacture in this country the various high-grade macaroni products we shall find the demand for this class of wheat growing, and North Dakota should be able, from the character of its soil and climate, to produce a superior product.

Even though the local quotation is the same for Velvet Chaff as for No. 1 northern, nevertheless Velvet Chaff wheat is at times still being discriminated against at the terminals. The time will come, however, in the near future, in my judgment, when we shall realize the full value of Velvet Chaff wheat as a crop for the farmer and for flour production.

Mining Experiment and Mine Safety Stations.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH HOWELL,
OF UTAH,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Monday, February 1, 1915.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the general sentiment in the House in favor of this measure will be hailed with the utmost satisfaction by the mining industry throughout the country. Congress has been slow in responding to the just demands of the mining industry. The appalling loss of life from time to time in coal mines and the serious impairment of health incident to mining and associated industries were so strongly impressed upon Congress that finally, after repeated and persistent effort, the Bureau of Mines was created. In the short time since its establishment it has certainly vindicated the arguments urged in favor of its creation.

From the first, despite the delays incident to assembling the necessary experts and the lack of means for adequate and sufficient equipment and facilities, the work of the bureau has been so favorably impressed upon the country that its future growth and usefulness is fully assured. No one can read the reports of its activities without appreciating the vital importance of its functions and without discerning the immense field of usefulness that lies before it. True to the paramount idea in the public mind at the time it was organized, the bureau has led in the "safety first" campaign in the mining and other mineral industries. It has sought to obtain the cooperation of State and other agencies seeking to increase safety and efficiency in those industries, and has been instrumental in bringing about changes in mining methods and in methods of treating minerals that have tended to reduce the death rate from accidents and have saved to the public mineral resources that might otherwise have been wasted—resources valued at many millions of dollars.

Some of the bureau's achievements that I consider particularly worthy of notice I will briefly mention. To describe the manifold activities of the bureau and to set forth in detail its great work for humanity is a task I do not undertake. The chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, in his report on the bill that has now been passed, pointed out the purposes of the bureau, its needs, its achievements, and the reasons why the Government should extend to the mining industries aid proportionate to the importance of these industries in the upbuilding of manufactures and commerce. I will not repeat what he has said, but, as a representative of a State having vast mineral resources, I am deeply interested in the efforts of the Bureau of Mines to increase safety and efficiency in mining, and especially in its efforts to aid in a greater development of the mineral industries in the public-land States. And it is with pride that I call attention to the fact that the State I have the honor to represent is now conducting, in cooperation with the bureau, investigations looking to a larger development and more efficient utilization of the mineral resources of the State.

In the mine-safety investigations of the bureau attention thus far has been devoted largely to the question of coal-mine explosions. Different grades of coal dust collected from hundreds of mines in different coal fields have been carefully studied with

reference to their explosibility and the starting of dust explosions by the use of improper explosives or from miners' lamps or mine fires. Experiments with different preventive measures during the past year are resulting in the development of practical and efficient devices for preventing or stopping explosions.

The bureau has already brought about what is little short of a revolution in coal mining through the introduction of new types of explosives, far safer than black powder or dynamite, for use in gaseous or dusty mines. Of these explosives, designated permissible explosives, more than 25,000,000 pounds was used in the more dangerous mines of the country during 1913.

The bureau is also developing "permissible" safety appliances for use in all branches of the mining, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, which, as their use is enforced by State inspectors, can not fail to largely decrease fatal and other accidents.

The bureau has not only brought about many improvements in electric installations in mines but is also aiding in the introduction of miners' electric safety lamps, which will make the miners' work safer and easier.

Through mine-rescue cars and stations now in operation the bureau is training the miners in different parts of the country in rescue methods and in giving first aid to the injured, giving aid after disasters, and carrying forward an educational campaign for greater safety in all branches of the mining industry. Already over 25,000 miners have been trained by the bureau, nearly 100 miners have been rescued by bureau employees, and a much larger number have been rescued by other miners who have received the bureau's training.

The bureau now operates eight mine-rescue cars, each of which travels from one mining district to another, training miners and giving instruction in rescue, first aid, and general safety methods. It also operates five mine-rescue stations in different coal fields.

Other safety work by the bureau includes investigations of accidents from falls of roof and from caving-in mines, the lack or the failure of safety appliances, and the accidents or the injury to health from the use of improper explosives and the improper use of explosives in metal mines, quarries, and tunnels.

The economic importance of the work for accident prevention is evident; during the past year more than 3,000 men were killed and 100,000 injured in our mining and metallurgical industries, and it is estimated that one-half of the deaths and three-fourths of the injuries may be regarded as easily preventable. The money loss from these accidents may be estimated at not less than $12,000,000 for the year, and this loss is ultimately paid by the consumers of mineral products.

The work of the States in carrying out their part of this general program in mine safety is being carried forward in a reasonably satisfactory manner. The States are already expending in their inspection and police supervision work more than the Federal Government is expending in all its investigations in behalf of mine safety. So far as it goes, this educational work is assuredly developing safer and better mining, and the leaders among the miners express the belief that if carried forward on a larger scale and in a more thorough manner the work can not fail to develop also better citizenship among the miners. The following excerpts from a communication received from the Salt Lake Mining Exchange are worthy of consideration:

> There are located within the boundaries of the several public-land States large bodies of low-grade ores of different types for the efficient treatment of which there are no known methods. There are other large deposits that are being worked in accordance with methods that are highly wasteful of valuable mineral products. On the public lands in these States there are many mineral deposits concerning the value of which little is at present known. These and other associated problems, general in character, will be investigated by the several mining experiment stations to be established in such regions, and it is obvious that the results of such investigations will be not only beneficial to the industry, but also to the general public.
>
> Mining is usually regarded as an industry made up mainly of the operation of a few large, profitable properties, such as the old Comstock mines in Nevada, the Treadwell mine in Alaska, the Utah copper properties in Utah, or the Homestake mine in South Dakota. It is usually considered to be an industry controlled by a few parties, the owners of which large properties would gladly avail themselves of an opportunity to unload on the National Government the cost of conducting researches in which they are particularly interested. Therefore it is usually considered as an industry which should be allowed, and even required, to take care of itself. These assumptions are far from correct.
>
> The facts of the situation are: These large, profitable properties are few in number; that, so far as known, their owners have never joined in a request for Government appropriations to aid the mining industry, nor have they been given any special consideration either in the establishment or in the plans of the Bureau of Mines. They have neither asked for assistance, nor have they endeavored to unload upon the Government any investigations of their own. On the contrary, at the request of the Bureau of Mines, a number of them have expended considerable allotments of their own funds on investigations which promise to be useful not only to them, but to other less important mining developments in which they were in no way involved.
>
> While the number of large mines in this country is small, there is a large number of small mines. The records show that in the country as a whole there are about 40,000 coal mines, metal mines, and quarries and about 170,000 oil wells, operated to a smaller or larger extent in connection with the mining operations. In addition to these there is a large number of operating plants connected with the smelting and other metallurgical operations and various mineral industry operations in different parts of the country. Few seem to appreciate the importance of helping those who hold these small properties to find methods of operation by which they can be worked at a profit instead of being helplessly transferred to a few large corporations who alone may have the funds for developing the processes that will make such operations possible.
>
> Congress is now appropriating as an aid to agricultural advancement nearly $28,000,000 per annum, while mining is receiving through the Bureau of Mines and the United States Geological Survey less than $2,000,000. The per capita contribution from the people of the United States for the advancement of agriculture amounts to 28 cents and for mining 2 cents.
>
> In referring to the aid given agriculture and mining by the Federal Government, Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior Department, recently said: "For a number of years Congress has been appropriating annually for the maintenance of experiment stations in behalf of agriculture in the several States an aggregate sum of nearly $1,500,000. In addition to this, in the public-land States the Federal Government has expended during the past 12 years $77,150,180 in the reclamation work of making available additional agricultural lands, and of this sum more than $8,000,000 has come from the proceeds of the sale of mineral lands in the public-land States."
>
> I mention these expenditures with no feeling other than that of approval, but in passing I may call attention to the fact that the mining industry in this country does not appear to have had a square deal in the way of public recognition and aid. And in speaking of mining, tunneling, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral-industry plants, it is impossible to estimate the number of men with health shattered through these conditions, who have had to give up their work before their natural time or the number of dependents who have suffered thereby.

In one of the best-known metal-mining districts of the United States, in addition to the number of men killed by accident, in the year 1912, there were 720 deaths from miner's consumption out of about 7,200 employed—10 per cent in one year. Ten years of such conditions wipes out an important mining camp. This almost unbelievable condition has apparently existed for many years, with the loss of hundreds and hundreds of men. It is also stated that at the present time from 30 to 60 per cent of the miners employed in mining operations in this district now have tuberculosis.

In the face of this condition, as we know that miner's consumption is an occupational disease caused by stone dust in the mines and largely preventable, it is imperative upon the Government to do its utmost to investigate the causes of this disgraceful condition and to improve the working conditions and to obviate, as far as human intelligence may be able, the dangers to life, limb, and health which now exist in that indispensable industry.

Preliminary investigations of health conditions in mining and other mineral industries, undertaken by the Bureau of Mines in cooperation with the Public Health Service, are yielding notable results. One of these investigations, that of health conditions in lead and zinc mines, is focusing the attention of local health authorities and of State officials on the excessively high death rate from tuberculosis in at least one important mining district and is showing that this excessive death rate is largely due to the inhalation of fine, sharp particles of rock dust made by drilling and blasting.

In its investigations looking to the lessening of present wastes or losses of mineral resources and the development of more efficient methods, the bureau has given attention chiefly to the waste from smelters and other metallurgical plants, the waste in the treatment of the rarer minerals and metals, the waste in coal mining, and the waste in the production of oil and natural gas.

In investigating the coking of coals in beehive ovens the bureau found that $75,000,000 worth of by-products is being lost annually. As a result the bureau has undertaken a study of industrial carbonization processes looking to the recovery of these wasted by-products and is preparing for publication a complete report of the notable advances made.

The importance of the bureau's investigations of mineral waste is further shown by the fact that these wastes or losses in our mineral resources, of which the Nation has only the one supply, now exceed $1,000,000 per day and yet are believed to be largely preventable.

In its investigations of fuels the bureau developed the new methods upon which the Government fuel purchases are now made, and has thus brought about savings in the Government's fuel bill that amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. During 1914 over $8,000,000 worth of coal was purchased for the Government under specifications prepared by the Bureau of Mines, or under its advice, and as a result of these fuel investigations the Government saved more than $200,000 as compared with prices paid in previous years. Other work by the bureau has served as a basis for boiler improvements in public buildings and the development of a new type of power-plant boiler.

We need not especially concern ourselves about the profits of the few large mining companies. There are many thousand small mine owners and prospectors struggling with difficult problems, there are the safety and welfare of the 2,000,000 employees in the various mining and mineral industries, and there are the other great national problems of waste in these industries, all of which should have our serious concern and should have also the benefit of extended national inquiry and scientific investigation.

As I have stated, during the first two years of its existence practically all of the appropriations for the work of the Bureau of Mines have been spent in behalf of the coal-mining industry, mainly in the Mississippi Valley and the Eastern States. This work has been so satisfactory as to justify the effort of those who favor this legislation and to win the approval of many of those who originally opposed the creation of this bureau.

In view of the great coal-mine disasters of the last few years the representatives of the metalliferous-mining industry recognized the propriety of making the prevention of these disasters the first great work of the bureau. This work is now well organized, and the recognition and aid of the Federal Government in behalf of the metal-mining industry of the West should not be longer delayed.

For the past 15 years the mining men of the Western States have been demanding Federal recognition and aid in behalf of the mining industry. With the help of representatives of the coal-mining regions the agency through which this aid can be given was finally secured, and its work should now be extended to the metal mines of the public-land States. The organization of mine-safety work in the metal-mining districts has not been entered upon, but is greatly needed. The loss of lives in many of these districts is almost as great as in the coal mines.

For some years past the metalliferous-mining industry of the West has not kept pace with the development of other lines of enterprise. Under the stimulating effect of Federal aid given through the Department of Agriculture the average annual valuations of agricultural production of the public-land States has increased from an annual value of $966,000,000 during the five years from 1901 to 1905 to an average annual valuation of $1,365,000,000 for the five years preceding 1910. During those same years the average production of precious metals from those States has decreased from $136,000,000 during the first period to $127,000,000 during the second period. With rare exceptions the population of all the mining camps in the West decreased during this period and in many instances low-grade mining camps have been entirely abandoned.

The achievement of the bureau's chemists and engineers in perfecting new methods for the extraction of radium has been brought to the attention of this House by the gentlemen from Illinois, who recently exhibited $11,000 worth of radium made by these methods. Steps have been taken to patent and dedicate to the public these processes, which show 15 per cent higher efficiency than that obtained by the largest foreign producer of radium, and promise to reduce the cost of radium to one-third of the present price.

In this line of research work, in my judgment, will be found one of the most valuable and legitimate provinces for its activities. What has been accomplished toward improving the method of reducing radium-bearing ores will, when promulgated, tremendously stimulate private enterprise in the production of radium, to the end that an adequate supply of this marvelous, mysterious, and benevolent element may be available for the people. What the bureau has so successfully achieved with this elusive mineral furnishes conclusive evidence of what may be realized in the treatment of other mineral-bearing ores. The field is fallow and awaiting such investigation and research work as this bureau must be permitted to engage in.

The safety and health of millions of toilers in mines and attendant industries will always be the paramount consideration. But, in addition to this, the bureau, without impairing its functions in this respect, should be provided with adequate equipment and facilities to conduct research work in respect to the economic and scientific development of our metal-mining resources, with the object of devising improved methods in mining and of avoiding waste and fruitless effort.

The discovery of gold in the shining sands of California by Mormons employed by Capt. James W. Marshall in digging a mill race in the mountains of Coloma in 1847 brought a rush of Argonauts from all parts of the world to the new Eldorado. From that time to the present a great deal has been done in the development of precious metal mining.

This has been accomplished by the hard common sense, pluck, and force of the courageous men who have engaged in the industry; but the time has come when this industry should be fostered and encouraged by disseminating the information to be secured by scientific research work under the Bureau of Mines. This bill provides ultimately for the establishment of 10 mining experiment stations and 15 mine safety stations, movable or stationary, including those already established, the province and duty of which shall be to make investigations and disseminate information with a view to improving conditions in the mining, quarrying, metallurgical, and other mineral industries, safeguarding life among employees, preventing unnecessary waste of resources, and otherwise contributing to the advancement of these resources; and, when its purposes have been carried out, the beneficial results will verify all we predict.

For several years an earnest effort has been made by the Members from the precious metal producing States to have the Bureau of Mines extend its activities by the establishment of mining experiment and mine safety stations at various places in that vast region. I have had a bill before the committee ever since the Bureau of Mines was organized to establish such a station at Salt Lake City. In the hearings before that committee, on December 18, 1911, I made the following statement, which I think is pertinent at this time to the bill under consideration:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH HOWELL, OF UTAH.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, H. R. 11853, which I have introduced, presents the same principle as that so ably discussed by Mr. Taylor. Salt Lake City is another suitor for a mining experiment station. This city is so situated in the heart of the great metalliferous mining region of the West and possesses other features of advantage for the location of such a station unequaled by any other place. But my chief purpose this morning, Mr. Chairman, is to urge an extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines, so as to include in the scope of its usefulness technologic investigations in metallurgy and a study of metalliferous mining. The mining States for many years have been knocking at the doors of Congress for the establishment of a department of mines, but not until they secured the cooperation of the coal-mining interest of the East were they enabled to make much headway. Finally, after a persistent effort the Bureau of Mines was created. This was hailed with a great deal of satisfaction by those engaged in precious-metal mining as an evidence that the great mining industry was about to receive the fostering attention of the Government that it deserved as one of the great basic industries on which rests the welfare and prosperity of our people. There were those in the beginning that opposed the Department of Agriculture and sneered at the futility of the General Government's activities in this respect, but time has abundantly proven the wisdom of the far-sighted statesmen who advocated the promotion of agriculture by the General Government.

The Department of Agriculture has grown to be indispensable to the country. Its beneficial work, like a candle set upon a hill, shines upon the whole country. In the light of what has been accomplished for agriculture we can confidently look forward to like achievements in the field of mining—its twin sister. These two industries are the source of all that we require for the welfare of mankind. Why should not the mining industry receive the same encouragement at the hands of the General Government as agriculture? The Bureau of Mines in the inception of its mission has confined its efforts largely to the coal-mining industry, and has done most excellent and praiseworthy work in that field. The horrible catastrophies constantly happening in coal mines have stirred the whole people and caused a demand on the part of the Government to put forth every possible effort to avert a recurrence of these calamities in the future and toward improving the conditions affecting the health and safety of the miners. But the time has come that the metalliferous miners demand some attention to their industry. Here is a field lying fallow for scientific research and investigation. The mining of precious metals in our country is in its infancy. Only the richest and most tractable ores have been made to yield their treasure. Millions of dollars of ore have been taken from mines and thrown aside, because no known process permitted their reduction at a profit. Other millions of tons of ore lie undisturbed in our mountain vaults for want of knowledge to profitably extract their values. Then there is the problem of controlling the poisonous fumes that issue from the smelters and destroy all vegetable growth in the vicinity and provoke never-ending bitter legal controversies to burden our courts. Scientific and economic experimentation along these lines are entirely beyond the reach of private investigation. This can be properly and adequately undertaken only by the General Government. What a field for effort. How pregnant of possibilities for the enrichment of the Nation. What an aim for the conservationist in utilizing to the highest degree our unborn wealth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the metalliferous mining States are keenly alive to the necessities of the situation, and everywhere there is a strong and widespread demand for the inauguration of a policy that will advance and promote this industry. The mining congress, composed of able representatives of all the mining States, unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas the development of processes of ore treatment capable of handling with profit the vast low-grade deposits and mine dumps of our mining districts is of the greatest importance to the mining industry and to all related industries: Be it

"*Resolved*, That it be the sense of the American Mining Congress that the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to provide for the establishment, under the direction of the Bureau of Mines, of a metallurgical experiment ore-testing station or stations for the purpose of devising methods for the extraction of metals from low-grade ores and appropriate sufficient funds for such purpose.

"*Resolved further*, That the officers of the American Mining Congress draft a suitable bill providing for the proper carrying out of this resolution, and that copies of the bill and of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and each Senator and Representative; and that the officers of the American Mining Congress use all honorable means to the end that such a bill may become a law. In view of the increasing importance and complexity of the mining and metallurgical industries, the deplorable waste in mining under present

methods, and the great need of trained men to aid in improving these conditions and in developing greater safety and efficiency.

"*Be it resolved*, That the American Mining Congress, now in session at Chicago, urges the Congress of the United States at Washington to provide for aid and cooperation in the maintenance of mining schools in the several States in a manner analogous to that which has been done in behalf of agriculture.

"*Be it resolved*, That the members of the American Mining Congress and the friends of the mining industry throughout the country are hereby urged to cooperate in securing the proper legislation necessary to carry above purposes into effect."

John Dern, a distinguished citizen of Utah, and one of our leading mining proprietors, president of the last mining congress, delivered an able and instructive address at that congress. His remarks upon the Bureau of Mines are so pertinent and set forth so clearly and convincingly the claims of the precious-metal industry that I insert the following excerpt from him:

THE BUREAU OF MINES.

"The American Mining Congress for years demanded the creation of a Department of Mines and Mining in our National Government, with representation in the President's Cabinet. Due directly to the efforts of our organization, Congress finally created a Bureau of Mines. That our efforts were successful was due to the support of the distinguished guest who is to honor us by his presence during our present session and whose wisdom, high-mindedness, and sincerity of purpose we all acknowledge and applaud—President William Howard Taft.

"Congress created the Bureau of Mines, but the usefulness of the bureau has so far been circumscribed within very narrow limits. It is true that it has been permitted to do some extremely valuable work to lessen the number of accidents in coal mines, but aside from that its chief work has been to test fuel for the Government, so that when Uncle Sam wants a load of coal for the Capitol at Washington or for one of his battleships he will get his money's worth. No doubt this is a necessary and important function, but we are not satisfied with this amount of aid for the mining industry.

"One of the important tasks before us is to create a demand that the Bureau of Mines be given a chance to do some of the things that we expected of it. Give it a chance and have no fear that it will not quickly justify itself. If we can convince our Congressmen and Senators that the Bureau of Mines ought to have the authority and the appropriation it asks for, our able and good friend, Dr. Holmes, and his assistants will promptly demonstrate that the money could not have been better spent.

"We believe that the Bureau of Mines ought to be to the miner what the Department of Agriculture is to the farmer. When the Department of Agriculture was created, it was the object of much criticism, and yet it is now one of the most important factors in our national life and nobody wants it abolished. I am an ardent admirer of the Department of Agriculture and of the work that it is doing. So far as tangible results are concerned, I believe it is the most useful branch of our Government. It tells the farmer how to maintain the fertility of his soil by rotating crops; when and how to plow his land; what sort of crops to raise and how to get the highest yields; how to irrigate his land if it does not rain enough, and how to drain it if it rains too much.

"If these great things are done for agriculture, why not do something for agriculture's sister—mining? Be it remembered that man's every need is supplied by our mother earth. Out of the earth's crust comes everything we drink, eat, wear, or use, all our habitations, conveyances, tools, and, in fact, everything we have, be it necessity or luxury. Agriculture and mining are the twin sciences that divide between themselves the work of extracting these things from the earth. Agriculture has the vegetable kingdom and mining the mineral kingdom. Is there any reason why agriculture should be made the favorite child of our Government, while mining is treated as a stepchild? The two sciences are of equal importance, and neither could exist without the other. We are not in the least jealous of the treatment that has been accorded to agriculture. She merits it all and more. We only plead that mining be likewise recognized and given her just dues. To those who argue that agriculture is the more important, we say, 'Pause and reflect whether any sort of civilization could be possible without the products of the mines.' It is undoubtedly true that no mining or any other sort of work could be done without agriculture, but agriculture alone is helpless to advance the human family in its onward march toward higher and better things."

Now, gentlemen, Mr. Taylor and myself and the other representatives of the West are of one accord in our efforts to extend the scope and work of the Bureau of Mines to cover its legitimate field of usefulness. These bills have been introduced as a step in this direction. If it is determined that one or more mining experiment stations is the most effective way to accomplish the desired result, I know of no other city in the country that possesses the same strategic points of advantage for such a station as Salt Lake City. The commercial club, consisting of the business and mining men of Salt Lake City, has had the matter before them for consideration and have adopted the following resolutions:

[Report of commercial club's committee on mines and mining adopted at the general membership meeting of the commercial club, December 22, 1911.]

"Whereas the American Mining Congress at its last annual session passed a resolution asking the Congress of the United States to enlarge the scope of the United States Bureau of Mines by establishing under its auspices metallurgical research stations, thus affording the mining industry the same encouragement and treatment at the hands of the General Government as is given the agricultural industry, and that an appropriation sufficient to carry out the enlarged functions of the United States Bureau of Mines be made;

"Whereas the present activity of the bureau is confined to the coal-mining industry, and should be equally devoted to the advancement of the metal-mining interests;

"Whereas Salt Lake City is the center of activity of the mining and smelting industry of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Salt Lake Commercial Club, by its assembled membership, give its indorsement to the general idea of the establishment of Government metallurgical research stations: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to appropriate for the use of the Bureau of Mines the sum of $500,000 for such experimental purposes and that it enact a law providing for the establishment of such metallurgical research station at Salt Lake City, Utah: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator REED SMOOT, Senator GEORGE SUTHERLAND, and Congressman JOSEPH HOWELL for presentation to Congress, and that these members of the Utah congressional delegation be earnestly urged to use all energetic and honorable means to bring about the aforesaid results: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a committee of two be appointed by the board of governors of the commercial club to bring this resolution to the attention of individual Representatives in Congress and use all honorable means to procure legislation necessary to bring about the purposes of this resolution."

Salt Lake City is the commercial center and metropolis of that vast territory between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Coast Range. It is in the very heart of the mining region. It is also a great railway center, with two continental railways—the Union Pacific and the Rio Grande—from the east, and three from the Pacific coast—the Southern Pacific, the Western Pacific, and the Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railway—while the Oregon Short Line connects the city with the States to the north and northwest. These main lines of railway, centering in Salt Lake, have feeders or branch lines ramifying the entire mining region and bring all the most important districts in direct and close connection with Salt Lake City. In a radius of less than a hundred miles are found all the leading mining districts in Utah, in which are found a variety of ores, containing gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, etc., typical of the ores of a vast mining region.

The State university is located here, which embraces an excellent school of mines, so that from every standpoint Salt Lake is the ideal place for conducting these investigations. In proposing this legislation I realize that we are breaking new ground, and the committee in its wisdom may determine upon some other method of reaching the object desired. I am sure the State school of mines at Salt Lake City would be most willing to cooperate with the Bureau of Mines in this work. I fully sympathize with the views of our chairman in favor of granting Federal aid for mining schools in the several States. This is in line with what has been done for agriculture, and I want to see the Bureau of Mines stand as the head in the new awakening to better, more scientific, and more economical methods of mining.

The Shipping Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LADISLAS LAZARO,
OF LOUISIANA,
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 16, 1915.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, having studied this shipping bill thoroughly from every standpoint, and after having heard it discussed from every angle here to-day, I have come to the conclusion that it is a good bill, and I shall vote for it. This is an emergency measure to meet a very serious condition brought about by the war in Europe. The situation should be plain to any thinking man. We had neglected our merchant marine—so much so that all three of the platforms of 1912 contained planks acknowledging this and promising the people relief. We did not realize how few ships we really have until the war broke out. From that day until now it has been difficult, and almost impossible at times, to ship the products of our farms, our mines, mills, and factories to the markets of the world. Not only that, but the Shipping Trust soon took advantage of this condition and raised their ocean rates until they are almost prohibitive. For example, we are to-day paying about fifteen times more than we paid before the war to ship our cotton to foreign ports. So the question comes up, Is this great Government of ours to submit to this Shipping Trust and permit the products of our people to rot at the docks when there is so much demand for them everywhere? I think not.

Of course, the Republicans being in the minority in this House, they are trying to make political capital of it and they are conducting one of the worst filibusters in the history of this Congress. They are criticizing us for adhering to our Democratic platform, which promises the people to enact laws to promote the growth of our merchant marine in order to develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to other countries, but they offer nothing as a substitute for this measure. We all know that their idea of building up a merchant marine is by subsidy, taking the money out of the Treasury of the United States and giving it to a few shipowners. No member of the opposition so far has brought forward any substitute bill to relieve this serious situation, which this bill is brought forward to meet.

It is admitted that individual enterprise can not be depended on at this time and in this emergency. No one denies the emergency nor the prohibitive freight rates, and yet they tell us we have enough ships. It stands to reason that if we had enough ships the rates would not be so high.

We have to decide now whether this Government of ours should help relieve this paralysis of our foreign commerce or whether, by refusing to help, it will permit this paralysis to continue until the war is over. In normal times it may be that we could solve the problem in some other way, and I am not prepared to say whether I would vote for a measure of this

kind in times of world peace; but these are abnormal times, and conditions have to be met as we find them.

Some say that if we enact this measure into law it would cause international complications. We have international complications now, and I do not believe that anyone would imagine for a moment that President Wilson would use the power given him by this act to bring about war, when we know that he is laboring day and night to prevent war.

This emergency measure is taking no privilege or opportunity from private enterprise. Its sole aim and purpose is to provide the country with shipping absolutely needed to carry on its commerce with the other nations of the world at a moment when the lack of ships is causing congestion of our commerce and causing transportation charges to go up until they are almost prohibitive. In his Indianapolis speech, on January 8, President Wilson spoke as follows on this subject:

> Do you know, gentlemen, that the ocean freight rates have gone up in some instances to ten times their ordinary figure? And that the farmers of the United States, those who raise grain and those who raise cotton—these things that are absolutely necessary to the world as well as to ourselves—can not get any profit out of the great prices that they are willing to pay for these things on the other side of the sea because the whole profit is eaten up by the extortionate charges for ocean carriage? In the midst of this the Democrats propose a temporary measure of relief in a shipping bill.
>
> The merchants and the farmers of this country must have ships to carry their goods, and just at the present moment there is no other way of getting them than through the instrumentality that is suggested in the shipping bill; and I hear it is said in Washington on all hands that the Republicans in the United States Senate mean to talk enough to make the passage of that bill impossible.

And, as he said in his address, the Republicans in the United States Senate are trying to talk it to death. It seems to me that our duty here now is to uphold his hands in this great emergency, brought about by this horrible war, and give relief to the people of this country by enacting this measure into law and putting an end to this Shipping Trust, which now has such a firm grip on the throat of our commerce.

Ship-Purchase Bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT N. PAGE,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Tuesday, February 16, 1915,

On House resolution 732.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when a Representative in the discharge of his official duties finds himself out of harmony with a majority of his party colleagues upon any matter of legislation, naturally enough, if he is conscientious, an effort is made to harmonize his views with those of his party associates and, if unable to do so, vindicate his position.

During the second session of the present Congress a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives, now publicly known as the shipping bill. It was understood then and now that this measure had the approval of President Wilson. By the provisions of this bill the Government of the United States was authorized to purchase and operate merchant vessels on the high seas. I believe firmly in the long-established policy of the Democratic Party touching a merchant marine, stated in the platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912 under the head of "Merchant marine," as follows:

> MERCHANT MARINE.
>
> We believe in fostering by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the south, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury.

This declaration of party principle is emphatic and unequivocal, and there can be no misinterpretation of the language "but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury." By the provisions of the shipping bill above referred to $40,000,000 was to be appropriated for the purchase or construction of these vessels; $30,000,000 of this amount to be raised from the sale of Panama Canal bonds, and $10,000,000 by appropriation from the National Treasury. No one will deny that this constitutes an additional burden upon the people. The Democratic Party having never declared in favor of Government ownership and operation of public utilities and being thoroughly convinced then as now that the Government can not operate these things either as efficiently or as economically as private enterprise, I could not gain the consent of my mind to support this legislation, and it was so announced in the public prints of my State.

Upon the convening of the present session of Congress on December 8, 1914, the President in his annual message urged upon the Congress the enactment into law of the shipping bill, basing his request upon the opportunity presented for the expansion of American commerce because of conditions brought about in the commerce of the world by the European war. In that message Mr. Wilson made it perfectly clear that it was the purpose of the proponents of this legislation to make it temporary, using this language:

> It should take action to make it certain that transportation at reasonable rates will be promptly provided, even where the carriage is not at first profitable, and then, when the carriage has become sufficiently profitable to attract and engage private capital and engage it in abundance, the Government ought to withdraw.

My own opinion is that the Government can not enter into any field of endeavor without necessarily monopolizing that field. The sentence quoted above makes it clear that it is the purpose, should this bill become a law, to operate these vessels at a loss. This necessarily precludes competition on the part of private capital, which can not operate without profit. A merchant marine capable of performing the service required of it in the handling of American commerce would require the investment not of $40,000,000 but not less than $400,000,000. The bill now under consideration is not the original bill but a consolidation of Senate bill No. 5259, introduced into the Senate by Senator WEEKS, of Massachusetts, and entitled "An act to establish one or more United States Navy mail lines between the United States and South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe." This bill, in brief, provides that the Secretary of the Navy shall establish one or more mail lines by employing such vessels of the Government as may be available between the United States and both coasts of South America and between the United States and the countries of Europe, to be operated under such regulations and at such rates as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. It also authorizes an increase of the enlisted strength of the Navy by the number of men required to man the vessels so employed, giving these new employees the same privileges of retirement as officers of the line.

This bill appropriated the modest sum of $100,000 for the purpose of organizing, inaugurating, and carrying on the traffic provided for in the bill, with the further provision that all moneys received for the transportation of mail, passengers, and freight shall be made available, in addition to the appropriation of $100,000, for the expenses incident to the proper conduct of the business contemplated—together with House resolution 732, better known as the Gore bill, which provides for the creation of a shipping board, its incorporation in the District of Columbia for the purpose of purchasing, constructing, equipping, maintaining, and operating merchant vessels to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States or to charter vessels for such purposes. The initial capital stock of this corporation is fixed at $10,000,000; a provision is made for the selling of $40,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds in addition to this appropriation. These vessels are limited by the terms of the bill to engagement only in trade with foreign countries, the Philippine and Hawaiian Islands, and the island of Porto Rico. This provision precludes the participation of these vessels in the coastwise trade of the United States. It also provides that two years from and after the conclusion of the present European war, that fact to be determined by the President, the corporation and the shipping board shall turn over and transfer all vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act to the Navy Department, and the Secretary of the Navy shall have the right, with the approval of the President, to lease or charter any of such vessels not needed for naval or military purposes to any firm, individual, or corporation for use as merchant vessels. It also provides that at this time the corporation shall go out of business and the merchant marine of the United States shall thereafter be operated by the Secretary of the Navy under the terms of Senate bill 5259, known as the Weeks bill.

If enacted into law, is this bill by its terms in conflict with the party platform adopted at Baltimore in 1912, that states in specific terms that the Democratic Party in fostering a merchant marine will do so without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties and subsidies from the Public Treasury? I think no one will deny that it is in direct contravention of this party declaration.

I yield to no man in my admiration for the President of the United States. I believe by training and in mental equipment

he is the equal of any man who ever held this high office. I have great confidence in his judgment and unbounded admiration for his personality, but I can not subject, without investigation, to his judgment my own convictions upon the questions involved in this legislation. If it was a mere opinion, I would relinquish it gladly to be in accord with him and with a majority of my party associates; but having an abiding conviction, based upon what I believe to be the long-established principles of the Democratic Party, that have been greatly strengthened and confirmed by the utterances of Mr. Wilson himself, I can not support this bill without surrendering my self-respect as well as prostituting my obligation to the constituency that has so signally honored me.

Going back to 1912, when the question of the Panama Canal tolls was before the House of Representatives and the question was acute as to whether or not vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States should be exempt from tolls in passing through the canal, I then favored and voted for the collection of tolls from vessels engaged in the coastwise trade, for two reasons: First, because, in my judgment, the treaty that enabled us to construct the Panama Canal prohibited us from giving this preference to our own vessels; and, second, because the vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States are, by our laws, made practically a monopoly, and to exempt them from the payment of tolls would be, if not a direct, certainly an indirect subsidy to the owners of these vessels. A majority of the Congress took a different view, and these vessels were at that time given free passage through the canal. This action on the part of our Government was considered by every foreign power as being a violation of the solemn obligations we had entered into by treaty; and the situation was so acute that the President felt impelled on March 5, 1914, to deliver a special message to the Congress upon this subject, and in this message he frankly asked the Congress to repeal the provision of the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, which exempted vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States from the payment of tolls. In that message he said:

> Whatever may be our own differences of opinion concerning this much-debated measure, its meaning is not debated outside the United States. Everywhere else the language of the treaty is given but one interpretation, and that interpretation precludes the exemption I am asking you to repeal.

Again:

> We ought to reverse our action without asking the question whether we were right or wrong, and so once more deserve our reputation for generosity and for the redemption of every obligation without quibble or hesitation.

During the discussion in the Congress of the bill to repeal the Panama Canal act of August 24, 1912, the President, in his periodical talks with newspaper correspondents in the city of Washington, as published in the World's Work of October, 1914, in discussing with them the measure pending in the House of Representatives, made reference to the plank in the Democratic platform of 1912 which, in specific terms, favored the exemption from tolls of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal, and he is quoted as having said:

> If you will examine the platform you will find that there are two planks in it, one directly, as all other declarations of a party have been, against subsidies, direct or indirect, or any additional burden laid upon the people for the sake of encouraging shipping; and the other is with regard to tolls. Now, it ought not to be difficult to determine which should take precedence—a long-established principle of a party or what now seems to be an exception from the long-established practice. That is perfectly plain sailing, to my mind; I don't see any escape from it. Free tolls certainly is a subsidy, and as between the principle of the party and a policy which violates that immemorial principle there ought not to be much difficulty in choosing.

Applying this reasoning to the shipping bill, by the terms of which the Government is to place a tax of from thirty to fifty millions of dollars upon the people to engage in over-sea commerce, and comparing this with the long-established policy of the party, as expressed in its platform quoted above, I can not escape the conclusion that it is perfectly plain sailing for me; I can not see any escape from it, and in supporting this bill I should unquestionably violate the long-established policy of our party, as well as a specific platform declaration.

Referring again to legislation enacted during the last session of Congress, namely, the bill that authorized the Government of the United States to construct and operate a railroad in the Territory of Alaska and appropriating therefor the sum of $35,000,000 was, to my mind, so serious a departure from long-established Democratic doctrine and precedent, and though indorsed by the President and a majority of my party associates, I could not support it. Certainly no platform of the Democratic Party in the past has directly or by implication committed the party, or myself as a member of that party, to the legislation now pending.

Party policy can only be inaugurated in one way, and that is by a direct declaration of principles in the party platform. If it is a matter of State interest and control, then the State platform, and if of national importance, then in the national platform.

As the representative of the people of the seventh congressional district of North Carolina, and in my representative capacity, even in the absence of a platform declaration, should they, my constituents, by any means inform me of their desire touching any proposed legislation I should consider myself bound to carry out their wishes or resign my seat in the Congress of the United States. As long ago as October, 1914, as I said in the beginning, the newspapers of my State published the fact of my opposition to this bill. Five months, very nearly, have elapsed since my position upon this question was known to my constituents. It was not discussed in the campaign of 1914 there or elsewhere. There has been no declaration by the party touching the question, and it is a very significant fact that in all these five months I have not received a single request from any constituent, either orally or by written communication, asking me to support this legislation. Some one may say that the action of a party caucus establishes party principles, but upon serious reflection I am sure that no one will so contend.

Only recently, namely, on the 28th day of January, 1915, the President delivered to the House of Representatives a message vetoing an act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, a bill that had been passed by a vote of two-thirds of the Representatives voting in the House of Representatives, and seven-tenths of the vote in the United States Senate, and in doing so he used this language:

> If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests, and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

If the matter of the regulation of the admission of aliens to our shores is a matter of such fundamental importance, is not the policy of embarking the Government into the unknown and untried seas of Government ownership a question of fundamental importance? Is it not one of such vast and far-reaching importance that before this step is taken the people should be given an opportunity to assert their wish? Does this bill now under consideration rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? If it has the assent or is fostered by the desire of the constituency that I represent, it has signally failed to assert its wish. Has any political party in this country, other than the Socialist Party, ever avowed a policy of Government ownership? I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. It is because I doubt that it is the desire or the wish of any considerable number of people among my constituency or within the Democratic Party to embark upon this doubtful and losing enterprise that I make bold to dissent from it.

If in the usual way the Democratic Party expresses as its mind and desire that we embark upon the practically untried and unknown sea of Government ownership and operation, reversing the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am, so far as the constituency that I represent is concerned, their servant and have no license to stand in their way. I am willing to abide by their verdict, but not until it has been rendered.

One other phase of this subject, and I am done. The disturbances of commerce and trade brought on by the terrific war precipitated in Europe on the 1st of last August has so deranged the revenues of our Government that it became necessary at the last session of Congress to levy a special tax upon the people in order that a hundred million dollars might be raised in taxes to supplement the loss occasioned by the falling off of imports. The Government, by embarking upon this enterprise of Government ownership and operation, in the construction of the Alaskan railroad, and in the purchase and operation of ships provided for in this bill, is placing a tax burden upon the American people in the aggregate of $75,000,000. Other men may feel free to assume the responsibility of imposing special taxes, onerous tax burdens, for purposes like this, for which the people have not declared themselves; but, as for me, I prefer to await the verdict of the people.

Ship-Purchase Bill.

SPEECH

OF

HON. SILAS R. BARTON,

OF NEBRASKA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, February 17, 1915.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 3362) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, through the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, to make a survey of natural oyster beds, bars, and rocks, and barren bottoms contiguous thereto in waters along the coast of and within the State of Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, it is to be regretted that on account of the drastic rule brought in yesterday we could not have the right and privilege that was given us under the Constitution, and which the people of this country expect us to have, in passing on one of the greatest problems confronting us to-day—the creation of a merchant marine.

Democrats have railed for the past decade against gag rule, but when they get into harness they bring in and adopt rules that are more drastic than the procedure under Cannon or Reed. A bill is brought in that has never received the consideration of a committee—ordered in by a caucus and forced through this body without even the privilege of amendment. The bill was not even the work of a secret caucus; it was not the work of the membership of this House; it was the work of the executive department, who brought it to you, and, like young robins, you closed your eyes and opened your mouths and swallowed, regardless of what was brought. By this rule you propose to discharge a committee that has never considered the bill. Your Committee on Rules attach an amendment that has never been introduced in this House, and your drastic action forbids amendment and limits debate to six hours. Unless the people of this country have decided that a monarchical form of government is preferable to a republican form, they will never set their seal of approval upon such action.

This is a period of our Nation's history when we should, as representatives of the American people, talk, act, and breathe neutrality. We should not stand by watching the great struggle, proclaiming to the world we are neutral, wink the other eye, and ship guns, powder, shot, and shrapnel to the belligerents on either side of the contest.

John Bassett Moore says in his Digest of International Law, volume 7, page 748:

> Much misapprehension as to the quality of the act of supplying contraband articles, such as arms and munitions of war to the parties to an armed conflict has arisen from the statements so often made that the trade in contraband is lawful and not prohibited.
>
> This statement, when made with reference to the preventive duties of neutral Governments, is quite correct, but if applied to the duties of individuals it is quite incorrect. The acts which individuals are forbidden to commit and the acts which neutral Governments are obliged to prevent are by no means the same; precisely as the acts which the neutral Government is obliged to prevent and the acts which it is forbidden to commit are by no means the same. The supply of materials of war, such as arms and ammunition, to either party to an armed conflict, although neutral Governments are not obliged to prevent it, constitutes on the part of the individuals who engage in it a participation in hostilities, and as such is confessedly an unneutral act. Should the Government of the individual itself supply such article, it would clearly depart from its position of neutrality.

GREAT BRITAIN RECOGNIZES THAT SUCH ACTS ON THE PART OF INDIVIDUALS ARE UNNEUTRAL.

April 23, 1898, Great Britain warned British subjects by proclamation against doing any act in derogation of their duty as subjects of a neutral power, or any violation or contravention of the law of nations, among which was enumerated the carrying of arms, ammunition, military stores or materials.

From the foregoing it appears that under general international law, as recognized by Great Britain itself, the act of our citizens in exporting arms and ammunition is an unneutral act. If our Government decides to forbid the commission of such unneutral act by its own citizens, can such action on the part of our Government be declared to be unneutral, since its object is to establish neutrality? It seems to me that with this falls the last argument of the opponents of the various measures pending before Congress designed to stop the export of arms and ammunition.

In this connection I desire to call attention to the further fact that there is now on the statute books of Great Britain an act very similar in its wording to House joint resolution 377, conferring discretionary power on the King of England to forbid the export of arms and ammunition; also that nearly all the neutral countries of Europe have since this war began enacted such legislation; also that the German Government during the Spanish-American War stopped the export of such materials on a protest from our minister, Andrew D. White.

We are a Nation that profess peace, yet our present attitude is to place the dollar above the man. For commerce we would sacrifice all. Just to make profits for the manufacturer of instruments of war we refrain from placing an embargo on such munitions. We do not see the difference between bullets and bombs, bread and bacon; we do not see the difference between cannon and cotton. I can not understand this blindness, especially when Holland, Switzerland, Norway, and Sweden have placed humanity above commercialism and have declared an embargo on arms. Why, then, should not we who claim to be the leaders of peace follow their glorious example?

Why, then, should not we enact the resolution against shipping arms to the belligerents; postpone this shipping bill until the war is over and be neutral in the true sense of the word. This shipping bill in my judgment is but another method of injecting ourselves into the strained condition now existing. Who will argue that conditions are so imperative that we can not wait to build our ships until this great war ceases? What is behind this great pressure that is being used daily? The President vetoed the immigration bill on the theory that the people had not passed on it. Have the people passed on the Government buying and sending their ships into the troubled waters of foreign countries? Is not the demand from seaboard speculators and men who will have control of the shipping board instead of the people? What ships can we buy but interned ships? If these ships could be bought without a breach of neutrality, who would they carry freight to? You know, and I know, that only one of the parties to this great contest could be benefitted. Is this the reason for the great pressure? Is it in truth to reduce freight rates? Do you think that shipping risk now is no greater risk than before the war? If you are really so concerned about the freight rates, why so insistent that the railroad rates be increased? Why did not the administration insist on placing a railroad across this continent to prove railroad rates were higher, and help the farmer?

The main argument that is used throughout the discussion is, we want ships to reduce ocean freight rates. In the words of Representative GOOD, of Iowa:

> "I would be very glad to vote for a bill to bring about a reduction in those rates. How about that side of the Chamber, whose party in convention in Baltimore adopted a platform promising cheaper railway rates? In the Interstate Commerce case where the eastern roads were asking for an increase of 5 per cent the president of the New York Central lines testified that in 1913 that after setting aside all that was necessary for depreciation, and after setting aside $11,000,000 to the surplus fund, they still had enough to pay 11 per cent on the entire capitalization of the road. The president of the Pennsylvania Railroad testified that in 1913, after setting aside a sufficient fund to cover all of the depreciation charges, they still had net earnings sufficient to pay more than 9.6 per cent on the total capitalization of the Pennsylvania Railroad. Yet, notwithstanding such magnificent earnings, the President of the United States on September 11 wrote a letter which appears in the New York Times of that date under the following headlines:

> "President asks aid for railroads—Calls country's attention to the necessity of giving them every possible help—Finds their needs vital—In open leter to Frank Trumbull he insists their credits must be sustained—May seek rate increase—Reopening of interstate ruling of August 1 probably will be asked by eastern lines.

> "The President says to Mr. Trumbull:

> "Since you read it to me yesterday I have read again the statement you made on behalf of the committee of railroad presidents whom I had the pleasure of meeting and conferring with at my office. It is a lucid statement of plain truths.
>
> "You asked me to call the attention of the country to the imperative need that railway credits be sustained and the railroads helped in every possible way, whether by private cooperative effort or by the action, wherever feasible, of Government agencies, and I am glad to do so, because I think the need very real. * * *
>
> "I am confident that there will be active and earnest cooperation in this matter, perhaps the one common interest of our whole industrial life. * * *
>
> "Cordially and sincerely, yours, WOODROW WILSON.

"Active cooperation! Active cooperation with whom? With whom could the President cooperate? Who had the power to grant the increase? The Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission alone. The President wanted freight rates increased for railroads that were earning 11 per cent in 1913 after they had paid all operating expenses, charged off all that was necessary for depreciation, and set aside $11,000,000 for the surplus fund. And yet you gentlemen on that side now claim that you are in favor of bearing down on the trusts and putting them out of business and of bringing

lower freight rates to the country." [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is said that we can not get ships to take our produce, yet during the month of December, 1913, we sent abroad 5,000,000 bushels of corn, wheat, oats, and barley, and in December of 1914, 41,000,000 bushels.

This is neither a Government ownership nor a private business. It permits private business to use Government money and credit for their exploitation, while the Government controls a majority of the stock, yet we know that fine, fat berths will be created for men whose main incentive and business will be to hold the job. Then after it is developed, if it should be, the bill proposes to lease the line to private interests—neither Government ownership nor private ownership—the Government a partner for its credit and money and the private interests for what they can make out of the senior partner.

I stand for a merchant marine; but the kind I stand for is ships built in American dockyards by American men, manned by American seamen, and floating an American flag.

The conditions are not so imperative that we can not wait until we build these ships, thus avoiding the danger of purchasing interned ships and sending them into troubled waters. In the interests of peace and neutrality let us pass the resolution against the shipment of arms and ammunition. Let us wait until the war is over before buying and building ships and embarking into new and untried waters, and if there are a few shippers and exporters who want to us the Government money to send their material abroad let them wait until this war concludes, and when we build our merchant marine let us build it without petty partners. In the spirit of peace and neutrality I shall vote against the measure.

Glory-Crowned Gettysburg, by Capt. Wilson I. Davenny.

SPEECH

OF

HON. SAMUEL W. SMITH,

OF MICHIGAN,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Thursday, February 18, 1915.

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me I should like to have the Clerk read an article written by Capt. Wilson I. Davenny, of Pontiac, Mich., entitled "Glory-Crowned Gettysburg."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

GLORY-CROWNED GETTYSBURG.

(By Capt. Wilson I. Davenny.)

"Gettysburg is a thrice-hallowed name. On the historic days in July half a century ago the Federal forces under Meade and the gallant and faithful followers of Lee mingled their sacrificial blood in the baptism of that most memorable field. And here, on a November day that was made forever notable by speech, Abraham Lincoln delivered his immortal address dedicating a portion of that field as a final resting place for the men who had yielded their lives that the Nation should survive. And within a lifetime more than 50,000 of the men who had been grim, determined actors in a death-inviting drama are met again upon the same consecrated soil and under the scorching rays of a July sun, but not in hostile ranks; not as foes, but as friends. The days of conflict and carnage are done, and the eyes that then were sighted along a glistening rifle barrel now dimmed by mists of years seek and meet the responsive and full forgiving glances of an erstwhile foe. The chasm of half a century is bridged. The asperities of years agone are submerged in an unbidden flood of mutual tears. The full and throbbing hearts of the veterans now beat in unison. There is no North, there is no South.

"The actual participants in the war of the sixties have themselves sealed the record of their privations and sacrificial suffering. Let no man open the book but to learn the splendid lessons of devotion to duty, as each man saw it, whichever section of our now united and common country may have claimed his service.

"It is worthy of serious reflection on this semicentennial anniversary of the third day's battle at Gettysburg that it is as true as when the 'great commoner' paid his tribute to the fallen sons of the North that while honoring the dead we should cherish a reawakened interest in 'that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion,' and that we 'highly resolve * * * that the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.' And in making this high resolve let us clearly understand that it is no idle pledge, but a dedication to civic endeavor, social uplift, and the advancement of practical patriotism. With the conspicuous inequalities in our social fabric, incident to the accretions in recent years of great wealth in the hands of a few and the daily exposures of venality and dishonest methods under our political system, the question, 'Whether or not a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal' is still biding its solution. There is still need for a sturdy, uncompromising, high-minded, patriotic citizenship, and there must be enough of it to give healthful direction to the all-encompassing commercial spirit of the times, if the American democracy is to endure as a permanent institution.

"God grant that the lessons of glory-crowned Gettysburg, thrice consecrated to duty, patriotism, and peace, shall strengthen and sustain the pillars of the Republic." [Applause.]

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

The superintendent of documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., is authorized to sell public documents at cost, and upon application that official will furnish free of charge price lists showing, under topical headings, the publications now available for sale.

The following topics are covered: Agriculture, law, engineering, lands, Army and Navy, fishes, Indians, transportation, finance, education, noncontiguous territory, geography and explorations, tariff, chemistry, animal industry, forestry, plant industry, roads, soils, statistics, American history, health and hygiene, poultry and birds, maps, political economy, and astronomy.

PRINTING OF EXTRACTS FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, ETC.

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver, upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof; and documents and reports of committees, with the evidence and papers submitted therewith or any part thereof, ordered printed by Congress may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate on prepayment of cost thereof. (Sec. 37, public printing act of Jan. 12, 1895.)

TERMS UPON WHICH THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD WILL BE FURNISHED SUBSCRIBERS.

The daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the third session of the Sixty-third Congress will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Single copies, 24 pages or less, 3 cents; each additional 8 pages, 1 cent extra.

Remit by money order payable to CORNELIUS FORD, Public Printer, Washington, D. C.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL.

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. W. A. Smith is in constant attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive subscriptions, copy, etc., and where extra copies of the RECORD, Congressional Directory, and information in regard to the cost of printing speeches in pamphlet form may be obtained.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE.

The superintendent of documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., is authorized by law to sell public documents at cost. Price lists, covering a wide range of subjects and including such general topics as agriculture, engineering, health and hygiene, and political economy, will be mailed free upon application.

LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES, WITH THEIR RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated.]

CLARK, CHAMP, Speaker, Missouri——2401 Massachusetts Avenue.
Abercrombie, John W., Alabama——Falkstone Courts.
Adair, John A. M., Indiana——Congress Hall.
Adamson, William C., Georgia——The Senate, 115 Second Street NE.
Aiken, Wyatt, South Carolina——1489 Meridian Place.
Ainey, W. D. B., Pennsylvania——
Alexander, Joshua W., Missouri——1110 Rhode Island Avenue.
Allen, Alfred G., Ohio——Congress Hall.
Anderson, Sydney, Minnesota——Falkstone Courts.
Anthony, Daniel R., jr., Kansas——The Woodward Apartments.
Ashbrook, William A., Ohio——Congress Hall.
Aswell, James B., Louisiana——Congress Hall.
Austin, Richard W., Tennessee——1827 Phillips Place.
Avis, Samuel B., West Virginia——Army and Navy Club.
Bailey, Warren Worth, Pennsylvania——Congress Hall.
Baker, J. Thompson, New Jersey——1710 N Street.
Baltz, William N., Illinois——307 M Street.
Barchfeld, Andrew J., Pennsylvania——1945 Calvert Street.
Barkley, Alben W., Kentucky——Congress Hall.
Barnhart, Henry A., Indiana——Congress Hall.
Bartholdt, Richard, Missouri——1603 Euclid Street.
Bartlett, Charles L., Georgia——The Cochran.
Barton, Silas R., Nebraska——1401 Delafield Place.
Bathrick, Ellsworth R., Ohio——The Winston.
Beakes, Samuel W., Michigan——The Driscoll.
Beall, Jack, Texas——The Cochran.
Bell, C. W., California——The Cairo.
Bell, Thomas M., Georgia——1467 Irving Street.
Blackmon, Fred L., Alabama——The Rochambeau.
Booher, Charles F., Missouri——313 New Jersey Avenue SE.
Borchers, Charles M., Illinois——The Continental.
Borland, William P., Missouri——1113 Sixteenth Street.
Bowdle, Stanley E., Ohio——1342 Vermont Avenue.
Britten, Fred A., Illinois——The Highlands.
Broussard, Franklin, Delaware——The Driscoll.
Brodbeck, Andrew R., Pennsylvania——Congress Hall.
Broussard, Robert F., Louisiana——The Rochambeau.
Brown, Lathrop, New York——1712 H Street.
Brown, William G., jr., West Virginia——Congress Hall.
Browne, Edward E., Wisconsin——2803 Ontario Road.
Browning, William J., New Jersey——146 East Capitol Street.
Bruckner, Henry, New York——The Continental.
Brumbaugh, Clement, Ohio——The Driscoll.
Bryan, James W., Washington——302 E Street NE.
Buchanan, Frank, Illinois——The Cairo.
Buchanan, J. P., Texas——The Driscoll.
Bulkley, Robert J., Ohio——1815 Twenty-fourth Street.
Burgess, George F., Texas——The Cochran.
Burke, Charles H., South Dakota——The Dewey.
Burke, James F., Pennsylvania——Army and Navy Club.
Burke, Michael E., Wisconsin——Congress Hall.
Burnett, John L., Alabama——Congress Hall.
Butler, Thomas S., Pennsylvania——The New Richmond.
Byrnes, James F., South Carolina——Congress Hall.
Byrns, Joseph W., Tennessee——The Burlington.
Calder, William M., New York——The New Willard.
Callaway, Oscar, Texas——Congress Hall.
Campbell, Philip P., Kansas——The Rochambeau.
Candler, Ezekiel S., jr., Mississippi——Congress Hall.
Cantor, Jacob A., New York——
Cantrill, James C., Kentucky——Congress Hall.
Caraway, Thaddeus H., Arkansas——116 Maryland Avenue NE.
Carew, John F., New York——Congress Hall.
Carlin, Charles C., Virginia——211 N. Washington St., Alexandria, Va.
Carr, Wooda N., Pennsylvania——The Congressional.
Carter, Charles D., Oklahoma——1818 Belmont Road.
Cary, William J., Wisconsin——Congress Hall.
Casey, John J., Pennsylvania——
Chandler, Walter M., New York——Congress Hall.
Church, Denver S., California——
Clancy, John R., New York——The Winston.
Clark, Frank, Florida——Congress Hall.
Claypool, Horatio C., Ohio——The Winston.
Cline, Cyrus, Indiana——Congress Hall.
Coady, Charles P., Maryland——
Collier, James W., Mississippi——The Driscoll.
Connelly, John R., Kansas——309 Fourth Street SE.
Connolly, Maurice, Iowa——Army and Navy Club.
Conry, Michael F., New York——
Cooper, Henry A., Wisconsin——The New Richmond.
Copley, Ira C., Illinois——2131 R Street.
Cox, William E., Indiana——The Milburn.
Cramton, Louis C., Michigan——Falkstone Courts.
Crisp, Charles R., Georgia——The Driscoll.
Crosser, Robert, Ohio——The Winston.
Cullop, William A., Indiana——Congress Hall.
Curry, Charles F., California——1504 Twenty-first Street.
Dale, Harry H., New York——The Raleigh.
Danforth, Henry G., New York——1401 Twenty-first Street.
Davenport, James S., Oklahoma——Congress Hall.
Davis, Charles R., Minnesota——The Rochambeau.
Decker, Perl D., Missouri——Congress Hall.
Deitrick, F. S., Massachusetts——Stoneleigh Court.
Dent, S. Hubert, jr., Alabama——The Rochambeau.
Dershem, Frank L., Pennsylvania——Congress Hall.
Dickinson, Clement C., Missouri——Congress Hall.
Dies, Martin, Texas——
Difenderfer, Robert E., Pennsylvania——Congress Hall.
Dillon, Charles H., South Dakota——The Dewey.
Dixon, Lincoln, Indiana——Congress Hall.
Donohoe, Michael, Pennsylvania——
Donovan, Jeremiah, Connecticut——The Driscoll.
Dooling, Peter J., New York——The Raleigh.
Doolittle, Dudley, Kansas——3107 Sixteenth Street.
Doremus, Frank E., Michigan——The Driscoll.
Doughton, Robert L., North Carolina——The Loudoun.
Driscoll, Daniel A., New York——
Drukker, Dow H., New Jersey——Commercial Club.
Dunn, Thomas P., New York——1315 Sixteenth Street.
Dupré, H. Garland, Louisiana——The Laclede.
Eagan, John J., New Jersey——Army and Navy Club.
Eagle, Joe H., Texas——1821 Nineteenth Street.
Edmonds, George W., Pennsylvania——Room 495, House Office Building.
Edwards, Charles G., Georgia——Congress Hall.
Elder, Walter, Louisiana——The New Varnum.
Esch, John J., Wisconsin——116 Todd Place NE.
Estopinal, Albert, Louisiana——13 First Street NE.
Evans, John M., Montana——The Wyoming.
Fairchild, George W., New York——The New Willard.
Faison, John M., North Carolina——The Driscoll.
Falconer, J. A., Washington——2236 Cathedral Avenue.
Farr, John R., Pennsylvania——Congress Hall.
Fergusson, Harvey B., New Mexico——2548 University Place.
Ferris, Scott, Oklahoma——Congress Hall.
Fess, Simeon D., Ohio——309 New Jersey Avenue SE.
Fields, William J., Kentucky——The New Varnum.
Finley, David E., South Carolina——The Farragut.
Fitzgerald, John J., New York——1723 S Street.
FitzHenry, Louis, Illinois——The Burlington.
Flood, Henry D., Virginia——The Shoreham.
Floyd, John C., Arkansas——310 Delaware Avenue NE.
Fordney, Joseph W., Michigan——The Dewey.
Foster, Martin D., Illinois——The Driscoll.
Fowler, H. Robert, Illinois——125 Fourth Street SE.
Francis, William B., Ohio——Congress Hall.
Frear, James A., Wisconsin——1166 Nineteenth Street.
French, Burton L., Idaho——2432 Twentieth Street.
Gallagher, Thomas, Illinois——
Gallivan, James A., Massachusetts——The Driscoll.
Gard, Warren, Ohio——Congress Hall.
Gardner, Augustus P., Massachusetts——
Garner, John N., Texas——The Burlington.
Garrett, Daniel E., Texas——The Roydon.
Garrett, Finis J., Tennessee——309 New Jersey Avenue SE.
George, Henry, jr., New York——1931 Biltmore Street.
Gerry, Peter G., Rhode Island——2107 Massachusetts Avenue.
Gill, Michael J., Missouri——
Gillett, Frederick H., Massachusetts——1525 Eighteenth Street.
Gilmore, Edward, Massachusetts——413 New Jersey Avenue SE.
Gittins, Robert H., New York——Congress Hall.
Glass, Carter, Virginia——The Raleigh.
Godwin, Hannibal L., North Carolina——Congress Hall.
Goeke, J. Henry, Ohio——The Continental.
Goldfogle, Henry M., New York——Congress Hall.
Good, James W., Iowa——The Brighton.
Goodwin, William S., Arkansas——Congress Hall.
Gordon, William, Ohio——Congress Hall.
Gorman, George E., Illinois——The Cairo.
Goulden, Joseph A., New York——Capitol Park Hotel.
Graham, George S., Pennsylvania——
Graham, James M., Illinois——The De Soto.
Gray, Finly H., Indiana——205 East Capitol Street.
Green, William R., Iowa——The Imperial.
Greene, Frank L., Vermont——The Driscoll.
Greene, William S., Massachusetts——1107 Seventeenth Street.
Gregg, A. W., Texas——The Cairo.
Griest, William W., Pennsylvania——The Congressional.
Griffin, Daniel J., New York——The Northumberland.
Gudger, James M., jr., North Carolina——Fontanet Courts, 14th and Fairmont Sts.
Guernsey, Frank E., Maine——The Shoreham.
Hamill, James A., New Jersey——The Plaza.
Hamilton, Charles M., New York——The Portland.
Hamilton, Edward L., Michigan——The Dewey.
Hamlin, Courtney W., Missouri——408 A Street SE.
Hardy, Rufus, Texas——1414 Sixteenth Street.
Harris, C. C., Alabama——Congress Hall.
Harrison, B. P., Mississippi——The Driscoll.
Hart, Archibald C., New Jersey——Army and Navy Club.
Haugen, Gilbert N., Iowa——Congress Hall.
Hawley, Willis C., Oregon——The Woodley.
Hay, James, Virginia——The Marlborough.
Hayden, Carl, Arizona——George Washington Inn.
Hayes, Everis A., California——2111 Bancroft Place.
Heflin, J. Thomas, Alabama——The Dewey.
Helgesen, Henry T., North Dakota——1921 Nineteenth Street.
Helm, Harvey, Kentucky——Falkstone Courts.
Helvering, Guy T., Kansas——1825 Nineteenth Street.
Henry, Robert L., Texas——12 Third Street SE.
Hensley, Walter L., Missouri——The Octavia.
Hill, Robert P., Illinois——The Netherlands.
Hinds, Asher C., Maine——The Burlington.
Hinebaugh, William H., Illinois——2117 S Street.
Hobson, Richmond P., Alabama——The Dewey.
Holland, E. E., Virginia——428 New Jersey Avenue SE.
Houston, William C., Tennessee——2718 Ontario Road.
Howard, William S., Georgia——1869 Wyoming Avenue.
Howell, Joseph, Utah——
Hoxworth, Stephen A., Illinois——
Hughes, Dudley M., Georgia——The Brighton.
Hughes, James A., West Virginia——The Portland.
Hulings, Willis J., Pennsylvania——The Dewey.
Hull, Cordell, Tennessee——The Cochran.
Humphrey, William E., Washington——918 M Street.
Humphreys, Benjamin G., Mississippi——The Burlington.
Igoe, William L., Missouri——The Winston.
Jacoway, H. M., Arkansas——The George Washington Inn.
Johnson, Albert, Washington——Congress Hall.
Johnson, Ben, Kentucky——1620 S Street.
Johnson, Jacob, Utah——Congress Hall.
Johnson, Joseph T., South Carolina——316 Maryland Avenue NE.
Jones, William A., Virginia——1709 Q Street.
Kahn, Julius, California——The Brighton.
Keating, Edward, Colorado——Congress Hall.
Keister, Abraham L., Pennsylvania——The Raleigh.
Kelley, Patrick H., Michigan——1757 K Street, Apartment 21.
Kelly, M. Clyde, Pennsylvania——The National.
Kennedy, Ambrose, Rhode Island——The Driscoll.
Kennedy, Charles A., Iowa——105 Second Street NE.
Kennedy, William, Connecticut——2317 Twentieth Street.
Kent, William, California——1925 F Street.

Kettner, William, California—Congress Hall.
Key, John A., Ohio—Fontanet Courts.
Kiess, Edgar R., Pennsylvania—Army and Navy Club.
Kindel, George J., Colorado—
Kinkaid, Moses P., Nebraska—The Winston.
Kirkpatrick, S., Iowa—1343 Girard Street.
Kitchin, Claude, North Carolina—The Driscoll.
Knowland, Joseph R., California—1712 H Street.
Konop, Thomas F., Wisconsin—
Korbly, Charles A., Indiana—238 Maryland Avenue NE.
Kreider, Aaron S., Pennsylvania—Congress Hall.
Lafferty, A. W., Oregon—Army and Navy Club.
La Follette, William L., Washington—1459 Harvard Street.
Langham, Jonathan N., Pennsylvania—901 Twentieth Street.
Langley, John W., Kentucky—The Burlington.
Lazaro, Ladislas, Louisiana—The Laclede.
Lee, Gordon, Georgia—The Cochran.
Lee, Robert E., Pennsylvania—
L'Engle, Claude, Florida—Irving Street, Chevy Chase, Md.
Lenroot, Irvine L., Wisconsin—The Kenesaw.
Lesher, John V., Pennsylvania—Congress Hall.
Lever, Asbury F., South Carolina—The Senate, 115 Second Street NE.
Levy, Jefferson M., New York—The Portland.
Lewis, David J., Maryland—
Lewis, Fred E., Pennsylvania—The Champlain.
Lieb, Charles, Indiana—Congress Hall.
Lindbergh, Charles A., Minnesota—
Lindquist, Francis O., Michigan—2530 Thirteenth Street.
Linthicum, J. Charles, Maryland—The Dresden.
Lloyd, James T., Missouri—The Portland.
Lobeck, C. O., Nebraska—The Driscoll.
Loft, George W., New York—The New Willard.
Logue, J. Washington, Pennsylvania—Congress Hall.
Lonergan, Augustine, Connecticut—The Raleigh.
McAndrews, James, Illinois—The Massachusetts.
McClellan, George, New York—110 Second Street SE.
MacDonald, William J., Michigan—1936 Biltmore Street.
McGillicuddy, Daniel J., Maine—Congress Hall.
McGuire, Bird S., Oklahoma—The New Willard.
McKellar, Kenneth D., Tennessee—The Occidental.
McKenzie, John C., Illinois—The Cochran.
McLaughlin, James C., Michigan—The Dewey.
Madden, Martin B., Illinois—2818 Connecticut Avenue.
Maguire, John A., Nebraska—The Driscoll.
Mahan, Bryan F., Connecticut—The Cochran.
Maher, James P., New York—121 Maryland Avenue NE.
Manahan, James, Minnesota—The Cairo.
Mann, James R., Illinois—The Highlands.
Mapes, Carl E., Michigan—The Dewey.
Martin, Eben W., South Dakota—Congress Hall.
Metz, Herman A., New York—The Raleigh.
Miller, Clarence B., Minnesota—The Burlington.
Mitchell, John J., Massachusetts—The Driscoll.
Mondell, Frank W., Wyoming—2011 Park Road.
Montague, A. J., Virginia—The Avondale.
Moon, John A., Tennessee—
Moore, J. Hampton, Pennsylvania—The Raleigh.
Morgan, Dick T., Oklahoma—The Dewey.
Morgan, Lewis L., Louisiana—The Iroquois.
Morin, John M., Pennsylvania—Congress Hall.
Morrison, Martin A., Indiana—906 M Street.
Moss, Hunter H., jr., West Virginia—1601 O Street.
Moss, Ralph W., Indiana—211 A Street SE.
Mott, Luther W., New York—The New Willard.
Mulkey, W. O., Alabama—Congress Hall.
Murdock, Victor, Kansas—1738 Q Street.
Murray, William H., Oklahoma—1464 Monroe Street.
Neeley, George A., Kansas—Congress Hall.
Neely, M. M., West Virginia—Congress Hall.
Nelson, John M., Wisconsin—2240 Cathedral Avenue.
Nolan, John I., California—The De Soto.
Norton, Patrick D., North Dakota—The Burlington.
O'Brien, James H., New York—The Raleigh.
Oglesby, Woodson R., New York—Congress Hall.
O'Hair, Frank T., Illinois—The Westmoreland.
Oldfield, William A., Arkansas—1863 Mintwood Place.
O'Shaunessy, George F., Rhode Island—The Powhatan.
Padgett, Lemuel P., Tennessee—The Clifton, 1323 Clifton Street.
Page, Robert N., North Carolina—1827 Park Road.
Paige, Calvin D., Massachusetts—The Portland.
Palmer, A. Mitchell, Pennsylvania—Woodward Apartments.
Park, Frank, Georgia—Falkstone Courts.
Parker, James S., New York—The Portland.
Parker, Richard Wayne, New Jersey—1723 Rhode Island Avenue.
Patten, Thomas G., New York—1726 N Street.
Patton, Charles E., Pennsylvania—2852 Ontario Road.
Peters, John A., Maine—The Grafton.
Peterson, John B., Indiana—Congress Hall.
Phelan, M. F., Massachusetts—The Highlands.
Platt, Edmund, New York—The Dewey.
Plumley, Frank, Vermont—100 Fifth Street NE.
Porter, Stephen G., Pennsylvania—11 B Street.
Post, J. D., Ohio—Congress Hall.
Pou, Edward W., North Carolina—The Shoreham.
Powers, Caleb, Kentucky—138 A Street NE.
Price, Jesse D., Maryland—
Prouty, S. F., Iowa—The Dewey.
Quin, Percy E., Mississippi—1922 Biltmore Street.
Ragsdale, J. W., South Carolina—1838 Connecticut Avenue.
Rainey, Henry T., Illinois—The Driscoll.
Raker, John E., California—2034 Columbia Road.
Rauch, George W., Indiana—Congress Hall.
Rayburn, Sam, Texas—The Cochran.
Reed, E. E., New Hampshire—Congress Hall.
Reilly, Michael K., Wisconsin—Congress Hall.
Reilly, Thomas L., Connecticut—The Driscoll.
Riordan, Daniel J., New York—The Raleigh.
Roberts, E. E., Nevada—
Roberts, Ernest W., Massachusetts—1918 N Street.
Rogers, John J., Massachusetts—1155 Sixteenth Street.
Rothermel, John H., Pennsylvania—The Cochran.
Rouse, Arthur B., Kentucky—The Netherlands.
Rubey, Thomas L., Missouri—Congress Hall.
Rucker, William W., Missouri—The Driscoll.
Rupley, Arthur R., Pennsylvania—The Metropolitan Hotel.
Russell, Joe J., Missouri—Congress Hall.
Sabath, Adolph J., Illinois—Congress Hall.
Saunders, Edward W., Virginia—The Driscoll.
Scott, George C., Iowa—1945 Calvert Street, Apartment 33.
Scully, Thomas J., New Jersey—The New Willard.
Seldomridge, H. H., Colorado—The Highlands.
Sells, Sam R., Tennessee—127 Maryland Avenue NE.
Shackleford, Dorsey W., Missouri—Congress Hall.
Sherley, Swagar, Kentucky—1718 Rhode Island Avenue.
Sherwood, Isaac R., Ohio—Congress Hall.
Shreve, Milton W., Pennsylvania—The Dresden.
Sims, Thetus W., Tennessee—2139 Wyoming Avenue.
Sinnott, Nicholas J., Oregon—Room 494, House Office Building.
Sisson, Thomas U., Mississippi—The Cairo.
Slayden, James L., Texas—The Concord.
Slemp, C. Bascom, Virginia—The Burlington.
Sloan, Charles H., Nebraska—The New Richmond.
Small, John H., North Carolina—The Cairo.
Smith, Addison T., Idaho—The Congressional.
Smith, Charles B., New York—Congress Hall.
Smith, Frank O., Maryland—
Smith, George R., Minnesota—Fontanet Courts.
Smith, J. M. C., Michigan—Congress Hall.
Smith, Samuel W., Michigan—The Buckingham.
Smith, William R., Texas—Florence Court.
Sparkman, Stephen M., Florida—Congress Hall.
Stafford, William H., Wisconsin—The Cochran.
Stanley, Augustus O., Kentucky—The Occidental.
Stedman, Charles M., North Carolina—The Driscoll.
Steenerson, Halvor, Minnesota—The Cairo.
Stephens, Dan V., Nebraska—1645 Newton Street.
Stephens, Hubert D., Mississippi—134 A Street NE.
Stephens, John H., Texas—101 Maryland Avenue NE.
Stephens, William D., California—1435 Fairmont Street.
Stevens, Frederick C., Minnesota—The Cairo.
Stevens, R. B., New Hampshire—The Wyoming.
Stone, Claudius U., Illinois—1501 Farragut Street.
Stout, Tom, Montana—Falkstone Courts.
Stringer, Lawrence B., Illinois—Congress Hall.
Sumners, Hatton W., Texas—Congress Hall.
Sutherland, Howard, West Virginia—Hotel Gordon, 916 Sixteenth Street.
Switzer, Robert M., Ohio—The Dewey.
Taggart, Joseph, Kansas—
Talbott, J. Fred. C., Maryland—
Talcott, Charles A., New York—The Farragut.
Tavenner, Clyde H., Illinois—5401 Illinois Avenue.
Taylor, Benjamin I., New York—The Continental.
Taylor, Edward T., Colorado—1361 Fairmont Street.
Taylor, George W., Alabama—The Alabama, Eleventh and N Streets.
Taylor, Samuel M., Arkansas—Congress Hall.
Temple, Henry W., Pennsylvania—The Dewey.
Ten Eyck, Peter G., New York—2137 R Street.
Thacher, Thomas C., Massachusetts—1721 H Street.
Thomas, Robert Y., jr., Kentucky—The Driscoll.
Thompson, J. B., Oklahoma—116 Maryland Avenue NE.
Thomson, Charles M., Illinois—8 East Irving Street, Chevy Chase, Md.
Towner, Horace M., Iowa—The Mendota.
Townsend, Edward W., New Jersey—The Wyoming.
Treadway, Allen T., Massachusetts—The Grafton.
Tribble, Samuel J., Georgia—The Cochran.
Tuttle, William E., jr., New Jersey—Cosmos Club.
Underhill, Edwin S., New York—The Cairo.
Underwood, Oscar W., Alabama—2000 G Street.
Vare, William S., Pennsylvania—The New Willard.
Vaughan, Horace W., Texas—The Driscoll.
Vinson, Carl, Georgia—The Driscoll.
Vollmer, Henry, Iowa—Congress Hall.
Volstead, Andrew J., Minnesota—The Brighton.
Walker, John R., Georgia—Congress Hall.
Wallin, Samuel, New York—The Powhatan.
Walsh, Allan B., New Jersey—The Portner.
Walters, Anderson H., Pennsylvania—Congress Hall.
Watkins, John T., Louisiana—The Balfour, Sixteenth and U Streets.
Watson, Walter A., Virginia—The Cochran.
Weaver, Claude, Oklahoma—The Luxor.
Webb, Edwin Y., North Carolina—The Dewey.
Whaley, Richard S., South Carolina—The Burlington.
Whitacre, John J., Ohio—The Occidental.
White, George, Ohio—2224 R Street.
Williams, William E., Illinois—Congress Hall.
Wilson, Emmett, Florida—Congress Hall.
Wilson, Frank E., New York—The Raleigh.
Wingo, Otis, Arkansas—The Avondale.
Winslow, Samuel E., Massachusetts—1714 N Street.
Witherspoon, Samuel A., Mississippi—The Driscoll.
Woodruff, Roy O., Michigan—The Dewey.
Woods, Frank P., Iowa—Congress Hall.
Young, George M., North Dakota—Fontanet Courts.
Young, James, Texas—The Cochran.

DELEGATES.

Kalanianaole, Jonah Kuhio, Hawaii—The Dewey.
Wickersham, James, Alaska—The Driscoll.

RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS.

Earnshaw, Manuel, Philippine Islands—1342 Thirteenth Street.
Quezon, Manuel L., Philippine Islands—1342 Thirteenth Street.
Rivera, Luis Muñoz, Porto Rico—The Highlands.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE.

South Trimble, Clerk, 3536 Thirteenth Street.
Jerry South, Chief Clerk, 3518 Thirteenth Street.
Robert B. Gordon, Sergeant at Arms, 201 Pennsylvania Avenue SE.
Joseph J. Sinnott, Doorkeeper, 3527 Thirteenth Street.
William M. Dunbar, Postmaster, 214 North Capitol Street.
Rev. Henry N. Couden, Chaplain, 2006 Columbia Road.

Mrs. Colby's Suffrage
Bill before House

please forward to Miss Clay for I have not copies for all members a, H. S,

Congressional Record.

SIXTIETH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

Memorial of Henry W. Blair on Suffrage in the District of Columbia and the Election of President.

PRESENTED

BY

HON. J. H. GALLINGER,

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

December 15, 1908.

SUFFRAGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a petition of Henry W. Blair, of Manchester, N. H., an ex-Senator of the United States, in favor of a constitutional amendment granting the right of suffrage to the citizens of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the petition be printed in the RECORD—it is brief—and that the petition and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the petition was referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on the Judiciary, and the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

Your petitioner, Henry W. Blair, of Manchester, in the State of New Hampshire, a citizen of the United States, respectfully represents that the inhabitants of the District of Columbia, consisting of more than three hundred thousand souls, have been held and are now being held in legal bondage, under a despotic form of government in which they have had no representation whatever, which has thus oppressed and despoiled them of life, liberty, and property continuously for more than thirty years last past, and that it is alleged and claimed that the said despotism is so set up and exercised over the inhabitants of the District of Columbia by virtue of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The permanent continuance of such a state of things is intolerable and impossible in a free country.

Your petitioner believes that the people of the District of Columbia are entitled to their full share in the sovereignty by which they are governed, and to equality of civil and political rights with other citizens of the United States and of the several States, including voting representation in both Houses of Congress, which has over them the combined powers of the national and state governments over other American citizens.

One drop of poison at the heart kills more surely than a shower shed on the surface of the body.

It is not well for the robust freedom which dwells on the hills and mountain ranges and in the valleys and plains of the country, which is our only real hope as a nation, to behold even a splendid slavery in their capital city and its people growing fat and magnificent and contented in their bonds, though made of hemp and iron and gold so mingled that at a little distance and to the popular eye the glisten of the latter conceals the other two.

Some who claim this to be the best form of government on earth are themselves the government which they thus naturally approve; others are apprehensive that any change will be harmful to dominant interests and to the forces and conditions which keep them so; others still are honest disbelievers in free institutions and all government republican in form, or their unrepublican environment has developed native-born foreigners under the shadow of the Capitol. But the great mass of human beings in the District of Columbia want a radical change for themselves, if possible, but chiefly for their children and the generations to come.

The population of the District of Columbia has increased fivefold during the last fifty years, and with the impetus which would come from participation in the higher franchise and general sovereignty of the country (not merely the local, subordinate, municipal franchise which Congress may now confer), before the close of the twentieth century more than 2,000,000 people will dwell within her limits.

The ordinance of 1787 and the cession of territory by Georgia in both cases required the division of the territory and its admission into the Union as States when the subdivisions had a population of only 60,000 free inhabitants.

(2) Your petitioner also alleges, as a matter of history, that in time of peace great danger has arisen to the existence of the Government of the United States by reason of deficient provisions in the Constitution for the transmission of the executive power, in that under the operation of those now existing an election of President became impossible and a deadlock in the Government and disturbance of public order, if not civil war, was only avoided by resort to a certain unconstitutional makeshift or device, entered into by agreement of parties, known as an "Electoral Commission," the practical working of which was not such as to make like agreements probable hereafter.

(3) He further respectfully alleges that in his belief the failure of the Constitution to provide for the temporary exercise of the executive power and for a new election whenever for any cause no President shall have been inaugurated at the end of the regular term of the President is a source of danger calling for immediate remedy.

Wherefore your petitioner prays the Congress to inquire, and if these things are found to be so, to formulate and submit to the legislatures of the States a joint resolution or resolutions for amendments to the Constitution substantially as follows, or in some better form which the wisdom of the Congress may prescribe:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as a part of the Constitution, namely:

ARTICLE XVI.

SECTION 1. The District of Columbia shall be entitled to representation in the Congress of the United States by one Senator and by one or more Representatives, according to the rule of apportionment established by the Constitution, and to as many electors for President and Vice-President as it has Members of the Congress, who shall have the same qualifications and powers as other like officers, and shall be chosen, and all vacancies filled, by election of the people.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall prescribe and regulate the qualifications of voters in the District of Columbia in any manner consistent with government republican in form.

SEC. 3. When the choice of President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives, the Members of the House chosen from the District of Columbia shall vote and be counted as a State, but in no case shall the vote of a Member chosen to either House of Congress from said District be cast or counted when a choice of President or of Vice-President will thereby be prevented; and in case there is a tie in the vote for President in the delegation from the District of Columbia in the choice of President by the House of Representatives voting by States, and there is no choice without the vote of the delegation from the District, the Senator from the District shall vote as a member of the delegation to the end that a President may be chosen.

SEC. 4. The Congress may provide for the holding of a new election by the people of the United States forthwith whenever for any cause a President shall not be chosen or inaugurated before the expiration of the existing term of the President and for the temporary exercise of the executive power (during a period not exceeding ninety days) until a President is inaugurated whose term of office shall end four years from the expiration of the preceding full term.

SEC. 5. The Congress shall enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY W. BLAIR.

65799—7988

O