

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of owners of grain elevators, Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 28180, with reference to securing a channel from the outer harbor to connect with the Buffalo River and for the enlargement of the anchorage basin in the outer harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Joel Hillman and the Washington Mercantile Co., Washington, D. C., protesting against the passage of the Jones-Works liquor bill for the regulation of the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the Missouri State Bottlers' Protective Association, Kansas City, Mo., favoring the passage of legislation for the removal of all duties on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the International Reform Bureau, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of the Jones-Works excise bill for the regulation of the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia and suggesting an amendment for same; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of W. L. JONES and JOHN D. WORKS, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of the Jones-Works excise bill, for the regulation of the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia, in its present form; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the International Reform Bureau, Washington, D. C., favoring the passage of the Kenyon "red-light" injunction bill for the cleaning up of Washington for the inauguration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Carrie C. Ware and the American Sign Co., St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill 25685, providing for the tagging and labeling of all fabrics and articles of clothing intended for sale under interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Eugene V. Murphy, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the naval appropriation bill providing for the building of one of the new battleships in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the National Liquor League of the United States, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation to repeal the clause making an appropriation of \$5,000 for the purpose of sending delegates to the International Congress on Alcoholism; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NYE: Petition of the Minneapolis Retail Grocers' Association, Minneapolis, Minn., favoring the passage of House bill 27567, for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the Whittier Board of Trade, Whittier, Cal., favoring the passage of the Weeks bill (H. R. 27567) for a 1-cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the A. H. Hitchcock Publishing Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of legislation extending the parcels post to include the third-rate postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 26, 1913.

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

Mr. GALLINGER took the chair as President pro tempore under the previous order of the Senate.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 398) to direct and empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to revoke licenses under certain conditions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3947) to provide for a bridge across Snake River, in Jackson Hole, Wyo.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented resolutions adopted by the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., favoring the strict en-

forcement of the law providing for the inspection of locomotive boilers and safety appliances, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CRAWFORD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Chamberlain and Harding County, in the State of South Dakota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of sundry citizens of Battle Creek and Berrien Springs, in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. POMERENE. I present a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of Ohio, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Senate joint resolution 6.

Joint resolution memorial to Congress relative to system of national highways.

Whereas the question of transportation has been paramount to all other questions since the dawn of civilization; and Whereas until the end of time there will be three methods of transportation, namely, railroad, water, and wagon roads; and

Whereas two of our great systems of transportation, namely, railroad and steamship lines, have been aided by the Government and then taken over and controlled by individuals and corporations and are now operated for pecuniary gain and to which all contribute; and

Whereas transportation by wagon over public roads has been taken over by the several States of the Union and their common use accorded to all people of the Nation free of charge; and

Whereas Congress of the United States has appropriated, in aid of railroad construction, public lands to the value of at least \$1,000,000,000; for rivers and harbors since 1875, \$592,395,000; for improvement of the Mississippi River since June 30, 1902, \$16,582,000; for public buildings since June 30, 1911, \$213,376,000; for public roads in Alaska, Philippines, Porto Rico, Guam, and the Canal Zone, \$8,300,000; and estimated appropriation of \$400,000,000 for the Panama Canal; and

Whereas the United States has 2,198,645 miles of public roads, of which only 190,679, or 8.66 per cent of the total, are improved; and Whereas it is estimated by the Office of Public Roads at Washington, D. C., that 90 per cent of travel is confined to 20 per cent of the roads of the United States and that the improvement of 440,000 miles of public roads would practically meet the present demand throughout the country; and

Whereas the exigency of the present times makes necessary a system of national highways: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That we urge upon Congress of the United States the necessity of the early designation, construction, and maintenance of a system of national highways; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Ohio is hereby instructed to forthwith transmit certified copies of this resolution to all Ohio Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States and the Clerks of these respective bodies at Washington, D. C.

Adopted January 30, 1913.

C. L. SWAIN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

HUGH L. NICHOLS,

President of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Jackson, Miss., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE STATE OF WYOMING, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
State of Wyoming, ss:

I, Frank L. Houx, secretary of state of the State of Wyoming, do hereby certify that the following copy of house joint memorial No. 3, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, has been carefully compared with the original, filed in this office on the 18th day of February, A. D. 1913, and is a full, true, and correct copy thereof:

House joint memorial 3.

Whereas there have been introduced in Congress three bills (H. R. 36, H. R. 4428, S. 2367) to afford Federal protection to migratory game birds; and

Whereas there is a very general sentiment in this State in favor of such protection, and an urgent request for the enactment of such a law has been made, as appears by the numerous petitions received: Now therefore

Resolved (the senate concurring), That Congress be, and hereby is, requested to enact a law giving ample protection to migratory game birds.

Resolved, That the legislatures of all the States of the United States, now in session or when next convened, be, and they are hereby, respectfully requested to join in this request by the adoption of this or an equivalent resolution.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House

of Representatives of the United States, and to the several Members of said body representing this State therein; also, to transmit copies hereof to the legislatures of all other States of the United States.

MARTIN L. PRATT,
Speaker of the House.
BIRNEY H. SAGE,
President of the Senate.

Approved February 17, 1913.

JOSEPH M. CAREY, Governor.

In testimony where I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Wyoming.

Done at Cheyenne, the capital, this 18th day of February, A. D. 1913.
[SEAL.]

FRANK L. HOUX,
Secretary of State,
By F. H. WESCOTT,
Deputy.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4957) for the relief of Simon M. Preston, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1319) thereon.

Mr. CUMMINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 28635) to amend section 81 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BURTON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 163) amending and extending the operation of the act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1320) thereon.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,200 to pay Robert W. Farrar for indexing and extra services as clerk to the Committee on Pensions, Sixty-second Congress, third session, and \$1,200 to pay Dennis M. Kerr for services as assistant clerk by detail to the Committee on Pensions, Sixty-second Congress, third session, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF ALABAMA.

Mr. CULBERSON. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 27827) to amend section 70 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911. I call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I ask for the present consideration of the bill. It is a House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

IMPEACHMENT OF ROBERT W. ARCHBALD.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably, with amendments, Senate concurrent resolution No. 36, to print copies of the proceedings in the Senate in the matter of the impeachment of Robert W. Archbald submitted by Mr. CLARK of Wyoming January 23, 1913. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were, in line 2, after the word "bound," to strike out "ten thousand" and insert "one thousand five hundred"; in line 8, after the word "which," to strike out "four thousand" and insert "five hundred"; and in line 9, before the word "thousand," to strike out "six" and insert "one"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 1,500 copies of the proceedings in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives and before the Judiciary Committee thereof in the matter of the impeachment of Robert W. Archbald, additional circuit judge of the United States from the third judicial circuit, and designated a judge of the Commerce Court, of which 500 shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 8581) granting a pension to Louise Capehart (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine (for Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$23,620 to increase the limit of cost for increased quarantine facilities at the port of Portland, Me., etc., intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted an amendment proposing to grant a leave of absence for 60 days to Mrs. Adelaide E. Grant, a clerk in the assessor's office of the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CATRON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$32,000 to be expended in the survey and establishing of boundaries of small-holding claims in the State of New Mexico, now listed in the surveyor general's office of the State of New Mexico, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$500 for moving weather ball from customhouse at Portland, Oreg., to a point where it can be readily seen by shipping, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$400,000 for the erection of barracks, quarters, and other buildings for the accommodation of marines, Isthmus of Panama, 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. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$390 to pay J. G. Hamilton for services actually rendered and performed as Doorkeeper of the Senate from December 14, 1911, to March 1, 1913, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Senate to pay to the officers and employees of the Senate borne on the annual and session rolls on the 30th day of June, 1912, a sum equal to one-twelfth of the annual compensation paid them by law, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment proposing to grant relief to certain American citizens in El Paso, Tex., and Douglas, Ariz., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. CRAWFORD submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$250 to pay Harry B. Straight for extra clerical services rendered in connection with the preparation of the omnibus claims bill, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McLEAN submitted an amendment relative to the protection of migratory game and insectivorous birds in the United States, intended to be proposed by him to the Agriculture appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 to pay for the compilation, annotation, and indexing of volume 3 of the Indian Laws and Treaties, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

THE CONSTITUTION (S. DOC. NO. 1108).

Mr. BROWN. I send to the desk a copy of an address by Franklin W. Collins, of the Department of Justice, on "The Constitution of the United States—Its Friends and Foes." I ask that the address be printed as a public document.

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

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, STATE DEPARTMENT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

With reference to the appropriation asked in the letter of the Secretary of State of January 4, 1913, to the Secretary of the Treasury (H. Doc. 1262, 62d Cong., 3d sess.), it is now necessary for me to reiterate, as most urgent, the recommendation that there be appropriated and made immediately available the sum of \$250,000 to be payable to the Republic of Panama when directed by the Secretary of State under article 14 of the convention between the United States and Panama for the construction of a ship canal, dated November 18, 1903, the ratifications of which were exchanged February 26, 1904, and which was proclaimed on the same date.

Article 14 of the aforesaid treaty provides as follows:

As the price or compensation for the rights, powers, and privileges granted in this convention by the Republic of Panama to the United States, the Government of the United States agrees to pay to the Republic of Panama the sum of \$10,000,000 in gold coin of the United States on the exchange of the ratifications of this convention and also an annual payment during the life of this convention of \$250,000 in like gold coin, beginning nine years after the date aforesaid.

The provisions of this article shall be in addition to all other benefits assured to the Republic of Panama under this convention.

The sum which the Congress is now asked to appropriate becomes payable beginning February 26, 1913, under the provisions of the convention of 1903. It will be recalled that in 1909 a tripartite arrangement was made between the United States, the Republic of Colombia, and the Republic of Panama by means of three interdependent treaties. Among the various provisions of this arrangement was one whereby the Government of the United States was to begin the payments of this annuity of \$250,000 five years earlier than provided for in the convention of November 18, 1903, namely, February 26, 1908. The Republic of Panama agreed, with the consent of the United States, to assign to the Republic of Colombia the first 10 installments, and the Government of the United States agreed to make these first 10 payments to the Republic of Colombia for the account of the Republic of Panama. The advice and consent of the Senate of the United States to the ratification of the treaties to which the United States is a party was given unconditionally as to the treaty with Colombia and conditionally as to the treaty with Panama; the Government of Panama has unconditionally approved the treaties to which Panama is a party and later indicated its willingness to ratify the treaty with the United States as modified by the Senate; but the Government of Colombia having failed to give its assent to the ratification of the treaties to which Colombia is a party, and the treaties being interdependent, the ratifications thereof have never been effected.

Inasmuch as one or all of the signatory parties may at any time withdraw from the unconsummated and, therefore, for the time being, inoperative arrangement contemplated by these unconcluded treaties of 1909, and inasmuch as the Republic of Colombia has failed to ratify the treaties of January 9, 1909, to which it is a party, these three interdependent treaties are left inoperative and the original stipulation of the convention of 1903, whereby the Government of the United States was to make payments to Panama under article 14 thereof, becomes effective. It is evidently necessary, therefore, that the Executive be forthwith placed in position to respond at the proper time to the obligation of the United States under the convention of 1903 with Panama for the construction of a ship canal. I therefore most earnestly urge immediate action as absolutely necessary to place this Government in position to respond at once to its treaty obligation.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 1913.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—THE BUDGET (S. DOC. NO. 1113).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

Under the Constitution, the power to control the purse is given to the Congress. But the same paragraph which makes it the duty of the Congress to determine what expenditures shall be authorized also requires of the administration the submission of "a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures"—i. e., an account of stewardship. The Constitu-

tion also prescribes that the President shall "from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." Pursuant to these constitutional requirements I am submitting for your consideration a concise statement of financial conditions and results as an account of stewardship as well as certain proposals with estimates of revenues and expenditures in the form of a budget.

THE BUDGET AS A MEANS FOR LOCATING RESPONSIBILITY.

The fact that ours is the only great Nation whose Government is doing business without a budget has not been a dominant reason for departure from 123 years of precedent. Such procedure is based on common experience and common sense. It is supported by the best judgment and experience that has obtained in the management of corporate bodies, both public and private. While officers of private corporations are not ordinarily limited by law in such manner as to make it necessary for them to act under formal appropriations, it is the ordinary method of transacting business to have the president of a corporation lay before its board at its annual meeting a report which is also made available to all persons who may be interested; it is common experience for the president, as the responsible head of the executive branch, to set forth what has been done during the past year and what it is proposed that the corporation shall do during the next year; it is common experience for the president as the head of the administration to accompany his proposals with estimates; it is common experience for the president as the head of the executive branch to submit with such estimates recommendations as to how proposed expenditures shall be financed.

In a Government such as ours, in which the legislative branch is made up of some 500 Members, it is not to be assumed that each Member or any committee of such a body is familiar with the many details which go to make up the public business. The increasing need for an Executive account of stewardship is apparent. The President is the constitutional head of an organization that is continental in the scope of its operations. Executive officers under him, for whom he is responsible, must manage and direct the details of hundreds of essentially different businesses that are highly complex and technical in their requirements. These officers must be held accountable for efficiency as managers; they must be held accountable for economy in the expenditure of public funds; they must be made to feel responsible for the fidelity of employees who are charged with money transactions aggregating more than \$5,000,000,000 each year, or \$16,000,000 each business day, of which vast amount nearly \$2,000,000,000 are in the nature of receipts and disbursements for current expenditures of the Government, while about \$3,000,000,000 are in the nature of trust receipts and disbursements, including currency trusts, Indian trusts, and other sacred obligations of the Government that have been undertaken by the Government for the welfare of those who have been designated as legal beneficiaries.

The recommendation of such measures as may be thought to be necessary and expedient and requests for support, in the form of estimates of future expenditures, should be premised on a knowledge of service needs. The needs of the service can only be known to those who are in charge of administrative detail. Representation of what has been done, as well as what should be undertaken in the future, must come from those who are acquainted with technical requirements. A sense of proportion, however, can come only from those who must assume responsibility for the administration as a whole. In the discharge of his duties the President has submitted annual reviews of the conditions affecting the national welfare and also many special recommendations for legislation; but the Chief Executive has never undertaken to lay before the Congress the facts necessary to the determination of questions of policy pertaining to that phase of public business which is his special responsibility, namely, the carrying on of the current work of the Government during the succeeding year.

ADVANTAGES TO CONGRESS OF A BUDGET.

The advantage to the Congress of having placed before it a definite statement and proposal, one which is submitted by the responsible head of the administration, must also be apparent. Such a statement will greatly facilitate the adoption of a procedure whereby the deliberating branch of the Government may determine the gross amount to be appropriated in advance of decision as to what amount shall be allowed for each detail of the Government's business, rather than leave the relations of income and outgo to be computed after action has been taken on the many matters which are brought before the Congress for determination.

THE NEED FOR KNOWLEDGE OF DETAIL AS WELL AS FOR PERSPECTIVE.

Size and complexity of the problem make it necessary for officers to have the advantage of seeing the business of the Government in perspective. But judgment with respect to the requirements of particular services requires that exact information be made available for the consideration of detail. This budget is submitted therefore not only as an instrument through which a perspective may be gained, but as an index through which Members of Congress and the public may obtain ready reference to supporting reports and detailed records of account.

The need for such an index through which exact information may be obtained as a basis for judgment about problems of public business is evident to one familiar with the governmental problems.

The highly complex and technical character of questions that must be decided by executive heads of departments is suggested by the complexity of departmental organization. In the Department of the Navy, for example, there exist at present 34 navy yards and stations, 31 naval coaling plants, 43 naval wireless stations, 12 naval magazines, 14 purchasing, pay, and disbursing offices, 9 inspection districts, 16 hydrographic offices, 20 hospitals, 20 dispensaries, 14 naval schools, 3 schools for the Marine Corps, 7 naval medical schools, 4 naval training stations, 13 target ranges (naval), 1 target range and permanent camp of instruction for the Marine Corps, 3 medical supply depots, 13 recruiting stations, 48 marine posts and stations and a Naval Militia, besides the fleet, which is the actual fighting machine of this branch of the military establishment. More concretely, the administrative requirements may be shown by reference to a single station such as the proving grounds at Indianhead. Here, under the jurisdiction of the senior assistant, are a police force, office buildings and grounds, living quarters, a water-supply system, boats and wharves, a railroad, a power plant, a carpenter shop, an electrical shop, a tin shop, a repair and pipe-fitting shop, and a storehouse; and under the jurisdiction of an officer known as the powder expert is a chemical laboratory, a sulphuric-acid factory, ether factory, dry house, boiling tubs, dehydrating house, an intensifier house, a solvent recovery house, a reworking house, a nitric-acid factory, a poaching and pulping house, a mixing house, a press house, a blending and packing house, a powder factory and magazines, a signal house, a rocket house, and a storehouse. These may be taken as illustrative of the character of administrative attention required in directing and controlling the activities of one of the many institutional subdivisions of one department of the Government.

THE LACK OF ACCURATE AND PROMPT INFORMATION.

Notwithstanding the breadth and scope of the many-sided business which is transacted by the Government, legislative and executive officers have been required to make decisions without having before them the essential facts. Inadequate organization is provided for the assembling and classifying of information needed by the Executive as a means of making available to Congress and the country a carefully prepared statement about what has been done and what are the Government's future needs. Lack of adequate information about what the administration is doing has led Congress to make over 100 special investigations of the executive branch within as many years, besides the inquiries that have been conducted by its standing committees. Like difficulty has been experienced by the Chief Executive. His effort to obtain information as a basis for Executive action and for concrete recommendation has not infrequently resulted in failure. Illustration of the difficulties experienced both by the Congress and the President is found in the fact that it was necessary to institute a special inquiry for the purpose of obtaining each of the several classes of data submitted with this budget. The disadvantages under which officers labor when forced to rely on special investigation for information that should be regularly produced and made available is shown by the fact that instead of having the information at hand at or near the close of the fiscal year, the President and his Cabinet were required to wait months before, even in crude and uncertain form, the ordinary business statements such as a balance sheet, an operation account, and a surplus account for the Government could be produced and summaries of revenues and expenditures could be made which would serve as a guide to future financial policy.

GOVERNMENT WITHOUT A PLAN OR PROGRAM.

Not only have we been without adequate information but, as a result of this and other causes, the Government, with its multiplied activities and with expenditures that within the last 123 years have mounted up from less than three millions to

more than one thousand million dollars each year, may be said to be without a plan or program.

Although we are annually spending \$400,000,000 for military purposes, including pensions, we have never had a comprehensive or consistent military policy. Nor have we as a Nation had any plan for developing the many services which have been created to provide for the economic and social welfare. Bureau after bureau, service after service, has been organized, but neither the executive branch nor the Congress has been consciously working to a consistent, well-defined purpose.

Not only have we not had a definite program for determining each year what welfare work should be undertaken, or what should be the next step in promoting or conserving economic and social interests, but there has been the same lack of program in regard to our national finances and proposed expenditures.

A DEFICIT TO BE FACED.

In December last a condition arose which made it my duty under the statute of March 4, 1909, to submit to Congress definite recommendations either for decreasing the estimates for appropriations or for increasing the revenue. The Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report, which was submitted concurrently with the Book of Estimates, said:

The estimates of appropriations for ordinary purposes for 1914 are \$22,556,023.03 in excess of the estimated revenues. The estimated expenditures for the Panama Canal are \$30,174,432.11; and if these expenditures should be paid from the general fund instead of from sales of bonds, the total estimates of appropriations for 1914 are \$52,730,455.14 in excess of the estimated receipts.

Anticipating that such a situation might follow the legislation of last session calling for largely increased expenditures without providing for a corresponding increase in revenue, and at the same time seeking, so far as practicable, to develop methods of accounting and reporting adequate to inform the Congress and the Executive, and to enable them to plan intelligently for the future, on July 10 last I issued a request to the head of each of the departments and other Government establishments to depute some officer whose duty it would be to see that the estimates and summaries of estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, were prepared in accordance with the recommendations contained in my message to Congress on June 27 last; that is to say, the head of each department and each independent establishment was directed, in addition to those estimates which are included in the Book of Estimates for appropriations as now required by statute and as sent to Congress, also to make return to the office of the Chief Executive of estimates of the actual expenditures for the same fiscal year, whether derived from old appropriations, proposed appropriations, or deficiency appropriations.

THE BUDGET SUBMITTED.

My instruction, therefore, to the Secretary of the Treasury was—

to print and send without delay to Congress the forms of estimates required by it of officers; also to have sent to me the information asked for * * *. This will be made the basis for review, revision, and summary statement in the form of a budget with supporting documents which may be sent to Congress by special message as the proposal of the administration.

Conformably to this request the financial statements and the analyses and summaries of revenues and expenditures were prepared which are attached. The lateness of their submission to me has made it impossible to get them before you at the beginning of the present session, but their significance is so great that I am now submitting them for your information.

OUTLINE OF THE BUDGET SUBMITTED.

The budget, which is transmitted herewith, carries the following summaries:

1. Summaries submitted as a basis for considering the present and also the prospective fiscal condition:

Budget statement No. 1. Comparative current balance sheet, showing the fiscal condition of the Government as of June 30, 1911, and June 30, 1912.

Budget statement No. 2. Fund statement, showing the condition of the general fund and of other funds and appropriations as of June 30, 1912.

Budget statement No. 3. Comparative account of operations, showing the revenues and expenditures of the Government for the fiscal years 1911 and 1912, and the estimated revenues and expenditures for 1913 and 1914, with the resulting annual surplus or deficit.

Budget statement No. 4. Treasury surplus account, showing the cumulated deficits as of June 30, 1911, and June 30, 1912, and the estimated deficits June 30, 1913, and June 30, 1914.

2. Summaries submitted as a basis for considering revenues and expenditures in relation to questions of Government policy:

a. Summaries of revenues:

Budget statement No. 5. Comparative statement of revenues for the fiscal years 1910, 1911, and 1912, classified by sources and statutory authorities, with the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1913 and 1914.

Budget statement No. 6. Comparative statement of revenues for the fiscal years 1911 and 1912, classified by organization units.

b. General summaries of expenditures:

Budget statement No. 7. Comparative summary of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds, classified by organization units.

Budget statement No. 8. Comparative summary of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds, classified by functions or classes of work.

Budget statement No. 9. Comparative summary of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds, classified by character of expenditures, i. e., to show current expenses and fixed charges as distinguished from capital outlays and debt payments.

Budget statement No. 10. Comparative summary of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds, classified by acts of appropriation.

Budget statement No. 11. Comparative summary of estimated and actual expenditures of trust and private funds, classified by organization units and acts of appropriation.

c. Analyses of expenditures to show relations between organization units, functions, character of expenditures, and acts of appropriation:

Budget statement No. 12. Comparative analysis of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds for each organization unit, classified by acts of appropriation.

Budget statement No. 13. Comparative analysis of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds for each organization unit, classified by functions.

Budget statement No. 14. Comparative analysis of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds for each organization unit, classified by character of expenditure.

Budget statement No. 15. Comparative analysis of estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds for each function, classified by organization units.

d. Analyses of expenditures to show objects:

Budget statement No. 16. Summary of results of governmental contracting and purchasing relations.

3. A summary of proposed changes of law—setting forth what legislation it is thought should be enacted in order to enable the administration to transact public business with greater economy and efficiency.

THE PROBLEM OF FINANCING GOVERNMENT NEEDS.

Any business forecast must proceed from a statement of present condition. The purpose of the first four of these summaries is not only to bring before the Congress information, but also to show the result of estimated revenues and expenditures, if authorized.

THE CONDITION OF THE TREASURY JUNE 30, 1912 (STATEMENT NO. 1).

More concretely, the purpose of the first budget statement is to show the condition of the Treasury as of the beginning of the current fiscal period, and also to give information with respect to the amount of the cash in the Treasury which is available for general governmental purposes. The Treasury is both the agent of the Government for providing money with which to meet its obligations and the guardian of very large trust funds upon which our currency system rests, as well as being the depository for other cash that can not be utilized in meeting ordinary obligations. The balance of cash in the Treasury and subtreasuries as of June 30 last was \$1,872,964,358.26. Of this amount \$1,674,535,369 was held in trust for the protection of currency obligations, leaving a balance of \$198,428,989.26 cash for other purposes. To this amount is to be added \$65,486,517.33, representing balances in banks, subject to draft of the Treasurer and other fiscal officers, and cash in transit, making a cash total, other than for trust funds to secure currency obligations, of \$263,915,506.59. As against this, however, it is necessary to reserve \$96,763,027.60, representing disbursing officers' balances, the national banks' 5 per cent fund, etc. This leaves a cash

balance of \$167,152,478.99 available for current operations. In addition to the reserves above described there are outstanding current liabilities reported amounting to \$21,431,236.56. As against these liabilities, however, disbursing officers were carrying balances amounting to \$60,461,012.48, leaving a net cash balance available for general-fund purposes of \$206,182,254.91, if sinking-fund obligations are entirely ignored.

If the provisions of law with respect to providing a fund for the purpose of sinking the national debt were deemed binding, then a readjustment of the Treasury statement of available cash balances would be necessary. Taking into consideration the fact that during the period from 1870 to 1890 bonds were retired from surplus revenues far in excess of sinking-fund requirements, and during the period from 1890 to date payment of the bonded debt has been halted from considerations of public policy—the issues being used as security for bank-note circulation—I am recommending that the sinking-fund law be amended, as hereinafter stated.

The sinking-fund act should either be repealed or be superseded by a law whose provisions are clear and possible of enforcement.

The sinking fund was established by the act of February 25, 1862; amended by the act of July 14, 1870; and later carried into the Revised Statutes as sections 3688, 3689, 3694, 3695, 3696, and 3697.

Prior to the Civil War period our Government had not provided for a methodical accumulation of a fund to be applied to the redemption of the public debt. No attempt was made to apportion equitably over a term of years the repayment of money borrowed to meet extraordinary demands.

The first act designed to create a sinking fund was passed during the Civil War as a means of buttressing the public credit. It required the payment of customs duties in gold or in demand notes made by law receivable for public dues, and provided that so much thereof as was necessary should be applied to the payment of the interest on the public debt, and that in each fiscal year a fund should be set apart for the purchase or payment of 1 per cent of the entire debt. The residue of customs receipts was to be paid into the Treasury.

When the law was passed the Government was a borrower and the public debt was rapidly increasing. Secretary Chase reported that he was unable to create a sinking fund. In March, 1864, a considerable amount of gold had accumulated in the Treasury. Gold was then selling in New York around 160. Congress sought to deal with the situation by passing a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to sell any gold not necessary for the payment of interest on the public debt. Subsequently it was held that this resolution was inconsistent with the law of 1862, which required that in addition to the payment of the interest a sum equal to 1 per cent of the total debt should annually be set apart for debt reduction.

Secretary McCulloch reported to the Congress in 1867 that no special fund had ever been actually set apart in pursuance of the act. Continuously since then the law has been consciously, and openly evaded. The fund has had a legal existence, but the legal requirements have merely been shown on the books. Notwithstanding this, the public debt has been reduced with amazing rapidity, for from time to time the annual surpluses have been applied to this purpose, and we have retired bonds since 1862 considerably in excess of the requirements of the law. On February 1, 1911, Secretary MacVeagh reported that we had paid off bonded debt amounting to \$280,000,000 more than the calculated requirements of the sinking fund. But a part of this was accomplished through refunding operations. Because of the lax enforcement of the law and contradictory, and confusing interpretations which have been placed upon it, and because its provisions could not be enforced except in periods of surplus revenue, it was proposed by Secretary MacVeagh to permit the use of surplus moneys for the redemption of the public debt.

A true sinking fund postulates an excess of revenue over current expenses. It is the simple truth that such excess of revenue over expenditure is the only real fund by which the public debt may be sunk. The object of a sinking fund is to reduce and gradually to discharge debt. In times of actual loss in current fiscal operations any scheme to reduce the aggregate liabilities is illusory and fictitious. It is because of this that when war is declared in which the British Government is involved one of the first steps taken by that Government is to suspend the sinking fund. One expert has said that the extinction of a small amount of debt with one hand while creating a large amount with the other is not practical; in fact, it is wasteful and a sham.

While we have kept the faith with our creditors and discharged our obligations promptly, our methods have been haphazard and our sinking fund act has become a dead letter. It should be revised at a time like this, when the state of our finances is normal, and revised on a basis that will compel the respect of administrative officers. I shall take this matter up again in considering the method of meeting the deficit.

THE CONDITION OF THE GENERAL FUND (STATEMENT NO. 2).

The purpose of the second budget statement is to show the condition of funds and appropriations as of June 30, 1912. Carrying into the general-fund account the cash deficiency which would result from including the sinking-fund requirement in the statement as a reserve, as shown by budget statement just described, and setting up as a resource the net amount that has been advanced on account of the Panama Canal (\$137,897,497.28), taking into account also the balance of appropriations which had not been expended and under which vouchers may be drawn for payment by the Treasury (\$257,328,302.45), the condition of the general fund as of June 30 last is shown; that is, before the appropriations of the current fiscal year became operative the general fund was in the condition of having been overappropriated to the extent of \$722,586,550.26. Leaving out of consideration entirely the sinking-fund requirements, however—in other words, ignoring altogether the appropriations which have been made by Congress for sinking-fund purposes—the statement would show an excess of general-fund resources over general-fund appropriations outstanding amounting to \$86,751,449.74. But even this balance is to be accepted with a very serious qualification, for the statement further shows that in addition to the appropriations that had already been authorized, and which, therefore, would operate as charges against the general fund, there were other authorizations to undertake work, for which necessary appropriations had not been provided, amounting to \$256,547,150.45. In other words, from the reports, incomplete as they are, which have been made by departments, it appears that uncompleted work has been authorized in excess of \$718,000,000, for which only about 60 per cent of the necessary amount had been appropriated. As against these authorizations contracts had actually been entered into, the amount of which could not be ascertained within the time available for the preparation of this statement. Assuming the correctness of the figures given—and they are taken upon report, without verification, as the best information which could be obtained within the time available and without taking into consideration the appropriations for this year, it appears that Congress had prior to the beginning of the current fiscal year already mortgaged the future of the general fund to the extent of \$169,795,700.71 over and above all sinking-fund requirements.

THE RELATION BETWEEN REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES (STATEMENT NO. 3).

The most notable fact about Government revenues and expenditures of the past is that we have had very little accurate information about them. What have been called "revenues" were receipts, and in this class have been commingled amounts realized from sales, trust funds, and refunds. What have been called "expenditures" have been either advances from the Treasury to disbursing officers, or disbursements, and in them not only have trust payments been commingled with those in liquidation of ordinary governmental liabilities, but no effort has been made to distinguish current expenses from capital outlays. What is quite as serious, from the viewpoint of both of the purposes served by these data—in the making of future plans and for guidance in administration—is that there is no present means for knowing whether all the revenues and expenditures have been included in the totals given, due to the fact that there are no true revenue or expense accounts kept and that certain appropriations are reimbursable from revenues. When seeking to obtain information from appropriation accounts many of the reimbursable items have been lost sight of, expenditures being shown as net. The amount of receipts reimbursable to appropriations, as reported for the last fiscal year by departments in answer to special requests for this information, is in excess of \$32,000,000. The unsatisfactory character of the information which has been made available in the past is also shown by the difference in the prospective Treasury condition as deduced on the one hand from totals shown by the Treasury statement for the year 1913 and the congressional Book of Estimates for 1914 and, on the other, as deduced from the total estimated expenditures for the years 1913 and 1914 that have been sent by the executive departments and establishments by my order to the Executive Office for use in the preparation of this budget. The estimated and actual revenues and

expenditures for the four years, as shown by the statements which are transmitted herewith, by totals, are as follows:

	1914	1913	1912	1911
Revenues.....	\$970,471,000	\$950,395,480	\$916,540,895	\$915,983,134
Estimated and actual expenditures of Government funds (other than debt redemptions and sinking-fund requirements)....	1,049,355,577	1,006,414,753	912,432,365	888,702,956
Excess of revenues.....			4,108,530	27,280,178
Excess of expenditures.....	78,884,577	56,019,273		
Principal of public debt: Receipts from the sale of bonds—				
Panama Canal loan.....			33,189,104	18,102,170
Postal savings bonds.....			459,280	
National bank note fund—excess of receipts over redemptions.....				5,255,715
Total proceeds of bond sales and excess of national bank note receipts over redemptions.....			33,648,384	23,357,885
National bank note fund—excess of redemptions over receipts.....			8,449,346	
Other debt redemptions.....			120,616	246,496
Sinking-fund requirements in excess of debt redemptions.....	60,685,000	60,650,000	60,050,433	59,929,038
Total public debt redemptions and requirements.....	60,685,000	60,650,000	68,620,395	60,175,534
Excess of public debt redemptions and requirements over receipts.....	60,685,000	60,650,000	34,972,011	36,817,649
Net expenditures of trust and private funds.....	4,223,403	1,569,090	7,571,463	5,882,614

The foregoing indicates a deficiency for the year 1914 of more than \$83,000,000 (ordinary \$78,884,577 and trust \$4,223,403) besides sinking-fund requirements, or \$143,000,000 if the sinking-fund requirements be included. This statement also indicates a deficiency for the year 1913 amounting to \$57,000,000 (ordinary \$56,019,273 and trust \$1,569,090), a total deficiency for the two years of \$140,000,000, ignoring sinking-fund requirements.

This \$140,000,000 would be reduced by issuing bonds to meet the probable expenditures for the Panama Canal, amounting to \$85,000,000, to a deficiency for the two years of \$55,000,000.

As has already been said, the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report submitted to Congress in December last, estimated a revenue deficiency of \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year 1914. This was on the following most favorable assumptions, namely, that ignoring the sinking fund, expenditures would exactly equal the amount shown in the Book of Estimates, and that bonds would be issued for the full amount of the Panama Canal expenditures during the next fiscal year. The Secretary of the Treasury, on the same assumptions, estimated a deficiency for the current year (1913) amounting to \$1,800,000, except that he included Panama Canal expenditures as a charge against the general fund. Altogether, therefore, for the current and ensuing fiscal years he estimates a deficiency of \$23,800,000, or, in case all Panama expenditures are charged against the general fund, the amount of the estimated deficiency for the two years would be \$53,800,000.

In making the foregoing estimates, however, the Secretary of the Treasury did not take into account a prospective excess of pension requirements under the new law over appropriations for 1913 amounting to \$20,000,000, for \$15,000,000 of which a deficiency estimate has already been submitted, to meet the demands on the Treasury for claims examined, without taking into consideration the accruals on claims which will not have been examined before July 1, 1913; nor did he take into account a probable deficiency in the pension estimate for the fiscal year 1914 of not less than \$10,000,000; furthermore, in his estimated deficiency for 1914 no account was taken of the emer-

agency and regular deficiency bills that are customarily introduced, estimates for which for 1913 have already reached \$3,300,000 (exclusive of the pension deficiency above referred to) and which for 1912 amounted to \$9,700,000. Subsequent to the making of the estimate by the Secretary of the Treasury there have also been filed supplementary estimates for appropriations which amount to \$6,600,000, chiefly to cover additional public buildings and other local works, requested for the most part by committees of Congress. Assuming that there will be increased demands for cash corresponding to these estimates, the prospective deficiency would be increased \$39,900,000. As the estimate submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury and that prepared from the data sent to the Executive Office for the budget are on an entirely different basis, they are stated below in such manner that they may be compared.

Estimated decreases in cash, on basis of report of the Secretary of the Treasury, from June 30, 1913, to June 30, 1914, making allowances for deficiencies and supplemental estimates.

	Amount.	Cumulated totals.
Excess of revenues over expenditures for fiscal year 1913, exclusive of Panama Canal payments.....	\$40,200,000
Excess of expenditures over revenues for fiscal year 1914, after deducting estimates for Panama Canal.....	22,000,000
Surplus as per Secretary's estimates in case canal bonds are issued for both years.....		¹ \$18,200,000
Estimated requirements for Panama Canal:		
For 1913.....	42,000,000	23,800,000
For 1914.....	30,000,000	53,800,000
Estimated deficiencies and supplementary estimates not included in Book of Estimates:		
For pensions—1913.....	20,000,000
For pensions—1914.....	10,000,000
For other purposes—1913.....	3,300,000
For other purposes—1914.....	6,600,000
Total not included in Book of Estimates.....	39,900,000
Net deficiency in case canal bonds are issued for both years.....		21,700,000
Net deficiency in case canal bonds are issued for neither year.....		93,700,000

¹ Surplus.

Estimated decreases in cash, on basis of reports to the President, from June 30, 1913, to June 30, 1914, making allowances for deficiencies and supplemental estimates.

	Amounts.	Cumulated totals.
Excess of expenditures over revenues exclusive of Panama Canal payments:		
For fiscal year 1913.....	\$2,000,000
For fiscal year 1914.....	53,000,000	\$55,000,000
Estimated requirements for Panama Canal:		
For fiscal year 1913.....	55,000,000	110,000,000
For fiscal year 1914.....	30,000,000	140,000,000
Estimated deficiencies not included in reports to President:		
For pensions—1913.....	20,000,000
For pensions—1914.....	10,000,000
Total not included in estimates.....	30,000,000
Net deficiency in case canal bonds are issued for both years.....		84,100,000
Net deficiency in case canal bonds are issued for neither year.....		170,000,000

¹ Under the instructions both deficiencies and supplementary estimates would have been included in the reports submitted; in case of the pension deficiencies, however, it is known that these were not.

The estimated expenditures for 1914, as shown above, are some \$31,000,000 in excess of the amount of the estimates submitted to Congress in the Book of Estimates for the same year. This difference is accounted for very largely by the fact that the estimates submitted to Congress were for appropriations, whereas the estimates which were submitted for the purpose of this discussion were for expenditures, without taking into consideration whether chargeable against new or old appropriations. In these were included over \$22,000,000 of estimated expenditures in excess of estimates for appropriation, without taking into consideration \$7,000,000 to be accounted for by the fact that in the Book of Estimates the item for the Reclamation Service was shown as \$7,000,000, whereas the officers in charge of this work estimate the expenditures at more than \$14,000,000. This service is financed entirely out of revenue appropriations; the difference in estimated expenditures would make a net difference in the demands on the Treasury only to the extent that it was not covered by reclamation revenues and repayments. These and other elements of difference, which are

more fully explained in schedule 5, supporting budget statements, account for the large discrepancy between the deficiency as shown by preceding table and as estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The difference between the estimates of expenditures reported to the President for 1913 and the estimates shown in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for that year is about \$55,000,000. This discrepancy is partly accounted for by a difference in the estimated expenditures for the Panama Canal, amounting to \$13,000,000; the other elements of difference were not disclosed by the analyses which were made, as the basis for the Secretary's estimate is not stated in his report.

THE CUMULATED DEFICIT (STATEMENT NO. 4).

The purpose of statement No. 4 is to show the manner in which expenditures corresponding to the estimates would affect the Treasury surplus in case there were no change in revenue laws. This statement shows that in case Congress grants the full amount of appropriations requested in the Book of Estimates, without a change in revenue laws, and, further, if the drafts against past appropriations are as estimated, the result will be, ignoring sinking-fund requirements as well as deficiencies, that an accumulated Treasury surplus of \$206,182,254.91, as of the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1912, will have been reduced by the end of the next fiscal year (June 30, 1914) to \$67,303,263.47. This will be an inadequate balance of general-fund cash, for the reason that the customary working balance which is carried by disbursing officers, plus the needed working balance in the Treasury proper, is largely in excess of this amount. Subtracting the estimated pension deficiencies of \$30,000,000, which were not included in the statement, even though all canal expenditures for 1914 are against borrowings and all sinking-fund requirements are ignored, advances of the usual amounts carried by disbursing officers would leave not a penny in the Treasury available for the meeting of current governmental demands.

THE RESULT OF GRANTING APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTED WITHOUT INCREASING REVENUES.

From all these data it is apparent that the estimates submitted by departments and establishments on the one hand and the probable revenues on the other should receive serious consideration; that as officers of the Government we should not go ahead blindly, passing and signing one appropriation bill after another without knowing where the money is coming from or how the obligations of the Government are to be met. Such a condition as this obtained in 1893, when a newly elected President found it necessary to go into a very unfavorable money market and borrow over \$260,000,000 in order to meet the Treasury needs of the Government and protect the currency obligations, with the result that his whole administration was handicapped, and the credit system of the country was seriously impaired.

ESTIMATES OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES.

A second set of summaries has been prepared for the purpose of considering questions of future policy. This is made up of analyses of estimated and actual revenues and expenditures.

ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL REVENUES (STATEMENTS NOS. 5 AND 6).

In order that a basis may be laid for determining where adjustments may be made to obtain the revenue needed, as well as for considering the result on the finances of the Government of making any proposed change in revenue law, each class of receipts has been separately shown, with a reference to the law which governs its accrual. There has also been prepared a summary of revenues by departments or establishments to enable officers to compare revenues and expenditures in any project which should be regarded as self-supporting.

ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURES.

The summaries presented herewith cover the estimates submitted by departments. This has been thought desirable because under the act of March 9, 1909, it is my duty to submit recommendations with respect to the departmental estimates transmitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, rather than to present estimates such as would have been submitted to Congress if there had been opportunity for Executive review. As shown by the list of budget statements (pp. 10 and 11), the estimates have been summarized in such manner as to show expenditures in four different relations, namely: (a) The cost and estimated cost of the business done by each organization unit (statement No. 7); (b) the cost and estimated cost of each general class of work performed (statement No. 8); (c) the cost and estimated cost of each class of expenditures, such as operating expenses, fixed charges, capital outlays, etc. (statement No. 9); (d) the cost and estimated cost classified by acts of appropriation in which authorizations to spend customarily

appear (statement No. 10). The remaining statements (11 to 16) show the same facts arranged in such manner as to reflect results in still other relations bearing on questions of policy.

Such inaccuracies as may obtain in the summaries are due to the fact that this is the first time that a systematic statement pertaining to the business of the Government has been attempted; that it is the first time that a statement has been prepared and submitted in the form of a budget; that since its figures have been prepared as a result of a special investigation, rather than from direct accounting results, there has been no means of verification. If every other reason were wanting, the present lack of facilities for obtaining information pertaining to subjects that are essential to any intelligent consideration of the business of the Government, and for knowing that the information when obtained is accurate, would be sufficient to make an annual budget desirable. Had accounts been kept in a form that would permit their use in the preparation of a budget, complete and accurate information would have been available for administrative and executive consideration some months before Congress assembled. Instead, I have been put to the necessity of going out with a dragnet for the essential facts, and then of being required to wait until after January 1 before all of the subjects concerning which data were asked could be reported on—in the end also being required to accept statements sent in without proof and knowing that, in some instances at least, they were incomplete. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing or intending to criticize the heads of departments in whose transactions and in whose books of accounts the material to be used in such a budget must be found. The truth is that they have all been laboring as much as possible, during the last four years, to improve the method of keeping and stating their several department accounts; but the confusion and unbusinesslike condition that have prevented a thorough reform and simplifying of our financial and operating statements have been the result of a century of neglect.

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES AND DECREASES BY DEPARTMENTS (STATEMENT NO. 7).

In most summary form the analysis of the data reported by organization units through which expenditures are made is as follows:

Branches of the Government.	Estimated expenditures for—		Actual expenditures for—	
	1914	1913	1912	1911
The Congress.....	\$9,967,463	\$10,496,325	\$10,695,468	\$11,063,547
The President (including Executive boards and commissions).....	449,040	296,057	621,484	457,803
The judiciary.....	5,408,101	5,234,004	5,110,918	4,979,750
Executive departments (other than sinking-fund estimates and appropriations and debt payments).....	994,090,557	927,479,221	852,667,884	831,140,986
Other establishments.....	33,899,702	58,277,125	37,933,030	36,092,385
Districts and Territories..	6,124,509	5,134,223	5,814,309	5,385,489
Total (excluding sinking-fund requirements and debt payments).....	1,049,939,372	1,006,916,955	912,852,093	889,119,960
Less amounts payable from revenues of the District of Columbia....	583,795	502,202	419,728	417,064
Total payable from Federal revenues, except sinking-fund requirements and debt payments.....	1,049,355,577	1,006,414,753	912,432,365	888,702,896
Sinking-fund requirements and debt payments.....	60,685,000	60,650,000	120,616	246,496
Total payable from Federal revenues.	1,110,040,577	1,067,064,753	912,552,981	888,949,452

DECREASES BY CONGRESS.

In the figures representing appropriations for 1913 and estimates for 1914 for the Congress it will be noted that there is a decrease indicated. This, however, is to be accepted with qualifications, for the reason that not all of the customary items are shown in the estimates for 1914 and no deficiencies are included for either year. Moreover, it is to be noted that for the year 1914 no estimate has been made for outlays for buildings and grounds. The appropriation for the Superintendent of Capitol Building and Grounds was \$951,757 for 1913, whereas only \$178,900 are estimated for 1914.

ESTIMATES AND EXPENDITURES IMMEDIATELY UNDER THE PRESIDENT.

In the Executive Office proper practically no differences appear. The differences in total expenditures directly under the President during the years 1911 and 1912 and in the totals of estimated expenditures for 1913 and 1914 are due to the amounts expended, appropriated, or estimated for the Tariff Board and the Commission on Economy and Efficiency.

INCREASES FOR THE COURTS.

The increase in the cost of the judiciary is almost entirely to be found in the circuit courts of appeals and the district and Territorial courts. For these there has been a gradually increasing cost corresponding to an increasing business.

INCREASES FOR DEPARTMENTS AND INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENTS.

With respect to executive departments, the totals for each of the four years reported, exclusive of sinking-fund requirements and debt payments, are as follows:

	1914	1913	1912	1911
Executive departments.....	\$994,090,557	\$927,479,221	\$852,667,884	\$831,140,986
State.....	4,653,373	4,559,768	4,258,409	4,478,977
Treasury.....	75,621,558	84,132,144	78,771,378	75,789,906
War.....	199,195,018	189,465,658	155,132,062	153,973,875
Justice.....	5,768,098	5,141,764	5,120,349	4,947,705
Post Office.....	284,141,018	271,608,550	250,154,310	240,208,411
Navy.....	152,626,008	126,836,305	134,299,251	118,987,722
Interior.....	230,216,066	204,528,564	189,887,027	193,075,238
Agriculture.....	24,706,013	25,422,263	19,669,339	18,793,633
Commerce and Labor.	17,163,405	15,784,205	15,375,759	20,885,519

From these figures it will be seen that there is a net increase of only \$21,000,000 between 1911 and 1912, and this is very largely accounted for by an increase of \$10,000,000 in the cost of the postal service, which is reimbursable, and increases in the Navy. Leaving out of consideration the sinking fund, the estimated net increase for 1913 over 1912 amounts to \$75,000,000, more than \$67,000,000 of which is accounted for by increases for the War Department, chiefly rivers and harbors, for postal service, and for pensions. As between the estimated expenditures for 1913 and for 1914 there is a net increase of \$66,000,000. This, however, is \$30,000,000 more than the increase indicated by the estimates submitted to Congress for appropriation in the Book of Estimates, although requests for appropriations amounting to more than \$24,000,000 have subsequently been sent in as supplementary and to cover deficiencies. The increases in estimates for expenditures for 1914 are accounted for by still further increases for rivers and harbors, in the War Department, and for the Post Office and increases for the Navy and for pensions. Leaving out of consideration the sinking fund as between 1912 and 1914, the difference of \$142,000,000, exclusive of sinking fund, is accounted for as follows: War, \$44,000,000, largely for river, harbor, and other improvements; Navy, \$18,000,000; Post Office, reimbursable, \$34,000,000; pensions, \$32,000,000; all others, net, \$14,000,000.

In the independent establishments the decrease in cost for 1914 is largely explained by the decreasing needs for the completion of the Panama Canal.

ANALYSIS TO SHOW COST OF EACH CLASS OF WORK (STATEMENT NO. 8).

The same estimates and expenditures have been analyzed and summarized in such manner as to show the cost to the Government of each class of work which is now being done, as well as the estimated cost of work projected for the next fiscal year. From this it will be noted that the estimated cost of functions which are general in character, such as legislation, executive direction and control, adjudication, administration of the national finances, etc., for the next fiscal year is \$166,000,000, whereas the estimated direct cost of service to the public is \$936,000,000. It also shows that the estimated cost for the next year of military services is \$452,000,000 as against a total of \$484,000,000, the estimated cost of all civil services. Again, the total cost of civil service is divided so as to show the amount spent for the promotion of friendly relations and the protection of American interests abroad, \$4,300,000 a year, and the amount spent for the promotion of welfare within the United States, \$479,600,000. This latter amount is further subdivided to show the cost of protection to economic interests, \$445,000,000, and the cost of the promotion of individual welfare, \$34,600,000. A still further analysis is made to show the welfare interests which are served. The \$445,000,000 estimated for 1914 expenditures for the promotion of economic welfare, together with the amount estimated for the current year and the actual expenditures of the last two completed fiscal years, is accounted for as follows.

	1914	1913	1912	1911
Promotion of agriculture, forestry, fisheries, and the care and utilization of the public domain.....	\$37,372,040	\$37,391,089	\$29,736,440	\$27,892,521
Promotion of trading, manufacturing, and mining.....	930,439	549,962	433,070	404,888
Providing facilities for transportation.....	116,844,538	134,564,906	82,517,834	77,347,590
Postal and other communication service (reimbursable)....	276,983,944	265,001,879	244,460,742	234,185,955
General:				
Regulation of commerce and banking.....	3,023,658	3,043,089	2,677,452	2,465,128
Providing a medium of exchange.....	4,584,554	5,168,325	5,188,261	4,998,012
Meteorological research and weather forecasting.....	1,712,490	1,666,680	1,618,098	1,515,005
Granting patents and copyrights (reimbursable)....	2,242,691	2,070,609	2,159,126	2,083,668
Collection of data pertaining to population and other general statistical information.....	765,060	1,069,310	1,990,398	7,544,949
Fixing standards of measurement.....	612,395	473,849	573,692	342,062
Total.....	445,071,809	450,999,698	371,355,113	358,779,778

The \$34,000,000 estimated 1914 expenditures for the promotion and conservation of individual welfare, together with the estimated cost for the current fiscal year and the actual cost for the last two completed fiscal years, is subdivided to show:

	1914	1913	1912	1911
Promotion of the special interests of the laboring classes.....	\$4,372,805	\$4,134,880	\$3,529,157	\$3,626,378
Promotion of public health, education, and recreation:				
Promotion and protection of public health.....	7,817,343	6,572,860	6,347,603	5,989,477
Promotion of public education and recreation and of art and pure science.....	5,736,545	4,844,242	4,346,185	4,262,921
Care and education of dependent, defective, and delinquent.....	2,622,487	1,826,064	2,734,197	1,867,090
Care and education of the Indians and other wards of the Nation.....	14,018,907	11,121,186	11,339,716	11,865,353
Total.....	34,568,087	28,499,232	28,296,858	27,611,219

It is thought that such analyses will be of great value in considering questions of policy bearing on the future work program of the Government.

ANALYSIS TO SHOW CHARACTER OF EXPENDITURES (STATEMENT NO. 9).

Analyzing the estimates and expenditures in such manner as to show the amount of the estimated and actual current expenses, as distinguished from capital outlays and debt payments, the totals for the four years are as follows:

	1914	1913	1912	1911
Current expenses and fixed charges (except principal of debt).....	\$821,131,982	\$779,892,645	\$742,206,621	\$738,419,108
Overhead and operating expenses.....	565,798,628	545,343,691	520,454,692	513,410,284
Upkeep of property.....	22,764,889	23,463,755	22,013,896	22,751,305
Fixed charges, except principal of debt (including interest, court awards, pensions, subsidies, contributions, indemnities, etc.).....	232,568,465	211,085,199	199,825,033	202,257,519
Acquisition of property.....	190,196,406	199,585,976	153,189,441	134,280,159
Unclassified.....	38,610,984	27,438,334	17,369,031	16,420,693
Total current expenses, fixed charges, expenditure for property and undistributed expenditures.....	1,049,939,372	1,006,916,955	912,852,093	880,119,960
Deduct amounts chargeable to revenues of the District of Columbia.....	583,795	502,202	419,728	417,004
Total expenditures other than principal of debt.....	1,049,355,577	1,006,414,753	912,432,365	888,702,956
Payment of debt.....	60,685,000	60,650,000	120,616	246,496
Total.....	1,110,040,577	1,067,064,753	912,552,981	888,949,452

Considering first the total for overhead cost and operation, it will be seen that this represents only about one-half the total for the Government. Including upkeep, the current expenses for the last completed year, 1912, reached \$542,468,588 out of a total of \$912,552,981. To give perspective to the problem of financing the next fiscal year the estimated expenditures may be grouped as follows:

Current expenses and fixed charges other than sinking fund.....	\$821,000,000
Acquisition of property.....	190,000,000
Unclassified expenditures (most of which are known to be expenditures for property).....	38,000,000
Payment of principal on the public debt.....	60,000,000

Subdividing the current expenses and fixed charges, as distinguished from acquisition of property, the estimated amount of overhead and operating expenses is \$566,000,000, of upkeep costs \$23,000,000, and of fixed charges \$232,000,000.

SIGNIFICANCE OF ANALYSIS IN DETERMINING FINANCIAL POLICY.

The special significance of this analysis is to be found in its use as a guide to the determination of financial policy.

In my opinion current expenses and fixed charges, including sinking-fund requirements, should be financed entirely out of revenues; that is, in planning to meet the Treasury needs of the Government it would be a mistake to provide the means for carrying on the current business and for liquidating the debt by incurring additional indebtedness. By this standard the least amount of revenue which would be required for the next fiscal year (assuming that the estimates sent in are approved by the Congress and incorporated in appropriations) would be \$881,000,000. This conclusion is based on the assumption that all estimates for "acquisition of property" and all "unclassified" estimates would be initially financed by the Government out of borrowings; that is, that all of these estimated expenditures are properly classified as capital outlays. It is to be observed, however, that in the estimated appropriations and expenditures for acquisitions of property during the four years reported all replacements of obsolete or condemned equipment or other property are included. These should be charged against current revenues. The estimates sent to me as for capital outlays, with corresponding expenditures for preceding years, are as follows:

Character of expenditure.	Estimates for 1914.	Appropriations for 1913.	Expenditures for—	
			1912	1911
Total expenditures for acquisition of property.....	\$190,196,406	\$199,585,976	\$153,189,441	\$134,280,159
Land.....	2,531,825	6,596,696	4,223,338	2,849,445
Buildings.....	20,958,273	20,896,897	15,947,814	14,990,947
Other improvements to land and waterways.....	74,974,140	108,486,547	72,339,558	60,708,285
Equipment.....	73,542,150	51,343,856	54,607,061	40,939,301
Stores (increases).....	7,268,549	6,675,373	4,886,730	5,405,233
Work in progress (increases or decreases).....	115,522	120,721	1,072,858	1,126,358
Unclassified capital outlays.....	10,805,947	5,789,328	2,257,798	1,513,306
Unclassified expenditures.....	38,610,984	27,438,334	17,369,031	16,420,693

¹ Decreases of stores; deduction from total expenditures.

In order to determine what amount of these expenditures may properly be financed from the proceeds of bond issues and what amount would be considered as expenses to be financed out of revenues, it is necessary to clearly distinguish those expenditures which are for the acquisition of additional properties and those which are for replacement of old. From the present state of the records and reports these data are not available. With respect to the \$73,500,000 estimated for equipment, however, this may be said: That a greater portion of the estimate is for battleships, ordnance, etc. It is doubtful if the amount asked for is more than is needed to cover the wear and tear and the depreciation due to obsolescence of equipment already owned by the Government. Assuming that all of the \$98,400,000 for land, buildings, and other improvements on land, and the \$10,800,000 "unclassified capital outlays," as well as the \$38,600,000 of other "unclassified expenditures," are for new properties, the conclusion that these are additions or betterments should not be accepted without qualification for the reason that no provision is made for estimating structural depreciation. In fact, there is not at present any means for knowing what amount of property the Government owns against which depreciation must be estimated. From the inadequate data at hand it appears that the Government has acquired buildings and other improvements on land during the last 50 years

the cost of which is considerably in excess of \$1,500,000,000. If it be assumed that the average life of such structures is 50 years, then not less than \$30,000,000 should be included in current expenses for depreciation due to obsolescence. This would leave about \$115,000,000 of the expenditures for the acquisition of property to be capitalized.

THE EXCESS OF ESTIMATED CURRENT EXPENSES AND FIXED CHARGES OVER ESTIMATED REVENUES FOR 1914.

From the foregoing it would appear that the amount of the revenues required to meet current expenses and fixed charges (including current upkeep of property and depreciation from obsolescence) is approximately \$995,000,000.

The amount which the Secretary of the Treasury estimates will accrue in revenues during the next fiscal year is \$970,000,000 (excluding refunds of revenues and trust-fund receipts), leaving a revenue deficiency of \$25,000,000. From any angle of approach, therefore, either the estimates for appropriations must be cut down or provision must be made for increasing the revenue.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REDUCTION OF CURRENT EXPENSES.

In submitting recommendations under the requirements of the act of March 4, 1909, it seems evident that the overhead and operating expenses and capital outlays should be clearly distinguished from expenditures in the nature of fixed charges and debt payments. The amount of expenditures for these latter purposes is not to any considerable extent affected by economy or efficiency of administration, but is the result of established policy expressed in terms of law. With respect to capital outlays the Congress determines whether buildings shall be constructed or rented, whether improvements shall be authorized. With respect to fixed charges the President has no control except through approval or disapproval of bills of Congress submitted for his signature. The executive branch can have little responsibility for nearly one-third of the total estimated expenditures.

If the executive branch is not handicapped by legislation that robs the service of the benefits of the proper exercise of administrative discretion, the economy and efficiency with which the many services of the Government are operated are primarily the responsibility of this branch. It is with respect to this portion of Government expenditures—the estimates for which amount to about \$566,000,000 for the year 1914—that the following recommendations are made. In submitting recommendations, however, I am suggesting such reductions only as it is thought may result from beneficial changes in policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS WITH RESPECT TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR PERSONAL SERVICES.

With respect to the cost of personal service the estimates may be divided into two classes, namely, (1) those for the payment of the salaries of persons appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) those for the payment of salaries to all other employees of the Government. The reductions which, in my opinion, may be made in these estimates without injury to the service are:

Reductions in estimates for salaries of local officers appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate	\$4,500,000
Reductions in estimates for all other salaries	2,000,000

REDUCTIONS BY ELIMINATION OF SINECURES.

With respect to the first class I have already submitted recommendations to Congress in several messages transmitting reports in which it is estimated that the direct salary cost of the Government may be reduced not less than \$4,500,000 a year—this to be done by placing a large proportion of presidential appointments in the classified service. The salaries of postmasters of the first and second classes amount to over \$6,000,000, while the salaries of assistant postmasters of the same classes amount to \$2,820,000. If the position of postmaster were placed in the classified service and these officers were given salaries equal to 20 per cent more than the salaries now given to assistant postmasters, the latter positions being no longer required, there would be a saving of \$4,512,000. Besides this direct reduction that might be immediately made in the estimates, there would also be very large indirect reductions of cost that might be availed of in future estimates—reductions that can not be realized so long as appointments are on a partisan basis. These unnecessary indirect costs are due to the fact that a considerable part of the services outside of Washington can not be properly brought within the discipline of administrative officers. So long as high-salaried local officers owe their appointments to local influence it may be assumed that their tenures will be fairly secure, regardless of their efficiency. This is discouraging to those in equally responsible positions who are rendering efficient service, but who, by reason of the nonpartisan character of the appointment, receive not more than half the amount of salary;

it tends to destroy the esprit de corps, especially with subordinates; it carries with it expenditures that in many instances are unwisely made. Altogether, in the opinion of those who are best acquainted with the service, the indirect saving to the Government amounts to more than the direct saving indicated. A list of presidential appointments, requested from departments, is attached (Appendix 5). [Omitted in RECORD.]

REDUCTIONS BY RECLASSIFICATION OF CIVIL SERVICE.

With respect to the other employees in the service, their salaries are either what are known as "statutory" (that is, specified in the acts of appropriations) or "nonstatutory" (the designation given to salaries paid out of lump-sum appropriations). With respect to these my recommendation is that the total appropriations for salaries be established at an amount sufficient to cover the pay-roll requirements of the present fiscal year, but that authority be given to make a complete executive reclassification of civil-service employees, to become effective by Executive order. Such a provision would reduce the estimates for current expenses not less than \$2,000,000, and, in my opinion, would result beneficially to employees as well as to the Government. In other words, I am of the opinion that an annual salary roll of \$2,000,000 less than the estimates for salaries for the year 1914, if properly distributed, would adequately provide for the personnel necessary to do the Government's present work. At present each statutory salary is fixed by Congress; this means that it is fixed by one or another of nine committees of Congress. Each nonstatutory salary is fixed by one or another of the nine heads of departments. The result is not only great confusion in service designations and service classification, but also great disparity in salaries for doing similar work. Furthermore, the fate of each individual employee in the matter of promotions, etc., so far depends on action that can not, under present conditions, be premised on merit or adjustment of compensation to work, that one of the serious embarrassments to the service is a constant request for transfers.

This embarrassment Congress has sought to overcome through laws the practical operation of which is to make details and transfers difficult; and committees on appropriations have usually looked with suspicion upon all requests for salary increases. Under the laws governing transfers, entry into the civil service in certain departments amounts to a three years' enlistment with very little hope for promotion. The obstructions to details of employees hamper the work of certain divisions and add unnecessarily to the cost of others. The impossibility of giving fair consideration to the question is shown by the fact that each year hundreds of increases are proposed in estimates to Congress, whose committees are supposed to pass on their merits. One committee may pursue a fairly liberal policy, and another may pursue a policy of restriction; but each must act with very little knowledge of their problem. One person whose position is proposed for increase may have a strong or influential advocate before a committee, while another, equally competent, may not. The whole subject of salaries is chaotic.

In the present situation many men at the bottom are receiving larger salaries than would be obtained for similar work in outside employment, whereas men in higher positions carrying great responsibility and the success of whose performance depends on training and long experience are inadequately paid. The Government suffers from both conditions. From the viewpoint of the rank and file, there is little hope of reward for merit. Instead of establishing a well-considered classification of positions and salary grades which will admit of promotions and increased compensation with added experience and ability to render valuable service, instead of holding out to the employee a career, a premium is placed on getting into the service, after which little inducement is offered to effort. There is little incentive to increasing efficiency, because as a rule initial salaries are placed too high and terminal salaries too low. The operation of such a salary scheme is to encourage application for appointment from persons who have already assumed large social or other responsibilities, and who are out of employment; at the same time by providing low terminal salaries the service is to this extent made unattractive to those who have spent years in preparation or who after long experience have become expert in the handling of the many technical problems involved in the economical and efficient transaction of public business.

The foundation for a reclassification of salaries has already been laid. An analysis of the service designations and salary grades has been made for the entire service. This is now being summarized in such manner that if the subject is pursued with vigor a reclassification may be completed within the next few months. In my opinion, such a reclassification would enable the Government to pay higher salaries to those from whom experi-

ence, training, and initiative are required, and make the saving of \$2,000,000 as already stated. It would hold out to the whole service a hope for better things instead of leaving each individual in it the victim of chance.

REDUCTIONS THAT WOULD FOLLOW MAKING CERTAIN SERVICES REIMBURSABLE.

In my opinion a considerable reduction in expenditures may be made without injury to the service by making certain expenditures reimbursable. Generally speaking, the reason for making Government expenditures reimbursable is either (1) that the benefits of the service inure mainly to those who use it rather than to the general public, and that therefore the entire cost should be paid by the users, or (2) that the service provided by the Government may better serve its purpose if the person for whose benefit it is performed pays at least a part of the cost incurred. Among the most obvious items of expenditure which should be placed on a reimbursable basis are those for certain publications of the Government that are distributed to the public.

ELIMINATION OF WASTE IN DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

The estimates for appropriations for the next fiscal year for printing and binding at the Government Printing Office amount to nearly \$6,000,000 besides the printing and binding that is done elsewhere. Of this amount a considerable part is for publications that are distributed to the public. As at present distributed it is known that a relatively small part of such publications gets into hands of persons who are really interested in them, and such persons could well afford to pay cost price for them. The other documents are sent simply as a reminder that there is some one in Washington who has the recipients' names on the list. The adoption of such a principle as is recommended would, in my opinion, change the entire character of the publication activities of the Government. At the present time many valuable documents of the Government are not obtainable at any price, since the issue is exhausted very shortly after publication. The practice is that such a number of documents is printed as is necessary to supply the public libraries and furnish the copies which, under the law, go to Members of Congress. Unless provision is made for distribution to the public anyone interested in a particular publication may be fortunate to receive the one or more copies that may be allowed the Representative of the congressional district in which he lives. Further than this he must depend largely upon exchange of courtesies between Representatives. Even those editions that are for public distribution, being given away, are soon exhausted. In order to make a supply available to persons who may not have the facilities for obtaining a desired volume or volumes at the time of the issue it is necessary to have a publication authorization that will place a stock in the hands of the superintendent of documents for sale. With respect to certain publications this principle of sale has already been adopted. It is urged that it be made general in its operation, thereby enabling Congress to reduce the estimate for printing and binding by the amount which it is thought will be realized from the copies distributed to the public.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR POSTAGE.

A further reduction in expenses may be made by applying the same principle to postage—that is, a part of the cost of distributing documents is the expense of handling them in the post office. In preparing the catalogue lists of publications to be paid for it is recommended that the cost of postage be included in the price to the public. This would be represented by special stamps issued by the Post Office Department to the departments and establishments through which the distribution would be made.

MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES.

The estimated cost of maintaining the independent assay offices carried in the estimates for the legislative, executive, and judicial bill is \$305,740. This is not the whole cost, as it does not include such as is carried in estimates for public buildings. The Secretary of the Treasury has recommended their discontinuance. By such action it is thought that the saving would be at least as much as the amount shown above. In this relation I wish to raise the question for the consideration of Congress as to whether it would not still further add to the economy with which the public business may be done, and at the same time increase efficiency, if the five Government mints located at Carson, Denver, New Orleans, Philadelphia, and San Francisco were consolidated. The cost of plant is very large. The added cost due to scattered work is also an element to be considered. The estimates for operating the mints amount to more than \$915,000. Besides this, there are large items of cost contained in the estimates for public buildings. It is thought that, aside from the saving of \$305,740 which might be effected

by closing the detached assay offices as has been recommended, there could also be realized a saving in overhead and other costs of not less than \$100,000 a year by the consolidation of the mints at some point of manufacture where the equipment is large and transportation facilities are good. The buildings in the cities where the mints were closed could be utilized for other governmental purposes, or sold.

REDUCTIONS OF EXPENDITURES PROPOSED BY THE COMMISSION ON ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY.

To the present time 24 reports of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency have been sent to Congress by me, most of which contain constructive recommendations. It is thought that if these recommendations were acted upon affirmatively a saving amounting to several million dollars might be effected without impairing the efficiency of the several services which have been made the subject of inquiry. As these reports are specific, and a number of them have been under consideration by committees in Congress, it does not seem necessary to do more than to refer to them at this time.

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RELATION TO ESTIMATED FIXED CHARGES.

As has been said, fixed charges are the result of legislation over which the executive branch can not exercise control and with respect to which it has no responsibility. To this general statement, one exception is to be taken, viz, the administration of the public debt. Not only is the executive branch made responsible for the management of the sinking fund, but upon it has also been placed responsibility for borrowing to meet the needs of the Treasury.

SINKING-FUND REQUIREMENTS.

The amount of sinking-fund requirements depends on three factors, namely, (1) the amount of the debt to be sunk, (2) the time during which the obligations are to be permitted to run, and (3) the conditions attached to the investment of fund accumulations.

As bearing on the amount of the national debt to be sunk, I am of the opinion that the policy of the Federal Government should be to remain as nearly debt free as good financing and the equitable distribution of capital outlays over a series of years will warrant. Our governmental establishment is made up of three kinds of public corporations—municipal, State, and national. Any program for the protection and promotion of the welfare of the country must include them all. The burden of taxes laid by them all falls upon, and must be supported by, private business or by the private resources of the people. The debt burden of all must be considered as an incumbrance on our national wealth. Considering the fact that many municipalities and States have already reached the constitutional limit of indebtedness; considering that the total bonded debt of New York City alone exceeds the bonded debt of the National Government, and that the total municipal indebtedness is many times greater; considering that the Constitution places the burden of national defense on the National Government, it would seem to be the part of wisdom for the Federal Government to keep as nearly debt free as is practicable. Not only does reason suggest that this is one of the most effective precautions that can be taken to fortify the Nation, but history supports this conclusion. Both in our conflict with Great Britain and in the Civil War, the fact that the Federal Government was practically debt free at the time that resort was had to arms must be assigned an important place in considering the factors which made for success.

THE CIVIL WAR DEBT STILL UNPAID.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Civil War was begun practically debt free, the Government was forced to the last extreme to obtain funds with which to carry on the conflict.

At the end of the war the meeting of this debt was one of our most serious problems. That we have gone along for over half a century since the Civil War, carrying the large part of this war debt, when during the latter part of this period the revenues of the Government far exceeded expenditures, has been due largely to the fact that our public debt has been a part of an admittedly vicious system of banking and currency. As a matter of public policy, definite provisions should be made for retiring this several-times-refunded balance of more than a thousand million dollars, and in such manner as to do no injustice to those who have purchased the bonds as collateral for bank-note issue.

And in making provisions for this refunding, the first obligations to be retired are the demand notes that were issued during the war and given currency through being made legal tender. Every objection to the retirement of the greenback that in the past has obtained is now without force. These outstanding obligations of the Government (the legal-tender notes) are a constant menace to both Government and private credit—a menace which has operated adversely to the successful financing

of Treasury deficits in periods of business depression by draining the Treasury of its gold—one which would be found even more serious in case the Nation should need again to fall back on its credit as a matter of military necessity.

At the present time the total bonded debt outstanding is approximately \$964,000,000. To this should be added \$346,000,000, the amount of the demand Treasury notes. This makes a total indebtedness to be sunk of \$1,310,000,000. Taking into the sinking fund the \$150,000,000 gold reserve against greenbacks outstanding and the \$137,000,000 advanced from the general fund for the building of the Panama Canal, gold certificates could be issued in place of greenbacks to the extent of \$287,000,000. It would be necessary to issue only \$59,000,000 more bonds to retire the balance of the outstanding Treasury notes, leaving an interest-bearing debt of the Government amounting to \$1,160,000,000 of all maturities, against which sinking-fund requirements would be calculated. Assuming that it is determined to retire the present debt in 20 years after July 1, 1914, and further that authority is given to invest the sinking-fund accumulations in new issues of Government bonds for future capital outlays which will bear an average rate of 3 per cent, it would require about \$45,000,000 to be set aside each year to retire the old debt, or about \$15,000,000 less than the present legal requirement. This sum for sinking-fund requirements would have to be increased to make provision of each new bond issue as fast as necessary.

PRESENT SINKING-FUND RESOURCES.

At the present time the only sinking-fund resource is a claim on the general fund amounting to \$809,000,000. This is now become a mere bookkeeping entry without real obligation or meaning. I recommend that the present law be amended so as to adapt the annual charge against the revenues to the actual requirements and that the book balance be canceled. To provide gold with which to retire the greenbacks, I recommend that authority be given to transfer the \$150,000,000 general-fund gold reserve to the sinking fund as well as the \$137,000,000 advanced for the Isthmian Canal from the general fund, the latter amount to be obtained by issue of 20-year bonds of the National Government.

CREATION OF A SINKING-FUND COMMISSION.

And to insure the independence of the administration of the sinking-fund law in the future it is also recommended that the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Treasury be made ex-officio a sinking-fund commission, and that the comptroller shall be required each year to audit and state the sinking-fund account to the President and the Congress.

CONDITIONS TO BE ATTACHED TO NEW ISSUES.

In the making of future issues of national bonds I assume the adoption of a new banking and currency system, which will retire the 2 per cent United States bonds now used to secure circulation under a plan which places the price of the bonds on a false basis by making these alone authorized securities for the issuing of bank notes. While this provision has enabled the United States Government to float most of its securities on a low interest charge, it has so commingled problems of national currency and private debt with questions of public debt as to hamper the Government in its dealings by placing a barrier of investment interest in the way of every effort to retire outstanding obligations. The proposal would give 20 years, if need be, within which to adjust bond issues to an investment basis.

CONDITIONS TO BE ATTACHED TO THE SINKING FUND.

To the end that the sinking fund may be used to advantage prior to the time when the present outstanding indebtedness may mature or may be redeemed, it is recommended that, in so far as cash may accumulate in the fund in excess of the demands for meeting current maturities, this cash be made available for the purchase of subsequent bond issues authorized for public improvements or other purposes, and that the sinking-fund commissioners be authorized, with proper restrictions, to sell such purchases at any time that money may be desired to carry out the purposes of the fund.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REDUCTIONS IN ESTIMATES FOR EXPENSES AND FIXED CHARGES.

From the foregoing it is evident that the estimates for expenses and fixed charges may be reduced \$25,000,000 without injury to the service. In fact, the results, in my opinion, would be beneficial, provided changes in law also be made as indicated. This could be accomplished by a reduction of not less than \$10,000,000 in estimates for overhead and operating expenses and by a reduction of \$15,000,000 by changing the sinking-fund law so that it would release the present cumulated reserve and provide only for an amount adequate for the retirement of the present national debt within 20 years from July 1 next and for

the retirement of future bonded debt within 20 years from the date of issue. This would reduce the total of estimated expenditures which should be met by revenue from \$995,000,000 to approximately \$970,000,000 for the fiscal year 1914, as against which there is an estimated revenue of \$970,000,000 (exclusive of trust funds, refunds, etc.).

CONSTRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS PERTAINING TO PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS.

Not only should every public improvement bear a definite relation to a plan or program which has reference to the needs of the Nation, but provision should be made for completing the improvement at such time as it will be most useful or serviceable in the carrying out of such a plan. In my opinion it is desirable that the Government at Washington should be housed in public buildings which should be built in such manner as to conform to a general plan of public buildings for the Government within the city. In order to carry out such a program it might be good business judgment to provide for spending fifteen or twenty million dollars within the next two years. As a matter of fact it would be advantageous for the Government to invest nearly \$100,000,000, if need be, to save the rent which it is at present paying within the District of Columbia. By first developing a plan and then working to it, whatever part might be approved might be financed through loans which would enable the Government to apportion the investment burden over a period of, say, 20 years. Such a method of financing, applied to all its permanent improvements, would enable the Government to make contracts on the most favorable basis, to avail itself of having its buildings provided at an early date, and at the same time to proportion the burden on revenue equitably over a period of years, through annual appropriations to the sinking fund.

Applying the same theory to internal improvements: A definite plan may be adopted for the damming of streams which periodically flood the Ohio and Mississippi River Valleys, thereby enabling the Government to operate these dams for the retention of water at times of flood and also to operate the dams for the production of power or other industrial or commercial uses. Such a plan, however, would require a large initial outlay, which should be proportioned over a period of years.

Briefly stated, my suggestion is that the Government first plan for its land purchases, buildings, and public works, then borrow money to acquire and to construct them, proportioning the cost over a period of 20 years and making the bonds issued to meet the cost payable out of an adequate sinking fund.

Following these suggestions, I not only question the desirability of continuing to appropriate for new projects without a definite plan and before provision is made for financing them either by increased revenues or bond issues, but assert, further, that without a plan there is necessarily a large element of waste. For example, it would seem to be wasteful use of public money to appropriate for the location of military posts and buildings at various local points and for the building of barracks and quarters, whether for the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, until a definite military program has been settled upon which will determine the question as to whether or not it is desirable as a matter of military expediency to maintain several hundred posts, scattered over the length and breadth of the country, for the quartering of troops, or to have quarters located at such points as to provide more adequately for the element of maneuver and military instruction which is the primary purpose of maintaining an army in time of peace. As has been said, in the past military posts and establishments have been located largely as a result of local pressure rather than from a consideration of military need. Many of the requests for appropriations above listed are based on this theory. Within the list are not only to be found the appropriations for military improvements, but also those civil in character, such as public buildings, improvements to rivers and harbors, etc., all of which should be subject to the same scrutiny before new projects are financed.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE IN POLICY PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS.

The analyses which have been made suggest quite a different handling of the subject of authorizations and appropriations than has obtained in the past. Considering this from the viewpoint of the needs of the service, it is suggested that appropriations should be of the following general classes:

1. Appropriations to cover overhead and operating cost.
2. Appropriations for upkeep of property.
3. Appropriations for fixed charges, including sinking fund.
4. Appropriations for permanent improvements.

CHARACTER OF APPROPRIATIONS TO COVER OVERHEAD AND OPERATING COSTS.

With respect to the form of appropriations for current expenses, I am of the opinion that a sharp line should be drawn between appropriations for overhead and expenses of operation

and those for other current purposes. Appropriations authorizing expenditures for overhead expenses and operation should be annual, biennial, triennial, quadrennial, or quinquennial, as by the terms and conditions may be best adapted to the management of the public business to greatest advantage. These are subjects concerning which questions of policy must be currently determined. On the other hand, I am of the opinion that provision for repairs, replacements, and depreciation, interest on the public debt, pensions, subsidies, grants, judgments, awards, indemnities, and sinking-fund requirements should not be left to current or annual determination. With respect to these expenditures every question of policy should be decided at the time the law is passed authorizing them. Appropriations for such purposes, in my opinion, should not be taken up by an appropriation committee, except to ascertain what amount will be required under a funding measure that would be passed by the Congress as a part of the original authority. Under such a law the amount required should be a matter for administrative or judicial determination.

UPKEEP SHOULD BE FINANCED THROUGH A REPLACEMENT FUND CREATED BY PERMANENT APPROPRIATION.

When buildings are constructed it should be assumed that they are to be kept in repair—unless they are of a temporary character, in which case the construction should be treated as a current expense—and the cost of such construction should be amortized completely over the period of each building's use. To the end that a definite basis may be established for determining what appropriations are needed for upkeep of property, I recommend the appointment of an appraisement board in each department to determine what is the present investment or net cost to the Government of properties against which a maintenance reserve should operate. Such board or commission, under central direction and control, should be instructed also to prepare as a basis for future appropriations actuarial tables on all buildings and other improvements to land which are subsequently acquired. In other words, when new battleships are authorized, definite provision should be made for upkeep; when buildings and other improvements on land are authorized, a calculation should be made with respect to the maintenance requirements, and the amount so determined should be authorized as a permanent appropriation. With respect to industrial property—that is, property which is currently used for purposes of manufacture or other production—estimates for maintenance, including depreciation, should also be made. These estimates, however, should not be made as a basis for appropriation, but for the purpose of establishing a reserve for upkeep, including depreciation, which may be ratably charged to the operations or work on which equipment or industrial property is used, thereby making unnecessary any appropriation for this purpose other than as included in appropriations to cover the cost of work. Having established a replacement fund, the annual estimated requirements for each department should be met by permanent appropriations, and from this fund allotments should be made to provide for the repairs and replacements needed. By requiring an accurate account to be kept of actual repairs and replacements, by classes of property, the actuarial estimates may be corrected from time to time as experience would indicate.

PENSIONS SHOULD BE MET BY PERMANENT ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Fixed charges are on quite a different basis. There is no greater reason for current acts of appropriation to cover pension rolls than there is for an annual appropriation to cover interest on the public debt. A present situation fairly illustrates what may regularly happen when the amounts required to make payment on pension claims authorized are included in an annual appropriation bill. The appropriation for the current year is not less than \$20,000,000 short of what it should be to meet pension claims. The result is that in the estimates for pensions for the next year a request is made for an appropriation to be made immediately available, but in case this is done the same situation must be faced the year following. It is probable that the appropriation already made, together with the pension item in the Book of Estimates, will not cover claims filed before June 30, 1914, by \$30,000,000. In my opinion, what should be done is to carefully compute the demands which will probably be made under a pension law before it is passed—a precaution that has heretofore never been taken. After such an estimate has been prepared, then estimates would be made annually on the basis of experience for the consideration of Congress in providing revenues to meet Treasury demands, but the pension law should carry with it a permanent appropriation.

JUDGMENTS AND AWARDS SHOULD BE FINANCED BY PERMANENT LAW.

The same may be said of indemnities and court awards. When a judgment or award has been made it should be considered as an appropriation payable out of funds in the Treasury, unless the award should be so large in amount as to

threaten the credit of the Government, in which case the Secretary of the Treasury should be permitted to withhold payment until provision could be made by borrowing or through increasing revenues for meeting the demand. Instead of this the present practice is to permit the courts to make awards for payments of claims and then to require the payment to await the slow process of a special appropriation. This is not only unjust, but it leads to a kind of trafficking which should not be encouraged. The only reason for requiring judgment creditors to wait for further congressional action would be in case payment of a large judgment would embarrass the Treasury or was in excess of an estimated annual requirement, when authority should be given to the Executive to defer payment till adequate revenues had been provided or bonds were issued for the purpose.

THE PRESENT LIST OF PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD BE REVISED.

As has been said, after a law has been passed providing for the borrowing of money on public credit, thereby authorizing the payment of interest, or for the payment of pensions, subsidies, indemnities, or the setting aside of revenues for the payment of the principal of the public debt, there is no further question of policy for Congress to consider until it may be found desirable to repeal the law or to deny the obligation. In general, this policy has already been followed. The list of permanent appropriations is a long one. For the current year the estimate reaches nearly \$134,000,000. In the list of permanent appropriations for 1913 are included such items as \$3,000,000 for meat inspection; \$1,700,000 for the operation and care of canals and other works of navigation; \$125,000 for the removal of obstructions in the Mississippi, Illinois, and other rivers; \$100,000 for the maintenance of channels, South Pass, Miss.; \$5,500,000 for the collection of customs. These are not proper subjects for permanent appropriations, whereas the expenditures of the character indicated above should, in my opinion, be thus provided for.

CURRENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR A LONGER PERIOD THAN ONE YEAR.

Both the expenses of current administration and operation and the acquisition of property for the continuing use of the Government should, in my opinion, be subjects for current consideration of questions of policy. To this end the administration should be held responsible for preparing and submitting each year carefully prepared estimates of needs, together with such collateral data as may be needed to consider what amount should be appropriated and what conditions should be attached. This does not mean that appropriations for overhead expenses and operation may not be for a longer period than one year. In many instances appropriations made to cover a period of years would result in largely increasing the economy and efficiency with which the service may be performed. It was, doubtless, with this end in view that the meat-inspection service was placed upon a basis of permanent appropriations. In my opinion this service should have been placed on a three-year or five-year appropriation basis until the service had become established and its current needs had been determined. There are many services the current expenses of which can, with advantage, be financed on a two, three, or five year basis. This would be of especial value in cases where a definite plan or policy is to be followed or worked to—as a military program or a plan for the development of public roads—in which the Government is to cooperate with States and other local bodies. For constitutional reasons, military appropriations can not be for a longer period than two years, but there is no such inhibition against funding the needs of civil service.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS.

With respect to the acquisition of permanent property, I would recommend, as a matter of financial policy, that no appropriation be made except pursuant to a plan which shall first have been approved by Congress in a bill separate and apart from the act making the appropriation. The formulation of a definite plan for improvements would enable committees of Congress, or, for that matter, Congress in committee as a whole, to consider what the Government shall undertake to do for a period of years before the requests for appropriations are taken up. This would be the alternative to the present method of having a large number of questions of organic law and questions of authorization to incur liabilities—which at the present time run some \$300,000,000 ahead of appropriations—settled in a committee on appropriations and brought in as riders on the appropriation bills at the end of sessions, when no one has time or opportunity to consider, even in general, what the thousands of items in appropriation acts contain. After the question had been settled as to what work would be undertaken during a definite period, the appropriation bill authorizing it, in my opinion, should indicate what part or what project or improvement would be financed out of bond issues and what part would be

financed out of the general fund. In so far as projects are to be financed out of the general fund, there should be a limitation placed on the appropriation so made, to the effect that no contract shall be let by the administrative officer under whose jurisdiction the improvement is to be made unless the estimated revenues of the year, together with the surplus and the general fund, after providing for legal reserves and estimated current expenses and fixed charges, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, are adequate to meet the obligations to be incurred under such contract. This would admit of administrative curtailment of contracts against revenues automatically in case, from loss of expected revenues, the general-fund cash surplus of the Treasury should disappear.

CHANGES IN ORGANIZATION NEEDED TO PREPARE AND CONSIDER A BUDGET.

The Government is not only in the position of having gone along for a century without a budget, but, what is at this time even more to the point, it has not the organic means either for preparing or for considering one. In the executive branch there is no established agency which may be utilized for assembling the data required for the preparation of budget summaries. The law governing estimates requires that they be prepared and submitted by various heads of departments and independent establishments without executive review or revision; this makes it impossible to submit a budget unless the President does it on his own initiative. In Congress nine standing committees are charged with formulating bills for appropriation; a tenth committee is charged with formulating plans for raising revenue; still other committees, with an entirely different membership, are organized for reviewing the Government expenditures. There is little provision made for giving coincidence of time to their action or for correlating the results of their work, and in many instances what is attempted to be done through appropriation bills prepared by one committee is undone through the appropriation bills prepared by another.

RECOMMENDATION FOR A BUREAU OF CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL.

First in the list of proposed changes in law setting forth what legislation should be enacted in order to enable the administration to transact the public business with greater economy and efficiency is a recommendation for the establishment of a bureau of central administrative control, with a comptroller at the head who would be responsible to the President and to Congress. Concretely, the proposal is to consolidate the six auditors' offices as well as the office of the Comptroller of the Treasury and the other central accounting offices of the Government in one executive bureau, and thereby, without increasing cost, to provide for a central accounting, auditing, and reporting organization which would include among its activities the preparation of a budget supported by a book of estimates and a consolidated financial report for the Government. This agency would also serve in the capacity of an independent agency for the preparation of special reports when requested either by the Congress or by the President.

THE NEED FOR A BUDGET COMMITTEE.

While it is with much hesitation that I suggest any change in committee organization in Congress, it seems to me to be highly desirable to have some provision, such as has been frequently suggested by Members on the floor, whereby a budget committee may be established as a final clearing house through which all the recommendations of the committees having to do with revenues and expenditures shall pass before they take the form of a definite bill. The special reason which I have for urging such a committee is that at present the administration is seriously handicapped by not being able to take up proposals or constructive measures affecting any particular department with any one body or committee which will undertake to consider them in all their aspects. For example, the War Department finds it necessary to deal with committees and subcommittees which have charge of the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, the sundry civil bill, the Army bill, the fortifications bill, the Military Academy bill, the river and harbor bill, besides committees in which various special bills and resolutions and the various recurrent appropriations may originate. The Interior Department finds it necessary to deal with committees which have in charge the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, the sundry civil bill, the Indian bill, and the pension bill. The Navy Department finds it necessary to carry its estimates before two different standing committees to be considered in three different bills. Neither do officers of the administration find it possible to get the whole of a particular subject before any one committee. The subject of transportation and communication (other than postal service) must be considered by the Appropriations Committee, Agricultural Committee, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Committee on Military Affairs, Committee on Naval Affairs, Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. Estimates for public health must go before three different com-

mittees, etc. For these reasons I am recommending not only that the administration be provided with adequate means for obtaining the information necessary to the executive direction and control of public business and the formulation and submission of a budget, but that Congress also make some organic provision whereby the administrative and legislative branch may coordinate their efforts in the development of the future activities of the Government as well as for the determination of the expenditures needed for the current transaction of its business.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 26, 1913.

INTERFERENCE WITH COMMERCE.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, a few days ago I gave notice that I would move to discharge the Judiciary Committee from the consideration of a bill pending before that committee (H. R. 56) "to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations."

In pursuance of that notice, I call the attention of the Senate to the provisions of this bill. I recognize the fact that we are in the midst of legislation that is necessary, but I particularly desire to call attention to what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] said the other day; he said that unless he got recognition on a bill that he thought is of paramount interest to the people, some of these appropriation bills would have to stand aside. I do not care to make this threat in reference to this bill, but I consider it of greater importance than any before the Senate. I respectfully invite the attention of the Senate to this measure because it is of as far-reaching importance, not only to one section of this country, but to the Nation at large, as any rate bill or any appropriation bill or any other bill that has ever been before this body.

There is no commodity produced in this country of more importance to the welfare of the people of America and the world than the American cotton crop. This is true both from the standpoint of domestic use and financial interest. The comfort of the entire population of this country and the civilized world depends upon it. Its uses as a textile article are almost unlimited. In almost every conceivable form in which a textile can be used cotton adapts itself. From the coarsest cordage to the finest thread or laces it is equally adaptable. It practically has no competitor in the field of textiles. The only competitors are flax, wool, and silk. The nature of wool is such that it can only be used to produce woollen fabrics. Flax has a limited field. Silk likewise.

Cotton, on the other hand, under the modern weave and aniline dyes, is a substitute for wool. And in fact it is largely used as a component part of all the woollen manufactures of the world. Under modern processes of spinning and weaving cotton has practically taken the place of flax. Under the mercerizing process it has entered the domain of silk and is rapidly becoming a substitute for it.

As a producer of revenue it alone, as an article of export in its raw form, has held the balance of trade in favor of America, bringing into this country approximately a half billion dollars annually.

The demand for American cotton is constant and world-wide. Its uses have continually widened. The number of spindles and looms from year to year has steadily increased.

The consumption has outstripped and is now outstripping production.

In 1900 the number of spindles in the world was 105,681,000; in 1912, 140,996,000. In 1900 the number of bales produced was 10,245,000 and in 1911, 11,965,000. In 1900, 105,000,000 spindles consumed a crop of 10,000,000 bales. In 1910 there were 140,000,000 spindles to consume a slightly increased production. In proof of the fact that cotton is a world-wide necessity, 900,000,000 people consume it. America holds a monopoly of this article. In proof of this I read some extracts from the proceedings of the International Congress of Master Spinners and Weavers, held in Brussels in 1910.

In the official report of the Seventh International Cotton Congress, held in June, 1910, at Brussels, Mr. F. Guillemin, a French spinner, said:

We are in a very bad position in France just now. We have been trying to find new places in which to grow cotton and, so far, we have succeeded in producing in them about 40,000 bales a year. We are in the hands of the Americans; there is no doubt about it.

Mr. J. Hilton, of England, at this meeting, when it was intimated that possibly India might produce 10,000,000 bales, said:

It has been suggested that it would be possible to get 10,000,000 bales from India. We want cotton, and we want to know where we can get it.

Mr. J. R. McCall, of America, in the same meeting, said:

I invite the attention of those who profess to legislate for the welfare of the people of America to this statement coming from the American member of the Spinning and Weaving Federation of this country.

It is the opinion of many intelligent men in America to-day that if the crop of this coming season should be less than 12,000,000 bales, cotton may see 20 cents a pound instead of 15 cents. It looks a reasonable proposition. The world can not go on continually curtailing. The markets are getting bare. The people are needing more shirts and clothes. They will be ready to pay 20 cents if they have to pay it.

Mr. C. W. Macara, of England, said:

It matters little to us where the cotton is grown; whether in India, Africa, or in any other part of the world. All we want is a sufficient supply.

These quotations are sufficient, coming as they do from the spinners and weavers of the world, to establish the fact that there exists a demand—a world-wide demand—for American cotton.

Is it not a monstrous proposition that with this world-wide demand and a restricted area of supply, with a steadily increasing consumption, that the sale of this article should be left in the hands of a few speculators and gamblers, who, by the rule of their exchanges, arbitrarily fix from day to day the price, regardless of the law of supply and demand? In place of the price being uniform after the amount of a year's production is known, the fluctuations in the market are so absurd, so violent, that the producer of the raw material and the manufacturer of the finished product may not even guess from day to day anywhere within a reasonable limit what the price may be.

If cotton was produced from day to day and buyers and sellers might not know from day to day what the production was likely to be, there might be some justification for an unusual fluctuation in the price; but in view of the fact that by the 1st day of December the entire supply of the American production of cotton until the first day of the next December is known, there is no justification in its fluctuating from day to day in a manner which is so disastrous.

These fluctuations not only demoralize to a large degree the manufacturer, but leave the producer absolutely at sea as to what his crop will reasonably bring and leave him at the mercy of the speculator and the manipulator of the market.

These speculators and manipulators neither grow the cotton nor do they spin the cotton nor do they handle the cotton in fact. They sell hundreds of thousands of bales that they never saw and never intend to handle.

So violent and unreasonable are these fluctuations that a resolution was introduced and passed in the House of Representatives on the 4th of February, 1907, regarding the methods in dealing in futures on cotton exchanges, which was phrased as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, through the Bureau of Corporations, be, and is hereby, requested to investigate the causes of the fluctuations in the price of cotton and the difference in the market price of the various classes of cotton, and said investigation shall be conducted with the particular object of ascertaining whether or not said fluctuations in the prices have resulted in whole or in part from the character of contracts and deliveries thereon made on the cotton exchanges dealing in futures or is the result of any combinations or conspiracy which interferes or hinders commerce among the several States and Territories or with foreign countries.

Commissioner Smith, in submitting his report of investigation to Congress, says:

However this may be, the New York Cotton Exchange, if it can not exist under a just and equitable system, has no excuse for existence at all. The present New York system of fixed differences is uneconomic, in defiance of natural law, unfair, and, like all other attempts to defy natural law, results in such complex and devious effects that the benefits of its transactions accrue only to a skilled few.

The market that practically fixes the price of cotton in this country is New York.

The nature of the contract by which the price of cotton is controlled, especially in New York, is so unjust, so unfair as to call for action on the part of Congress for the relief of those who produce the raw material out of which the clothing of the American people is made, and upon which the world is dependent and upon which the balance of trade is dependent. They are entitled to the consideration of this body from every standpoint; from the standpoint of laborers—from the standpoint of labor, of which we hear so much in this body theoretically, principally, and practically null and void; I say from the standpoint of labor; from the standpoint of American income; from the standpoint of justice and equity they demand a hearing in this body. Congress has no right longer to disregard their repeated petitions for and attempts at relief.

I shall undertake to show that they are at the mercy of the exchange rules and regulations.

Commissioner Smith states this dependence in part, perhaps, better than I may. In reply to the contention that if the rules and regulations of the New York Cotton Exchange are consid-

ered by the producer and others as unfair and oppressive, that they may stay out of the market, and that those who patronize it patronize it with a full knowledge of the rules that govern it, says:

The reply of certain interests in the New York Exchange is that a contract is a contract; that men who come there of their own will are supposed to understand the game. This position can not commend itself as sound business ethics. Practically, also, it is not true that cotton interests are wholly at liberty to stay out of the exchange. As shown above, certain interests must have a hedging place. Furthermore, financial connections with New York are so close that New York must be the place for many of them. Still further, the New York Cotton Exchange practically owes its existence to the volume of business made possible by the participation of outside interests. Both the duty of a private business man to his customers and the duty of a concern which is to a certain extent a public utility demand fair dealing.

I shall read a New York Cotton Exchange contract. I suppose there are Senators here who have never taken the time to read such a contract, and for the benefit of those who may do me the honor to read this speech in the Record I am going to read this contract and incorporate it in my remarks. It is as follows:

In consideration of \$1 in hand paid, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, blank have this day sold to or bought from blank 50,000 pounds in about 100 bales of cotton, growth of the United States, deliverable from licensed warehouse in the port of New York, between the first and last days of blank month next inclusive. The delivery within such time to be at seller's option in one warehouse upon notice to buyers as provided by the by-laws and rules of the New York Cotton Exchange. The cotton to be of any grade from good ordinary to fair, inclusive, and if tinged, not below low middling tinged, or if stained, not below middling stained. New York Cotton Exchange inspection and classification at the price of blank cents per pound for middling, with additions or deductions for other grades, according to the rates of the New York Cotton Exchange on the day previous to the date of the transferable notice of delivery.

Now, just a word of comment on this contract and a suggestion so that you may keep the connection. If you will observe, the contract is made "basis, middling." The difference between the price of "middling" and the grades below and the grades above "middling" is fixed arbitrarily by the grade committee, and the seller of this contract has the option to deliver any one or some of all of the grades above and below, at his option. I shall discuss that more fully, and, I think, to the satisfaction of the Senate.

It will be seen from this contract that the seller of a contract has the option of delivering, at the expiration of the contract, cotton of any or all of the grades tenderable under the rules of that exchange on the contract. This would give him advantage enough if the price at which he delivered such grades as he did deliver was in accordance with the price as fixed by the law of supply and demand for that grade or those grades. But this he does not do. The price is fixed upon what is known as "basis" contract; that is, middling cotton having a certain whiteness and a certain per cent of foreign matter, such as leaf and dirt, is the middle grade. There are a certain number of grades below this and a certain number above it. A committee of the exchange meets once or twice a year and fixes arbitrarily the difference in price of the grades below and the grades above relative to middling.

For the grades above there is a certain number of points computed in hundredths of cents "on"—that is, above the price of middling; and for the grades below a certain number of points "off"—that is, for the grades below middling. So that one buying a contract buys it "basis, middling." He contracts for 100 bales of cotton—the minimum amount allowed to be sold on any one contract—let us say, at 10 cents a pound. Now, he has not bought a hundred bales of middling, but he has bought a hundred bales of cotton the standard of comparison of which is middling. What grades he is to receive is at the option of the seller. Suppose the fixed difference between middling and good ordinary, the lowest grade now supposed to be tenderable on the New York exchange, is fixed arbitrarily by the grade committee at 1 cent a pound less than middling.

If the party purchasing bids 10 cents basis middling and the fixed difference between it and good ordinary is 1 cent, and good ordinary is tendered to him on the contract, it is tendered to him at 9 cents. Suppose the real difference in the trade at large, according to the law of supply and demand, is 2 cents, therefore, he has lost 1 cent, which is \$5 on a bale, or \$500 on his contract. The next time he buys, realizing that that condition exists, he bids 9 cents for middling without any regard to the intrinsic value of the middling or its scarcity or its abundance, in order that when he comes to receive this lower grade at a fixed price he shall have closed the margin and can save himself from a loss by disposing of it under the law of supply and demand.

What is the result? The result is that middling cotton is fictitiously quoted 1 cent, or perhaps 2 cents, below what it is intrinsically worth, and the rank and file of the producers of

cotton, deceived thereby, are placed at the mercy of the speculator.

In this connection Commissioner Smith says:

FIXED DIFFERENCES UNJUST TO THE BUYER.

The main argument in favor of fixed differences, as above presented, considers only the position of the seller of future contracts. The answer to it is that, in return for any such additional security to the seller, the insecurity of the buyer is correspondingly aggravated. The injustice of thus adding to the disadvantage of the buyer is all the more indefensible, because, by the very nature of a basis contract, his disadvantage is necessarily great. That a basis contract, in connection with fixed differences, throws the risk of fluctuations in grade differences upon the buyer is apparent. Advocates of the fixed-difference system frankly admit this, but contend that it is altogether proper. Their argument is that the buyer of any commodity necessarily takes the risk of fluctuations in its value subsequent to the date of purchase. This argument overlooks the vitally important distinction between a basis contract and a specific contract. It is unquestionably true that in ordinary contracts for specific property, such as a piece of real estate, the buyer who agrees to take such property at a future date at a fixed price has no just reason to complain because, after he enters into such a contract, its value declines. It is his business to take the risk of such subsequent change in value. The argument that he should take the entire risk of change in value under a basis contract, however, by no means follows. The option of the seller, under a basis contract, of tendering such grades as he may desire creates a fundamental distinction between such basis contract and a specific contract. The buyer is absolutely unable to know with any degree of certainty what grades of cotton he will be compelled to take. If, in addition, he is compelled to take such unspecified grades at arbitrary values relative to middling, then the contract really assumes much of a gambling character. A contract of this sort, while extremely advantageous to the seller, becomes for the buyer almost a lottery. The seller not only has the privilege of selecting any grades which he may desire to tender, without notifying the buyer what they are, but also has the obvious inducement to select those grades which it will be of the greatest advantage to himself to deliver and usually of the greatest disadvantage to the buyer to receive.

Again, he says, in reference to this matter of fixing differences as compared with the relative values of the various grades as fixed by the law of supply and demand, the following:

The relative values of the various grades of cotton, and therefore the differences between those grades and middling, vary as the result of natural laws. This fluctuation in the differences is as natural a feature of the cotton market as are fluctuations in the price of middling cotton itself. This being the case, there is no sound reason why an exchange should arrogate to itself the power to "fix" these differences any more than it should assume to regulate or fix the price of middling cotton itself. Any such "fixing" of differences clearly is a defiance of the natural laws of trade. It is doubly objectionable because such fixing of differences is left to a committee of men who may be, and some of whom usually are, heavily interested in the future market, and who thus are subjected to the temptation to fix differences improperly in order that they may reap inordinate gains.

That is what Commissioner Smith says in his report on exchanges. His intimation that self-interest may be at the bottom of this remarkable custom of fixed differences is not the only objection. I shall read what he says in reference to this matter.

This is really the heart of the matter, involving the comfort of millions of people who are not noticed by legislation, who, in spite of the stupendous wealth that they give this country, receive such recognition as we know they have received at the hands of this body. Here is what he says:

Even if this question of self-interest could be eliminated, however, the New York system would be scarcely less objectionable. In the first place, even when the differences established by the committee in the first instance are in accord with commercial differences, they are almost certain to become out of line during the period, whether 2 months or 10 months, before the next revision. Since commercial differences are subject, under the influence of supply and demand, to constant change, there can be no possible certainty that the differences fixed on the third Wednesday of November, on the basis of the commercial differences then existing, will agree with the commercial differences three months or six months later. If they do agree, it is a mere chance. In the second place, if the committee attempts to establish differences, not on the basis of the commercial differences at the time of the revision, but on the basis of an anticipated average of differences for the period covered, its action becomes, by the very nature of things, little more than sheer guesswork. Furthermore, since the New York revision committee is practically unfettered by any restrictions—that is, since there is no established rule or standard to govern its action—the cotton trade is compelled to guess what theory the revision committee will adopt as to its duty; and in case it is believed that the committee will base its action on the probable average commercial differences of the ensuing period rather than on the current differences, the trade must guess what the committee's guess of that average will be. That a great business like the cotton business, affecting, as it does, millions of producers and tens of millions of consumers, should be conducted on the basis of guesswork is preposterous.

This is the statement of the chairman of the committee appointed by this Congress to investigate the conditions that have robbed my section and made it the poorest, while it is producing that out of which the most stupendous fortunes of the world have been made. For 50 years we have been clamoring at the doors of Congress, asking not for protection, but that the hard hand of oppression shall be lifted and the God-given law of supply and demand shall obtain in their favor. Shall we plead in vain? We are dismissed with indifference, and sometimes with worse.

I hope that the technical features of this bill will not cause the Members of the Senate to miss the main point. I will at this time take occasion to explain, so that you may follow me clearly. Cotton naturally divides itself, on account of the nature of the plant, into different commercial grades; that is, the staple. It bears until frost stops it. It is gathered from about the 1st of August, according to the openness of the season, if the crop is unusually abundant, sometimes until March. On account of cotton being open and lying in the field, necessarily, it becomes discolored. The carelessness of picking incorporates into it a certain amount of trash and leaf. The grades that contain the foreign matter and are discolored are the off grades; that is, the grades which are below middling. The grades that are picked without being weather-beaten, having a more or less creamy color, are graded above.

The method of selling cotton is to take middling as a standard of comparison and rate all the grades below, according to color and foreign matter. They are priced off about a quarter of a cent for strict low middling, which is the first grade below middling; another quarter for low middling, a half to 1 cent for ordinary, and a cent or 2 cents for good ordinary, which last grade is the lowest under the present classification. Above, we have strict middling, good middling, strict good middling, and middling fair. That is as high as it goes—nine grades, four above and four below. For the grades above about a quarter of a cent "on" middling for each grade. I am contending that the trade should recognize each grade upon its merits; price it according to the demand for that specific grade, thus giving the grower the benefit of the value of each and every grade he may have to sell. But instead of doing this, the New York Exchange fixes arbitrarily the relative value of all the grades to the basis middling. They overvalue the lower grades, stack their warehouses with these undesirable grades. Then, through this overvaluation of the lower grades, they can force the price down by offering to deliver this junk on contract at a price beyond its value, forcing the purchaser of a contract to accept this undesirable cotton at a loss or to settle on margin; that is, to settle according to the difference between the price of middling when he bought and the price of middling on the day of settlement, which is nothing more nor less than gambling. This is what I am proposing to prevent.

Thus much has been said in reference to the unfair and preposterous rules of the exchange. What effect now has it upon the price of cotton? In the first place, it is universally true of the law of matter, as well as of trade, that it is easier for a thing to fall than it is to rise. It is easier, therefore, everything being equal, for a market to decline than for a market to rise. And whatever artificial and powerful laws are invoked for the depression of prices, the natural tendency is greatly accelerated. If, in buying a contract for the delivery of a given article, and that article is divided into different grades and these different grades are of different values, and the value of these different grades are not fixed by the law of supply and demand as to the different grades, but by an arbitrary law "fixing these differences" and giving to the seller of that contract the right to deliver any grade on that contract which he may deem of the best interest to himself, the natural result will be, as in the case of the cotton market, where the buyer has to buy "basis," that is, one specific grade as a standard of comparison, he (the buyer) will make this "basis" as low as possible so that whatever grade he receives may, by comparison to the basis he purchases on, conform as profitably as possible to the natural law of supply and demand of the grade he receives.

The natural result of this arbitrary fixing of differences and the unusual power given the seller has caused New York practically to cease to be a spot market and become what is known as a "hedging and speculative" market.

The overvaluation of the undesirable grades attracts to this market a class of undesirable cotton which is held in stock for delivery on contracts. In this connection Commissioner Smith, the impartial investigator appointed by Congress to go through this matter and to bring the facts to the attention of Congress, which he has done very exhaustively in six volumes, says:

The privilege enjoyed by the seller of the basis future contract, as previously described, of tendering a variety of grades or any grade, instead of a specific grade, has a tendency to depress the price of middling contracts, as compared with the price of middling cotton in the spot market.

In proof of the fact that this abnormal condition, tending as it does to inevitably depress the price of the future basis contract, also depresses the price of the spot cotton in the hands of the producer, Commissioner Smith says in Volume IV in his report on "Cotton Exchanges":

Whenever the future price is distorted, either by wrong differences or by any other cause, it is obvious that, instead of eliminating risks

from the transactions of the cotton merchant, a new element of risk is injected into them. There is no just reason why the cotton merchant should be forced to bear any such unnecessary risk. The inevitable risks of his business, strictly as a merchant, are great. The mere fact that the merchant is obliged to vary his limits simply because of some abnormal fluctuation in the contract price, due wholly to an arbitrary and improper method of conducting future trading, is in itself objectionable. The great injury inflicted upon cotton merchants by the fixed difference system was discussed in Part I. It is also referred to in succeeding chapters. From the evidence presented in this chapter it is apparent that that system has also worked to the serious disadvantage of the cotton producer.

After investigating fully and impartially the rules of the cotton exchanges in this regard, he reaches this conclusion:

The effect of a difference system upon the business of the New York market alone is not the proper basis for framing the rules of an exchange. The first consideration is that these rules shall be equitable and commercial. If the New York Cotton Exchange can not exist under such rules, then it has no right to exist at all.

This is the indictment that Commissioner Smith brings as the result of his investigation.

Before proceeding further in summing up the personal experience of those who are actually engaged in the production of cotton I want to quote a letter put in evidence before the committee of investigation, which speaks for itself. It was dated Waco, Tex., and is as follows:

WACO, TEX., November 17, 1906.

MR. ATWOOD VIOLETT, New York.

DEAR SIR: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your circular letter of the 14th instant, relative to duty of revision committee, that is to meet within the next few days, to adjust differences on cotton contracts. I fully concur in every statement made by the minority members of that committee, and I unhesitatingly agree with every argument and suggestion made by you on behalf of adjustment of such differences; i. e., on basis of commercial differences existing in spot markets.

From the standpoint of a broker I think I can state without denial that under the existing differences now in effect in the New York exchange no exporter or spinner would under any circumstances accept or hold a contract for delivery in the New York market.

The whole truth of this matter as it appears to me is that instead of the New York exchange making some effort to make the New York market a spot market, and by so doing increase largely its spot business as well as enhancing the value of its membership seats, it is instead a mere dumping ground for all the low-grade trash that the South can not sell or use and the other markets of the world will not have.

Mr. President, I should like to insert the balance of this letter in the RECORD without reading it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

I suppose I would be safe in assuming that out of your certificated stock to-day, say 69,000 bales, not more than one-third of this amount would be tenderable on contract as defined by the New Orleans Exchange. Another important matter, it seems to me, is that the New York Exchange is losing a large amount of its hedge business on this account solely; I know this from our own business, for much of our hedge business is now going to New Orleans where it formerly went to New York. I trust you (or the minority of committee) will be successful in convincing the entire revision committee in adjusting differences on basis of your suggestion. I should be glad to add my vote to accomplish this object if it be needed.

In conclusion I desire to congratulate you on the clear and concise manner in which you have placed the matter before the board of managers.

Very truly, yours,

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I call particular attention to the last part of the letter I have quoted, that the New York market is—

a mere dumping ground for all the low-grade trash that the South can not sell or use and the other markets of the world will not have.

It has been contended for a long time that these low-grade cottons were held in stock by the New York Cotton Exchange for the purpose of delivering on contract; that they were so overvalued as to make it impossible to resell them if accepted on contract, or were of such a character as to be entirely undesirable as a commercial article.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. GRONNA. Will it disturb the Senator if I interrupt him for a question?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No.

Mr. GRONNA. I should like to know how this cotton is standardized or graded when in the hands of the farmer, before it leaves the producer's hands.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. In reply to that question, I will state that one of the means by which the cotton grower has been mercilessly fleeced and robbed is the so-called classification of cotton by the average buyer, through his agent at the local selling points throughout the South.

Mr. GRONNA. Then, would it not be a benefit to the producer if the standardization were fixed, if it were possible to have the cotton standardized?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is one of the things my bill contemplates—that the Department of Agriculture shall make

a careful study of the different grades, classify them according to their intrinsic value, and give those grades to the farmer and to the trade at large, and demand that they shall be the standard, just as 12 inches make a foot or 36 inches a yard.

Mr. GRONNA. I know absolutely nothing about cotton.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. You are in the same fix with reference to your wheat in the West.

Mr. GRONNA. I do know something about grain; and I will state that in the case of grain the price is based upon a certain particular grade. Number one northern is the grade upon which the contract is based.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GRONNA. It seems to me, and in fact I know, that whenever there is a surplus of the lower grades of grain there is a large spread; the grain has been contracted for as number one northern, but of course there is a vast difference between the price of number one northern and the price of the lower grades, and of course the farmer or the producer has to stand the loss. I presume that is true in cotton the same as in wheat.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. To be sure; that is it. And is it not shrewdly suspected that when the buyer demands the specific fulfillment of his contract from the producer he will accept nothing but an absolute number one northern, and then he mixes it with number two and exports it and sells it as number one?

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that that is the complaint that has been made.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not charge it as a fact, but I have heard the same complaint.

A careful investigation of the report by the commissioner shows that even this investigation, so painstaking and so full of facts, does not go into the details of the effect that this system has on the producer. In a few pages some letters are given, some comparison of date and prices, to show that when the future market is depressed that the spot price is likewise in a degree depressed. But it is apparent that the bulk of the investigation relates entirely to what effect it has upon the cotton merchant and the manufacturer.

It is the same story that is repeated in nearly every department of our economic life. Those who are able by their wealth and personal influence to force a hearing and force a modification of law and rules and customs get that hearing. Those who have not individual wealth, individual influence, no matter what service they render the State and society in general, or what the aggregate wealth they produce, are disregarded.

The merchant and miller by their advantageous equipment, both as to time and money, have devised plans through what is known as the hedging process to protect themselves in a measure against the disastrous practices of the exchange.

When a cotton merchant sells a contract to a mill, for instance, for future delivery and intends to deliver the actual cotton at the time specified in the contract, at a price specified in the contract, of grades specified in the contract, he immediately buys a contract on the exchange as a "hedge," or an insurance against loss. By virtue of his study, his opportunities to study the machinations of the speculator, he has been in a measure enabled to protect himself. He "hedges." Let us take the case of a merchant who, for instance, sells to a mill a thousand bales that he does not own at the time of the sale, at a fixed price, to be delivered on a certain day in the future. He immediately buys a contract on the New York Exchange or the New Orleans Exchange as a hedge. It protects him, if things are equal, for the reason that if the price of the raw material goes up before the day of delivery the price of his "futures" have gone up likewise, and what he makes on the contract offsets what he loses on the spot, and he still has the profit in the original contract. On the other hand, if the price of contract cotton goes down and the spots go down, what he loses on his contract he makes up in the less price he has to pay for the spots, so that if the thing moves *pari passu* he is in a bombproof. But what about the 5 and 10 and 15 bale farmer, who produces the bulk of the crop out of which the spindles of America and of Europe get their raw material, and upon which the clothing of the world is dependent? What about him, defenseless and alone? He has to stand the speculation and gambling in this product.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I simply wanted to inquire to which of the bills the Senator is addressing himself?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am addressing myself to my bill, which I propose to offer as a substitute. It is No. 4654.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator proposes to offer it as a substitute for House bill 56?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. For House bill 56; yes.

Mr. President, the small farmer does not understand the hedging process, nor does he understand the machinations of the market. He does not know anything about "longs" and "shorts" and "puts" and "calls." All he knows is industriously to take the chances that God in His wisdom sends him in the seasons, and to make that for which the world is clamoring. He expects his lawmakers, in the exercise of their functions as the guardians of the best interests of the people, to see that no injustice shall be done him in the operation of the law of supply and demand.

I am standing here to-day pleading for him. I would plead for any man, rich or poor, if by circumstances he was being unjustly dealt with. But how much more will I plead for the man who is dependent upon me for a square deal? I wish the Senate could know and realize, as I know and realize, the conditions that exist in my section of the country; how men stand—God help them—hungrily watching, not the operations of the legitimate law of supply and demand, but watching with fevered interest the markings on the board, upon which markings hang the welfare of his home, the education of his children, the putting of carpets on the floors and pictures on the wall, and the possibility of enjoying some of the decencies and comforts of life. Under this miserable system he is forced to be dependent, not on the law of supply and demand, but on the dice in the box of the gambler, who reckons not of his hopes and aspirations, but is simply trying to cast a lucky number to fill his pockets with gains that he has not wrought for, and that wreck the hopes and aspirations of thousands engaged in legitimate business.

I venture this prediction: Were the cotton growers of America sufficiently few in number, of sufficient individual wealth, the rules and customs of the exchanges that are practiced to-day would have been long ago either abolished and denounced as iniquitous, or modified to a point where the grower would get a just and righteous deal.

In view of what the cotton grower of America contributes to the general welfare, in furnishing the raw material out of which the textile industry in this country gets its supply, he is entitled to every consideration and protection that the laws of the States and the National Government may throw about him. He practically produces that upon which the currency, the capital, the circulating medium of nine sovereign States of America are dependent.

My own State, South Carolina, produces an average of about a million bales of cotton a year. At 10 cents a pound, or \$50 a bale, there is an income to that small State of \$50,000,000. Texas, with an average production of 3,000,000 bales, has an income upon that basis of \$150,000,000, the other cotton-growing States receiving like large incomes according to the cotton produced. The total value of the cotton crop is about a billion dollars annually, yet the cotton grower is left to the mercy and caprice and greed of a handful of speculators on the exchanges of this country.

Not only is this true as to the cotton grower providing the circulating medium for the Southern States in which cotton is grown, but I invite the attention of the legislators of this body, grappling with the question of a sufficient income for America, to this point: A study of the Statistical Abstract reveals the fact that our income from all the exports to this country, manufactured, raw, and otherwise, is two billion of dollars.

Raw cotton alone—not counting the manufactures of cotton, not counting the seed, which is now a great commercial product—raw cotton alone brings a fourth of all the exports for the whole continent of America—one-half billion dollars annually. Yet it is to be disregarded. Listen! Two bales out of every three are exported. Every time you raise the price of cotton a cent a pound you add \$5 a bale, and out of an average export of 8,000,000 bales you add \$40,000,000 to American wealth annually in the exchange of American cotton for European gold.

I quoted to you where the manufacturer in Brussels said that, according to the law of supply and demand, cotton in 1910 was worth 20 cents a pound, or \$100 a bale.

Suppose the export cotton were to reach the magnificent price, which is a legitimate price in comparison with other products, of 20 cents a pound—\$100 a bale—it would bring in the vast sum from the exportation of 8,000,000 bales of \$800,000,000. It reached the high watermark in 1911 and 1912 of 10,000,000 bales export. At 20 cents a pound this would mean \$100,000,000 in exchange of our cotton in the form of European gold.

Yet we must sit supinely by and under the operations of a law of protection see steel double in price and hear no complaint, see shoes double in price and hear no complaint, see the pro-

tection articles double in price and hear no complaint, but it is actually a thing to congratulate ourselves upon. It is the home market for home capital invoking the law of man against the law of God to bring it about, erecting an artificial barrier around the coast of America and defying the law of supply and demand for the enrichment of the American manufacturer.

Nature has erected a wall about the cotton growers of America and given them a monopoly of a human necessity. We do not desire to take advantage of this natural monopoly to extract an unjust return from those dependent upon us for it, but we do demand a fair and legitimate price. We do not want your high protection even if it could be given. But we do not want to be robbed. If you legislators throw the strong arm of the law about a few in defiance of the law of supply and demand for their benefit, in the name of the God of justice see that the hand of the robber, the selfish, and the greedy shall not despoil those who are producing the wealth of this country.

As cited elsewhere in my speech, in 1910 the spinners and weavers of the world in convention assembled at Brussels declared that America was the only source of the cotton supply of the world; that the price had reached 15 cents a pound; and that if the crop then growing should be less than 12,000,000 bales cotton would be worth 20 cents a pound. There was no reason why it should not bring 20 cents; no reason in trade, no reason in intrinsic value, no reason in its relation to the price of other commodities, but it didn't bring 20 cents. Why? Not because it was not worth it; not because the purchaser of cotton goods and the manufacturer of cotton goods did not realize that according to the law of supply and demand it justified that price, but because the manipulators of the market did not propose that the margin in which they were to reap their millions should be jeopardized for the benefit of those rightfully entitled to the full price.

What did actually happen? The mill men of this country, and particularly of the South, realizing a prospective short crop and knowing the condition under which cotton was produced, began to prepare themselves for what seemed to be the inevitable. Certain cotton speculators, realizing that the world was short of cotton, went on the New York market and began to buy contracts for the future delivery of cotton at a price which they knew that, if the law of supply and demand could be brought into operation, that if the legitimate laws of trade could be brought into operation, would yield them a splendid and legitimate profit. The sellers, this very class of men who, under the rules of the New York Cotton Exchange, Commissioner Smith has so clearly shown had such an extraordinary advantage, began to sell. To sell at a price which was, at the time of selling, below the legitimate value of the spot cotton, and certainly for the distant months, if the crop should be short, absurdly out of line with what the world recognized would be a fair price. They were depending upon their overvaluation of low grades, their undesirable stock in their possession, to offset any risks that might be involved in selling this market short, and in the hope ultimately of forcing the market down by their old practice of tendering these undesirable grades on their contracts.

According to my understanding, these gentlemen who were buying this cotton sold it in turn to the millers of the country, with the understanding that they were to take up the cotton as the contracts came due and deliver it to these manufacturers. When "notice" day came, according to their custom, there was tendered to these buyers this low-grade cotton. It was taken up, absorbed. The breastwork was torn down. Other months were sold short by the bears. Here they were, with their overvalued, their undesirable stock, their hope and defense gone. And their only chance of filling their outstanding contracts was to go into the open market, buy cotton where they might, and deliver it. This meant, of course, competition with other buyers. This meant a legitimate price. This meant the realization of the right of the producer to realize a fair profit, a fair price. What happened? Realizing that they were unable to fill their contracts, they practically repudiated them and rushed into court, invoking the law against combinations in restraint of trade to indict the men who had taken them at their word and bought from them cotton that they did not have and at a price they could not purchase it at without a loss. The case is still pending. One member of that number indicted has plead guilty to a technical breach of the law. Thank God the southern men who bought that cotton are standing firm and declaring that in good faith they bought, in good faith they demanded delivery, and in good faith will they demand a fair trial.

The parties who sold this cotton sold thousands of bales, depending upon the low grade of the cotton in stock to protect them against the day of delivery. Now, what happens? I state without fear of contradiction that of all the pusillanimous exhibitions of cowardice, of greed, was exhibited by these men on

the New York market in 1910. What happened? When the time for the first delivery of the cotton came, these sellers tendered to the buyers the low-grade over-valued cotton they had in stock. The buyers in the meantime had made arrangements to accept this low-grade cotton and dispose of it where it would not get back in the hands of those trying to depress the market. This practically exhausted the stock of low-grade cotton by means of which the sellers had hoped to save themselves.

There were still other contracts outstanding to be filled. With their stocks gone, their defense gone, what were they to do? To go into the markets of the South to buy cotton to fill these contracts meant competition with other buyers. That meant a loss, perhaps ruin. That meant, perhaps, 20-cent cotton. That meant that the producer, by the law of competition and supply and demand would get the real value of his cotton. What did these bears do? In place of buying cotton and filling their contracts like men they rushed into court and indicted the men to whom they had sold this cotton.

One of those men indicted has plead guilty to a technical offense. The others, speculators though they may be, have the right blood in them, and reject any compromise. They declare they bought the cotton in good faith, sold it to the mills in good faith, and demand that those who sold it to them shall deliver the cotton, and that they will stand in the court and plead their right to do this.

I introduced a resolution in the Senate at the time these men were indicted, calling upon the Attorney General to inquire as to who sold the cotton, how much actual cotton they had at the time of the sale, what was the price at which they sold, as compared with the price of cotton in the South upon the date of sale. The Attorney General's reply was tantamount to telling the Senate that he knew his business and that the Senate did not, and that he was not going to make an investigation; but we are going to make one.

We are reckoning with a force to-day that the law of heredity and habit and the consequent inertia make us slow to realize. We are living in an age unparalleled by any other age; not that human nature has changed, and I am glad that it has not, but the means of expressing the desires and hopes and ambitions of each heart are more perfect than ever. The facilities for transportation and communication and education are so perfect that the man in the woods who has been the victim of the shrewd and the heartless has become as cosmopolitan as the man who walks the streets of the city. With better training at honest work, with a virtuous mother and honest father, he has had ground into his bones the intrinsic principles of honesty and integrity. Justice must be done him. He demands no more; he will accept no less; and the Government has yet to reckon with that class of our people who established it.

The bill that I propose, reduced to its simple terms, means that a buyer and seller shall have the same chance; that what a seller proposes to sell shall be specifically and definitely named, both as to quality and price, and that he shall deliver that, and shall deliver it at the price agreed upon and of the grade agreed upon; that the setting aside of fair competition shall cease, and that so far as interstate commerce is concerned, and in so far as Congress can regulate that commerce, the law of supply and demand shall obtain.

It is an easy matter, it seems, to dismiss this question and leave the farmer to take care of himself. It seems to be the sentiment of some that he is doing very well; that he ought to be satisfied with what he has and thank God that it is no worse. One reason that this sentiment is prevalent is because the farmer has not yet realized that one reason that he is in the condition that he is, is because the legislators of this country have been really indifferent to his welfare.

It is an easy matter for a man in easy circumstances to take an optimistic view of things in general and of the individual or people who are in a bad fix particularly; but we are going to have this legislation.

Mr. President, in conclusion I desire to say that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] the other day stated a thing that struck me as being very forceful. He said that the poet by virtue of his genius and his intuition saw deeper into the heart of things than another, and in verse he was very often able to express it more clearly and tersely and powerfully than another. Since the Senator made this remark I came across this verse, and it was so appropriate that I shall quote it. We sit here in better circumstances and do not hear the cry of poverty nor feel the humility of its attendant evils. We are optimistic, and we are forgetful of our more unfortunate fellows. These are the lines that illustrate that:

The toad beneath the harrow knows
Exactly where each tooth point goes—
The butterfly upon the road
Preaches contentment to that toad.

Mr. President, I said I would ask to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary having in charge the bill that passed the House. The motion having under the parliamentary rule laid over, I now move, without any prejudice to the committee, for I know they have been hard worked and this was a subject by the very nature of which they could not give it proper attention, and it is not in prejudice to them—I now move the discharge of the committee and the bringing of the bill to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina makes a motion, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from South Carolina moves to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 56) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not know that personally I have any objection to the Senate taking this bill from the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not, however, believe that that is a good practice, especially at this time of the session of Congress and without some sort of a showing that the committee has deliberately failed in duty or that there is an effort to suppress the legislation which is incorporated in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Wyoming allow an interruption? I understand the nature of the case thoroughly, and I desire that the statement shall go into the RECORD that I do not charge or attach any blame whatever to the Judiciary Committee for its failure to report the bill. I have simply tried this morning to show from just what we were suffering, and if I could get the bill before the Senate I would simply offer mine as a substitute and let it take its chances upon its merits.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. As I was saying, Mr. President, I myself do not feel that the Senate ought at this time to bring the bill before the Senate without the consideration of the committee. The bill is fully as important as the Senator from South Carolina in his very eloquent address has indicated, and to my mind much more important, because it involves constitutional questions which we may laugh at in public addresses, but which we must consider carefully when we come to consider legislation of this character.

The bill came before the Judiciary Committee in July of last year. We all know that there was no time for the committee or the Senate to consider the bill during the balance of the special session. It has been before the Judiciary Committee during the present session. It perhaps should have been acted upon, but other matters consumed the attention of the committee, and other matters of very grave importance.

I know of no session of the Senate since I have been a member of that committee, which has been for a good many years, when the committee has considered so many questions of far-reaching public importance as the committee has considered, or has attempted to consider, this year. Certainly, in my judgment, bringing this bill before the Senate at this time would have no effect. Even the most ardent advocates of the bill could not hope to secure its passage without considerable debate upon the floor of the Senate. That debate, of course, can not be had now. It is simply bringing the bill from the committee.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. May I ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The time is limited, it is true, but the bill that I proposed to substitute is very marked. My object was to get this bill before the Senate and substitute mine. I did not state and I hesitate now to state that this bill would have been called up earlier if it had not been for certain conditions that affected me personally in my home and made it impossible for me to be here; hence this delay.

I have not taken up very much of the time of the Senate. I have been content to watch the proceedings and to vote. But this touches my section of the country so vitally that I am a little disposed not to have it sidetracked without a hearing. I do not want to make any threats about having my rights asserted, because I recognize that it is late in the session. All I ask is just a vote as to whether the Senate will discharge the committee from the further consideration of the bill; that is all.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Of course, the Senator does not insinuate that any measure has been sidetracked; and, of course,

the Senator would make no threat as to what would be done. But I was simply stating a fact which the Senator knows as well as I, that the passage of this particular bill through the Senate at the present session of Congress is absolutely impossible, and that not because of opposition to the bill, but because of the absolute necessity of a thorough investigation as to its terms and a thorough knowledge as to its effect. It is one of those bills which are sweeping in their importance. The Senator himself, in his speech this morning, recognizes that fact when he says it may mean millions of dollars annually to the people of his section—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. And to the United States.

Mr. CLARKE of Wyoming. And to the United States. I have no doubt of it. The Senator can readily recognize the fact that a bill of that importance could not be disposed of in this Chamber without discussion, and discussion simply means that it can not be acted upon.

As I said, personally I sympathize with the Senator from South Carolina in his desire to have action upon this bill; personally I have no pride in having it retained in the Committee on the Judiciary, but I do think that a motion of this kind prevailing at this time of the session would establish an unwise and an unfair precedent.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I insist on the motion.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I hope the motion to discharge the Judiciary Committee from the further consideration of this bill will be adopted, if for no other purpose than as a formal expression of opinion on the part of the Senate that the bill was sent to the wrong committee in the first instance. It does not involve a constitutional question at all. Every disputed feature about it, so far as its legality is concerned, has been settled so completely that that usually troublesome aspect has become obsolete. It is in the present state of developed law simply a question of policy as to whether or not the Congress of the United States shall deny to persons engaged in this nefarious business the facilities of interstate commerce to aid them in carrying on the business. It is a practical question, an economic question, and one that could be more properly disposed of by any one of two or three committees of the Senate than by the Judiciary Committee. When it was sent to the Judiciary Committee, I believe it was inadvertently done. Some of the friends of the measure failed to observe the fact that it had been done until it was too late to do anything effective about it. I admit that at this time it is perhaps rather late to make the motion that has been made; but it should be made, that notice may be given to those who are interested in the enactment of such beneficent legislation as well as to those who are interested in opposing the adoption of this remedy that the people who are behind the demand for this relief are in earnest, because they believe that they are the victims of a most grievous commercial outrage, to the consummation of which the Government of the United States is lending its functions.

I am not so certain about substituting the bill of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] for the bill that is now pending, and for several reasons. In the first place, the bill that is pending is a House bill; it goes upon the principle that that business is nefarious and should be suppressed. The bill introduced by the Senator from South Carolina fundamentally departs from that central idea, and proposes a modification of existing practices to the extent of permitting the delivery of any one of three grades of cotton upon one of these future gambling contracts. So far as I am concerned, I see no reason why that should be done. It is capable of very great abuse, for the reason that in more than 99 per cent of the transactions on the organized cotton exchanges there are no deliveries at all, and it is not outside of the range of human probability that the same ingenuity that built up that great system of spoliation, that has robbed one of the great industries of the South of untold millions, could find some way by which the whole purpose of this remedial legislation could be rendered inoperative. I prefer to say that the seller shall describe exactly what he is going to sell and the purchaser understand definitely what he is going to buy. I have no objection to future sales and deliveries upon that basis, but the more leeway you give them the wider door you leave open for abuses.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that the only reason why I submitted to any modification was because those who were as much interested as I was argued that we had better get a modified form as a beginning. I myself would vote for the passage of the House bill.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am sure the Senator from South Carolina is entirely sincere in his attitude on this question, and I did not intend to imply in the slightest degree that he was

not; but I believe he has conceded more than the fair justice of the case requires.

Then, the House bill has been worked out in that body very thoroughly; a similar bill has been passed by the House several times; it has undergone the scrutiny of debate and investigation in that body. Whilst it is not probably perfect, as no proposition of legislation generally is perfect, it does deal drastically and effectively with the question, and if it were put upon our calendar now I feel satisfied that the justice of its provisions would justify the Senate in passing the House bill and at once giving us effective legislation upon that subject, whereas I fear that if we should substitute the bill offered by the Senator from South Carolina, we might find ourselves in the condition in which the friends of such legislation found themselves 25 years ago, when, while each House had recorded its opposition to the business generally, it had done so in a different way, and there was that failure of unity of action that is necessary to make a law.

I therefore think that the motion to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the bill ought to be adopted, first, because the bill ought never to have gone to the Judiciary Committee. The crowded condition of business before that committee and the technical character of that business require so much discussion there that there was no time to consider the bill, it being true that the committee possesses no special equipment to consider it well. So, I think, that as a mere matter of selection the Judiciary Committee ought to be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Then again, the bill pending there is a House bill, and when it gets on this calendar a single vote of the Senate will put it well on its way to the statute book.

Mr. LODGE. Did I understand the Senator from Arkansas to say that the bill is a House bill and is on the calendar?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The House bill is not on the calendar, but it is before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senate bill on the calendar?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to ask the Senator how long has the House bill been before the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Since last July, I am advised by the chairman of the committee; or, at least, I thought I understood him to make that statement. It has been in the hands of that committee what has usually been considered a sufficient time to have been discussed and reported—I would not say that has been improperly done, because I myself know how crowded is the business of that great committee—but I see no reason for the bill having gone there at all. There was no reason why it should have gone there. The legal propositions involved in it are pretty well settled from a constitutional standpoint.

It is merely a question of policy as to whether such legislation shall find its way to the national statute book. I think it ought to do so. I think now that the Senate ought to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of this bill, and by thus placing it on the calendar give us an opportunity to consider and dispose of it at an early day. Even if we could not dispose of it; even if the pressure of business having priority here be so great that the measure can not receive consideration, and from entirely legitimate causes, and not because of obstructive delays, then we will at least demonstrate the fact that the Senate are willing to take notice of the great evil under which one of the principal industries of this country rests, and are willing to do something to relieve that condition as effectively and promptly as an orderly disposition of the business pending will permit.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask that it may be read, a letter which I have received in regard to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection the letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE,
New York, February 24, 1913.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senator from Massachusetts, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I confirm telegram sent you to-day, as follows:

"Reports from Washington state Senator SMITH will ask Senate to-morrow to take Beall House Calendar bill 199 from Senate Judiciary Committee and discharge committee from hearing said bill, and bring it direct before the Senate to a vote. As president of the New York Cotton Exchange representing a membership residing in each cotton-producing State, as well as this and the New England States, I protest. This is too important to be treated so flippantly, as the economical distribution of the cotton crop will be greatly interfered with, and I respectfully request that you use your best efforts to see that this measure is not rushed through. The right of a hearing is a privilege of which American citizens, in fairness, should not be deprived, especially as we were promised by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that we would be given a hearing on this bill."

I would welcome a discussion of the merits of this bill before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and when this bill was referred by the Senate to its Judiciary Committee I immediately communicated with its chairman and was advised that I would be notified when hearings were held.

I wish to state that through the cotton exchanges, that trade in contracts for the future delivery of cotton, the cotton crop of the United States is distributed from the farmer to the cotton spinner at the smallest expense of any agricultural crop raised in this country, and without the facilities provided by such exchanges the expense of distribution would be greatly increased.

Apologizing for the length of this communication, but assuring you that the importance of the matter is much greater than is conveyed in this letter, I remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

GEO. W. NEVILLS,
President.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not examined this bill with any care, but the statement of the president of the New York Cotton Exchange is that, as soon as the bill was introduced, they asked for a hearing before the committee and were informed that they would be heard when the committee took up the bill. I suppose the reason they have had no hearing is that the committee has not had an opportunity to take up the bill and give it consideration. It seems to me, Mr. President, that it is only fair that those who are opposed to the bill should at least have an opportunity to present their argument, no matter how meritorious the bill may be, and I think the motion to discharge the committee, in view of the fact that they have not had an opportunity to consider this bill, which is a very important measure, is rather premature.

The Committee on the Judiciary, as we are all aware, is loaded with work, loaded with bills of the utmost importance. I am certain that they have endeavored to do everything they could to dispose of the many matters before them, but it seems to me that it is hardly fair to those who are opposed to the bill, and who certainly have the right to be heard, that they should be cut off without any opportunity, at least, to present their arguments.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will not state that the members of the New York Cotton Exchange have had an opportunity to be heard on this particular bill, but the New York Cotton Exchange has been heard on a bill similar to the House bill that is pending before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

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

Mr. GRONNA. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from North Dakota that the hearings before the House committee on the bill which passed the House were more exhaustive than the hearings had before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate. They covered a longer period, and ample opportunity was given all the interests involved to be heard. The hearings were printed, and upon them the Committee on Agriculture made its report. The bill went to the House, it was discussed, and it passed that body last July, if I am correct. Through a misapprehension or an oversight on my part when the bill was transmitted to the Senate it was not referred to the proper committee. It originated in the House and was referred to the Committee on Agriculture in that body, and should have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate.

There has been no attempt, and there is no disposition on my part or on the part of those who are in favor of this legislation, to criticize the Judiciary Committee at all. It is a matter somewhat technical in its nature, but those who dealt with it in the other House exhausted it completely, so far as the hearings were concerned. Those hearings have been available for all those who are interested in the subject, but the bill has quietly lain in the committee, and, as I have said, on account of my inability to be here from January on it has been postponed until this time. It is of such importance that I hope, without prejudice or without casting any reflection or any Senator thinking that a reflection is being cast upon the Judiciary Committee, that the committee may be discharged, and, as the Senator from Arkansas has said, let this matter come before the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. My recollection is that the gentleman who has sent the letter which has been read at the desk appeared before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate. Am I right in that?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator will allow me, he certainly did appear. He was heard for quite a length of time, and had all the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture that he desired in the discussion of this subject.

Mr. GRONNA. I thought I recognized the name.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. He brought others with him, and we gave them all the time they wished in which to present their views before the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate, and their views were all reported and have been printed.

Mr. PERCY addressed the Senate. After having spoken for 15 minutes,

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PERCY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to say at this point what I should have said before, that under the rules I shall ask before the morning hour is closed, if I have the opportunity, that the motion to discharge the committee shall lie over.

Mr. PERCY. Do I understand the Senator to make a motion?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I shall make the point that under the rules I shall object to the motion being acted upon to-day, and it will of necessity lie over.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, on the day before yesterday, the calendar day, I gave notice that I would, on the day following, make a motion; or, as I understood it, I made the motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the bill, and gave notice that I would make some remarks on it. I knew that the rule required that I should make a motion the day previous, and that under the rule it would lie over. I made the motion, but I see that it was printed—I noticed it immediately when I saw the calendar—that I gave notice that I would make a motion. What I really did was to move that the committee be discharged, and I then gave notice that I would speak on the matter. That was the way I intended to do it; but I suppose I may have inadvertently said that I gave notice that I would make the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The RECORD discloses the fact that the Senator from South Carolina gave notice of a motion which he has made to-day. The point made by the Senator from Wyoming, if insisted upon, will necessarily postpone the matter until to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. If that be the fact, then this will come in its order to-morrow?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will, under the rule, have the privilege of making the motion if he gets an opportunity to make it to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have already made the motion, and it has been discussed; it has been entertained by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can call up his motion to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is a different proposition.

Mr. PERCY. I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming for the purpose of submitting that motion to the Chair if he wishes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What the Chair meant to say was that the Senator would have to find his opportunity to call up the motion to-morrow. The Chair, of course, will not in advance determine what may be before the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I do not wish the Senator to understand that a motion of that kind will give him the floor to-morrow. Notices have been given here of appropriation bills that certainly must have the right of way if we are to proceed as we have always done, and as we must do to conclude our business. I do not think we should permit the idea to prevail that a notice of any other kind can take precedence over the privileged business of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will allow me an interruption, there is a difference between giving a notice and making a motion to consider, which under the rule must go over until the next day. I am contending that the motion has already been made, and that it is now before the Senate, and that therefore no subsequent motion is necessary to consider it. The motion has been entertained, and we are now considering it. Of course, if the Chair rules, under the motion made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], that at 12 o'clock this matter will have to be laid aside, I will not have to make a motion to-morrow to consider it; but under the ruling of the Chair, if I get an opportunity, I can move to take up the matter.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in this connection, if I may be permitted, I desire to say that the appropriation bills are now entirely up to the kindly disposition of the Members of the Senate. It is entirely within the power of any Senator or number of Senators to occupy the floor, so that all appropriation bills must go over. On the other hand, in my judgment, there is plenty of time, if we will be economical with it, to dispose of the business. But in order to do that I beg Senators to understand that we must first get the appropriation bills into the hands of conferees, where the real struggle occurs, and where time is necessarily consumed.

Unless we do that, of course it is useless for me or other members of the Appropriations Committee to struggle any longer

with appropriation bills; we will simply have to lay them aside. The Senate must, in its good nature and judgment, allow the appropriation bills to have almost exclusive consideration for a couple of days or more, until we can get them moved along.

We have still on hand—on the calendar and in committee—some of the largest supply bills for the support of the Union, carrying not only funds for the next fiscal year but also funds for the work between now and July 1. There are branches of the Government where employees are now waiting because there is no money now available to pay them. They will have to be paid for this time, without doing work, perhaps, in some cases. We must get these bills along, or else we shall fail to provide for the Government, and shall have to commence all over again with the appropriation bills at the next session.

Mr. PERCY. I believe I have the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. PERCY. I desire to say that if this motion is laid on the table now, when it is taken up I shall complete my remarks on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the objection made by the Senator from Wyoming the motion will go over until tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. For the sole purpose of disposing of a small treaty, unanimously reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, which ought to be disposed of, and which will take but five minutes, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

ORDER FOR RECESS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, in view of the state of the public business, I ask unanimous consent that at 6 o'clock the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and then continue its session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that at the hour of 6 o'clock the Senate shall stand in recess until 8 o'clock this evening. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Mr. GRONNA obtained the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from North Dakota permit the Chair to interrupt him for the purpose of making a brief statement?

Mr. GRONNA. I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators doubtless have read the RECORD and know the status of the bill the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has in charge. In an effort last evening to properly interpret the rules and preserve the dignity of the Senate during the progress of a so-called filibuster the Chair was somewhat uncertain as to the status of House bill 22913 upon adjournment, and suggested to the clerks that it be not placed upon the calendar as unfinished business, the Chair desiring to think over the matter a little further. The Chair is of the opinion that the bill did become the unfinished business, and now asks that it be laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 22913) to create a Department of Labor.

Mr. GRONNA. I was about to ask unanimous consent that the bill be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, when the Senate took an adjournment yesterday I was about to discuss some of the phases of the bill introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], but in view of the statement which has been made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. WARREN], and in view of the fact that I know much important business is pending before the Senate that must be taken up immediately if those bills are to become law, I shall not delay the Senate more than a very few moments.

I want to emphasize what I stated yesterday, that I am not opposed to the creation of the Department of Labor. My opposition is simply directed to some of the phases of this measure. I do not believe that the Bureau of Immigration should be changed, and if changed at all it should go to the Department of State. I believe that I can state without any successful contradiction that ever since I came to Congress every vote I have recorded has been in the interest of the wage earner and friendly rather than unfriendly to labor. I wish to say further

that my action in the future will demonstrate the fact that I want to see labor treated not only fairly but put upon a higher plane if possible than it is to-day.

With these few remarks I shall close. I hope that this bill when it becomes a law will be what the friends of the measure hope and expect it to be.

There is another thing I wish to state before I take my seat, and that is that no one has advanced any good reason why this bill should be passed in this particular form. I was anxious on yesterday to have some friend of the measure discuss the different provisions of the bill. I do not criticize anyone for not doing so at all. I have the utmost confidence in the judgment of the Senator who has the bill in charge, and I think I may be permitted to state that he knows in this matter I am acting in good faith in addressing myself to and opposing one particular phase of the bill.

As I stated, I do not wish to delay the passage of the bill for a single moment, nor do I expect when it comes up to vote against it.

Mr. SHIVELY obtained the floor.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator from Indiana yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. SHIVELY. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator begins his remarks, as I understand he is going to address himself to the pending bill, I wish to ask the Senate to consider a brief amendment. In lines 5 and 6, on page 1, I move to strike out the words "and a member of the Cabinet."

Mr. SHIVELY. Is the Senator just laying that amendment before the Senate for action later in the day, or does he desire a vote now?

Mr. BORAH. I wish to present it and ask for a vote. I do not think there will be any objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "and a member of the Cabinet."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move an amendment to the pending bill. On page 3, line 14, after the word "Labor," I move to insert the words "children's bureau."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 14, after the word "Labor," it is proposed to insert the words "children's bureau."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BORAH. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President, the amendment just adopted detracts in no way from the efficiency of the pending measure. What is commonly known as the President's Cabinet is neither a creation of the Federal Constitution nor of congressional enactment. In the written law there is no corporate entity, no body politic, no collective agency known as the President's Cabinet. The Constitution having vested the executive power in the President, the Congress, as from time to time seemed necessary and proper, created certain executive departments as instrumentalities in the administration of such power. In each organic act the Congress provides for an official head of the department, designates his official title, and prescribes the jurisdiction and duties of the new organization. By reason of his title as head of the department, the official may fall within the category of Cabinet officer, but the category itself is purely a creature of custom and not of constitutional ordainment or statutory origin. This fact in no sense detracts from the value of the system. It rather augments it. Under the custom there is opportunity to the heads of the several departments for the widest mutual and collective counsel and cooperation among themselves and with the President, while under the law each separately is responsible for the conduct of his own department. The effect is to combine the salutary influence of voluntary and unrestrained common counsel with individual official responsibility.

It becomes noticeable, therefore, Mr. President, that the use of the words "and a member of the Cabinet," in the first section of the pending bill, was a departure from the language employed in the creation of any of the present executive departments. By their own force the preceding words of the section designating the head of the proposed department as the "Secretary of Labor" place that official in the class which the language of custom designates as a member of the Cabinet. It

might be inferred that these words were used in fear or in doubt lest without them the new department might not rank in parity of dignity with the other great executive departments, but I draw no such inference. The relations of the official head of the new department to the President and to the public, and his powers and duties in all respects, would be precisely the same with or without this designation to membership in a body having no existence in positive law. The additional title would have added no function to his relations to any other department of the Government, and the absence of it subtracts nothing from his individual responsibility for the conduct of his own.

The organization having charge of our foreign relations was created as the Department of Foreign Affairs by act of July 27, 1789, and changed in name to that of the Department of State by act of September 15, the same year. The Department of War was created by act of August 7, 1789, and the Department of the Treasury by act of September 2, the same year. The Department of Justice was created by act of September 24, 1789. The office of Postmaster General was created by act of September 22, 1789, and the general Post Office was established at the seat of government by act of May 8, 1794, and raised to the dignity of what is now the Post Office Department by act of June 8, 1872. The Department of the Navy was created by act of April 30, 1798, and the "Home Department" by act of March 3, 1849, which designation was subsequently changed to the Department of the Interior. The Department of Agriculture was established by act of May 15, 1862, with a chief entitled Commissioner of Agriculture, which designation was changed to Secretary of Agriculture by act of February 9, 1889. The Bureau of Labor was created by act of June 27, 1884, the head of which was entitled Commissioner of Labor, which bureau was, by act of June 13, 1888, made the Department of Labor, and which department was, by act of February 14, 1903, incorporated in a new and enlarged executive organization entitled the Department of Commerce and Labor, whose head is entitled the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

Of the first seven of these executive departments, each is charged with the execution of some specific power or powers, whether pertaining to foreign relations, Federal taxation and finance, the national defense, the national justice, the custody, transmission, and delivery of the mails, promotion of the "progress of science and useful arts" by copyrights and patents, the administration of the public domain, or any other subject matter confided by the Federal Constitution to the control of the executive power of the Federal Government. Each of these departments has functions distinctly public, governmental, and Federal in character. The creation of an executive department whose function related to agriculture was the first marked exertion of Federal power on the field of enterprise private in its employments and purposes, and public only in the sense that the industry sought to be fostered is so primary to the daily life of society that its vicissitudes are always of anxious and universal public concern. The functions assigned to the Department of Commerce and Labor relate to a wide variety of subject matter, some of which is directly within the purview of Federal power and other of which is only remotely incidental to it.

In creating the Department of Labor the pending bill declares the function of such department to be "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States; to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." To not be futile, this language, of course, must be found not to involve derogation from that vast department of power expressly reserved by the Federal Constitution against the Federal Government to "the States, respectively, or to the people." But it is rather to the policy of the bill that I address myself, and in doing so direct a glance at the historic attitude of government toward and in relation to the class of workers denominated by the bill as "wage earners."

When Aristotle set himself to the task of writing his book on "Politics," he had before him 158 political constitutions. Each of these constitutions was an organism through which power had circulated in a scheme of government. After all of his research and reflection, Aristotle concluded that stable and efficient government is founded on two classes. The first he denominates the Leisure class, born to the arts and graces of life, the honors and emoluments of government, and control of the movements of society. The other he denominates the Servile class, born to do the work of society and bear the burdens of government and, in the discretion of the superior class, to fight the battles of the country. The great philosopher honestly believed that stability and efficiency in government require that the inequalities among men in a state of nature must be reflected in the form and structure of government, and conceived

that the division of society into these two classes was a sufficient approximation to the principle.

However disguised, this class principle was dominant in the composition of the governments of the earth from the earliest dawn of recorded history down to the eighteenth century of the Christian era, and is still dominant in a large portion of the statecraft of the world. There are here and there instances of slaves rising to the dignity of poets, orators, and statesmen, but this was in spite of a principle that left the toiler without a place in history. The ancient historian tells us of the rise and fall of dynasties, the birth, reign, and death of kings, the victories and defeats of great captains, but naught of those whose labor supported the dynasties, embellished the thrones, and fed the armies.

What know we of those whose labor built the Pyramids by the Nile? Who has told the story of the toiler on the Hanging Gardens of Babylon? What manner of men built the old Coliseum by the Tiber? The traveler stands in dumb amazement before the splendid ruins of the Acropolis, near Athens, but who tells him the story of the sweat and blood and tears wrought into the masonry of its walls? The well-nigh universal silence of history on the struggles of the great multitude of the world's workers is the most pathetic fact in that history, and defines with a precision sharper than words the low status assigned to labor in the society of those times.

The gentle Galilean in His youth and early manhood, at His work as a carpenter, and St. Paul, amid his busy ministrations as evangelist of the new faith, and at his craft as a tentmaker, earned their daily bread and placed their stamp of nobility on useful toil. In after centuries, when the civilization of the West faded into the gloom of the Dark Ages, there were institutions here and there consecrated by pious spirits to noble ends wherein the toiler found a welcome and adequate requital of his service. But rarely did this stamp of nobility or these institutions move the pulse or have the patronage of government.

From the thirteenth to the eighteenth century the fortunes of the wage earner in Europe varied, but seldom rose above the level of hopeless degradation. Thousands of years before, the humanity of Moses had commanded "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treads the corn." In central Europe it was customary to so fasten a board about the neck of the treadmill worker as to prevent him carrying meal to his mouth with his hand. The whole tide of legislation and local regulation was toward longer hours and the lower wage. Governments prescribed a maximum wage and harsh prosecution and punishment for the humane employer who should pay more than the wage prescribed. There was no minimum wage. Even in the reign of Elizabeth, Parliament enacted that the master who paid the highest wage should be subjected to 10 days' imprisonment and the apprentice who received the highest wage should suffer 21 days' imprisonment. I mention this as illustrating the trend of labor legislation in those days and the attitude of government toward the wage earner, which was almost uniformly repressive, oppressive, and heartless.

The struggle was accentuated and embittered from a most unexpected source. The first invention of labor-saving devices was hailed by the philosophers and poets as the evangel of emancipation of labor from excessive length of the workday and assurance of increase in time for rest, recreation, and family companionship. But as capital in the idle machine was dead capital, invention set the current of industrial forces toward longer rather than shorter hours. The struggle against this tendency raged fiercely in Europe through five centuries, during which the forces of government were arrayed with singular unanimity against the wage earner.

The more general diffusion of knowledge, the wider assertion and discussion of the natural rights of man, and the consequent increase in the popular spirit in government in the later years of the eighteenth century arrested the adverse tide and gave to labor at least a hearing for its cause. The American Declaration of Independence was an unqualified challenge to the whole political doctrine and philosophy of Aristotle. That some of those who subscribed to that instrument were not entirely free from the spirit of caste we can easily believe. Yet it was issued at a time when then existing institutions and dogmas were under the white heat of a remorseless intellectual and moral inquisition, and many cherished idols of power were being cast down and melted away in the flame of a revolution that signalized a new conception of the true form and functions of government. It is easily conceivable that in the fervor and enthusiasm of that revolution the sponsors of the great declaration regarded the humblest toiler in the Colonies as of more value to society than the whole tribe of titled parasites bred at princely courts of kingly power.

The Americans of that generation were profounder students of the history and philosophy of government than any generation that preceded or succeeded them. They knew that the democracies and republics of antiquity had been compromised with the class principle and that they descended into inglorious graves under a system that spelled luxurious splendor and decadence, on the one hand, and hopeless squalor and misery on the other. The Declaration of Independence was a labor document as well as a political document. Under its pledges was baptized into the family of nations a republic of republics, within which sovereignty reposes in the people, to be exercised through their chosen agencies, and no artificial order or class is permitted as an institution or instrument of government. By the new system the toilers in increasing number became separate and independent units of political power, partakers in government, clothed with the duties of citizenship and obligations to the faithful performance of them. The natural effect was to lift labor out of the category of mere ticketed merchandise in the market, recognize it as of living flesh and blood, of mind and conscience, inseparable from and bound up with the highest interests of home, family, society, and the state. The process involved less the creation of conventional rights than a recognition of the inherent right to pursue happiness, for security to which all just government is ordained.

In this spirit the Federal Government has enacted and enforced measures prohibiting the importation of alien labor under contract, regulating the working hours of laborers and mechanics in Federal employment and in certain cases of private production for Federal use, regulating the conditions of employment of seamen in the merchant marine, modifying or withdrawing in whole or in part the common-law defenses of assumption of risk, fellow-servant liability, and contributory negligence in suits for personal injury suffered in certain employments, and other measures protective of rights falling within its jurisdiction. In the same spirit the several States in varying degree have enacted laws by which the power of the State is exerted to fix maximum hours of the workday in certain occupations; to secure the laborer from the exactions of "pluck-me stores" by requiring that his wages be paid in the current money of the country; to give him a lien for his wages on the product of his toil; to require safeguards to his life, limb, and health on railways, in store and factory and mine, and by various other measures to preserve the fair course in the race of life essential to his status as a citizen and his rights as a man.

Primitive and pioneer industry, with its household and modest shop production and its rude forms of transportation and distribution, was one thing. Modern industry, with its colossal plant and systems of transportation and distribution continental in their operations, is quite another. In the one the laborer operated singly or as one of a small group; his task was simple and his environment safe. In the other he finds himself operating as one of thousands in a huge establishment filled with machinery propelled by steam or electricity, and amid the dangers that attend crowded conditions and the use of high forms of mechanical power. In changes so revolutionary, displacement and readjustment attended the transition, and naturally new rules of law became necessary, not as creative of new rights, but as preservative of old ones.

There are, however, Mr. President, features of jar and maladjustment attending the swift development of industry in this generation that are not so readily susceptible of correction by inflexible rules of law, and the nature of which suggests some agency of mediation and conciliation. The vast physical change in the magnitude and methods of modern industrial enterprise is scarcely more marked than the moral dislocation in certain lines of relations between capital and labor that came with and as incidental to it. This is illustrated in the case of the enterprise controlled by directors sitting a thousand miles from the operations of its wage employees, to whom directors and stockholders are alike total strangers. In the change, the close personal and mutually sympathetic relation of employer and employee born in the course of common toil in the modest shop was broken, to be succeeded by an impersonal, isolated, and purely pecuniary interest. In the cold struggle between dividends and wages the antithesis of viewpoints becomes so sharp that too often when disputes arise as to wages or other conditions of employment no common starting point is available from which to approach disentanglement of the controversy, and the contest sinks into prolonged, wasteful, and embittered strife.

In the external affairs of nations it frequently happens that when controversy arises between two governments the diplomatic department of each advances extravagant claims as a basis of give-and-take in the final adjustment, and which neither may regard as fundamental to national honor or worth the waste of war. But the people of the respective countries may accept

the claims of their respective diplomats so seriously that the heat and passion engendered in the course of subsequent negotiation reach a stage where the foreign office of neither government can recede without stormy domestic commotion and loss of national prestige. In this situation both governments welcome the intervention of a friendly and impartial third party as a means of relaxing the tension and composing the substantial rights of both countries without wounding the sensibilities of either.

When labor and capital employed in the great producing and distributing enterprises of the country get into controversy and the conflict of cross-purposes drifts into that heat, acrimony, and deadlock that have on too many occasions put society on the edge of peril, the pending bill offers a means of relaxing the strain and composing the strife, in the provision of section 8, "That the Secretary of Labor shall have power to act as mediator and to appoint commissioners of conciliation in labor disputes whenever, in his judgment, the interests of industrial peace require it to be done." The bill contemplates no legal coercion. It authorizes no compulsion, save that which friendly and impartial official opinion and counsel formed and given in the light of the facts in each case may carry to the parties to the controversy.

If enacted into law, the value of this provision will depend in a peculiar degree on the care and judgment with which the head of the new department exercises the wide discretion vested in him. To regard every labor dispute as a menace to "industrial peace" and project Federal power indiscriminately into industrial controversies would prove provocative of strife rather than promotive of peace. To indulge such practice would be to cheapen a noble function, and subject the department to the suspicion of patronizing industrial controversy for the employment such controversy would offer in composing the dispute. The real virtue of the power of intervention resides in the fact that such power exists, rather than in resort to it except where the menace is actual and imminent and the prospect of voluntary concession and settlement beyond reasonable hope.

Mr. President, I have touched but a few features of the bill. The withdrawal of several bureaus and divisions from the present Department of Commerce and Labor and their incorporation in the proposed executive department make the new organization one of peculiar strength and commanding importance. The most important consideration, however, at this juncture is the fact that a bill creating a department of labor is about to become law. The event is a vitally significant step in the wide movement to reconcile economic progress with social justice. This significance is accentuated by the large facilities provided for the collection and distribution of accurate statistical and other information relating to the wage earner, his products, and the conditions attending his employment. The clearer and whiter light on these conditions which this function of publicity supplies will in itself mitigate some evils, while the facts collected pave the way for intelligent legislative action for the cure of others.

It is under favorable auspices, Mr. President, that this new agency of public service will enter on its mission among the great executive departments of the Government. Its destiny is linked with the dignity and nobility of useful toil. While the millions of wage earners throughout the country are made the special objects of its care, a noble host of other spirits will join in welcome to its coming. To no special class is confined the resolve that the civilization of our Republic shall not degenerate into industrial and social cannibalism for want of the intelligence and public spirit to comprehend and master its problems.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I am earnestly in favor of this bill. I am a member of the Committee on Education and Labor which has reported it, and I would do nothing which would retard its passage quickly and promptly. There is, however, a condition in connection with the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization which is still left ambiguous in the bill. The bill which passed creating a Department of Commerce and Labor provided for a Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization. The same act provided for a separate bureau, and there was a controversy as to whether the Commissioner of Immigration should appoint the Chief of the Bureau of Naturalization. The same act makes them two separate bureaus, and there was a controversy as to whether the Commissioner of Immigration should appoint the Chief of the Bureau of Naturalization. It was referred to the counsel for the department, and he decided, on account of the ambiguity, and to give effect to all parts of the act, that they were separate; and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor appointed the Commissioner of Naturalization.

This bill still leaves that ambiguity. I have offered an amendment, which I hope will not retard the passage of the bill, to get rid of this ambiguity. I hope the chairman of the committee who has charge of the bill will accept the amendment and send it into conference. If it would at all retard the passage of the bill—which is a measure that I earnestly favor—I would not offer it, and would not ask to have it go into conference.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, this amendment, as I understand, is designed to make more explicit and certain the law with reference to these two bureaus?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. In fact, it would put into the law what now rests largely on construction?

Mr. SWANSON. This amendment would put into law what is now the construction of the department in connection with these two bureaus.

Mr. BORAH. I have no objection, so far as I am concerned, to the amendment going to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 18, after the word "department," it is proposed to insert:

The Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization is hereby divided into two bureaus, to be known hereafter as the Bureau of Immigration and the Bureau of Naturalization, and the titles Chief, Division of Naturalization, and Assistant Chief shall be Commissioner of Naturalization and Deputy Commissioner of Naturalization. The Commissioner of Naturalization or, in his absence, the Deputy Commissioner of Naturalization shall be the administrative officer in charge of the Bureau of Naturalization and of the administration of the naturalization laws under the immediate direction of the Secretary of Labor, to whom he shall report directly upon all naturalization matters annually and as otherwise required, and the appointments of these two officers shall be made in the same manner as appointments to competitive classified civil-service positions.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 27148) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning with line 20, page 12.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 12, line 25, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$40,870,000" and insert "\$40,572,000," so as to make the clause read:

And to provide for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade; in all, \$40,572,000.

Mr. BOURNE. I will ask that the Senate disagree to the committee's amendment there, for the reason that the failure of the Senate to agree to the committee's amendment preceding that necessitates the restoration of the amount that was in the House bill.

The amendment was rejected.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 13, after line 7, to strike out:

For compensation to clerks in charge of contract stations, at a rate above \$300 each and not to exceed \$1,000 each, \$430,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 10, to strike out:

For compensation to clerks in charge of contract stations, at a rate not to exceed \$300 each, \$750,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 12, to insert:

For compensation to clerks in charge of contract stations, \$1,010,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 16, after the word "vacation," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$225,000," so as to make the clause read:

For compensation to substitutes for clerks and employees at first and second class post offices on vacation, \$225,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 14, after the words "post offices," to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$4,800,000," so as to make the clause read:

For rent, light, and fuel for first, second, and third class post offices, \$4,800,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in the disbursement of the appropriation for such purposes, apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing premises for the use of post offices of the first, second, and third classes at a reasonable annual rental, to be paid quarterly for a term not exceeding 10 years; and that there shall not be allowed for the use of any third-class post office for rent a sum in excess of \$500, nor more than \$100 for fuel and light, in any one year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 24, after the words "second class," to strike out "\$375,000" and insert "\$400,000," so as to make the clause read:

For miscellaneous items necessary and incidental to post offices of the first and second class, \$400,000, of which sum \$25,000 may be used for the purchase of post-office equipment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 16, after the words "City Delivery Service," to strike out "\$35,360,000" and insert "\$35,160,000, of which amount \$100,000 shall be immediately available," so as to read:

For pay of letter carriers at offices already established, including substitutes for letter carriers absent without pay, and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the letter carriers in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade, City Delivery Service, \$35,160,000, of which amount \$100,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate disagree to the last part of the Senate amendment there—"of which amount \$100,000 shall be immediately available"—because that will be taken care of in the deficiency bill. As I understand, the House has made provision for that in the deficiency bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Oregon moves to amend the committee amendment by striking out, in lines 16 and 17, page 16, the words "of which amount \$100,000 shall be immediately available."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BOURNE. I will ask the Senate also to disagree to the committee amendment that follows, where the words are stricken out in the print.

Mr. BRISTOW. Do I understand, Mr. President, that the Senator desires to recede from that?

Mr. BOURNE. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. It seems to me that is very unwise. That is the striking out of lines 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 on page 16.

Mr. BOURNE. No; what I meant was the striking out of lines 2 to 9, inclusive, on page 17, because of the Senate's disagreement to the previous provision.

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, yes.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that corresponds with the vote we had last night on the other amendment.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; that is all right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16 it is proposed to strike out the proviso in lines 17 to 23, both inclusive, as follows:

Provided, That after June 30, 1913, substitute letter carriers and substitute post-office clerks employed in first and second class post offices shall, when working for a carrier or clerk absent without pay, receive the rate of pay of the carrier or clerk in whose place the substitute is employed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I think that amendment ought to be disagreed to. The provision of the House is that when a substitute letter carrier takes the place of a regular carrier who is absent without pay he shall receive the pay that the regular carrier would have received for that service. It seems to me that is reasonable and fair. When one man does another man's work he ought to receive that man's pay. That is all that is provided by the House provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understood the chairman of the committee to ask that that amendment should be disagreed to.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. I did not intend to ask to have that amendment disagreed to. I should like to have the action of the Senate committee affirmed. If the Senator will pardon me, the reason the Senate committee recommended striking out the House provision was because frequently in the postal service a substitute will in one day take the place of two or three different men, drawing different salaries. If the House provision stood, it would be difficult, if not impossible, of administration; or at least, according to the statement of the department, it would make the keeping of the accounts very expensive and cumbersome. Upon

the presentation of the department's views the majority of the committee concurred. The First Assistant Postmaster General said that there were frequent instances where a substitute would take the place of two employees—a man, say, in the \$900 grade and a man in the \$1,300 grade. The enactment of the provision put in by the House would require accounting in the post office itself and also in the auditing department in Washington. The First Assistant Postmaster General said that, as far as the administrative branch of the Government was concerned, he would strongly favor increasing the compensation from 30 cents an hour to 40 cents an hour, rather than to try to administer the House provision if enacted into law.

Mr. JONES. Has the committee made any suggestion along that line, or any attempt to comply with that suggestion of the department?

Mr. BOURNE. They have not. They have left it at 30 cents per hour. It was an alternative, not a recommendation.

Mr. JONES. The department apparently recognized the injustice of requiring these substitutes to do the work of somebody else and take less pay.

Mr. BOURNE. No, Mr. President; I differ with the Senator from Washington in regard to that. It was not a recognition of injustice, but a statement as to the difficulty of administration, and the alternative that in preference to having that difficulty of administration they would prefer or recommend, and thought it would be better from a governmental standpoint, to increase the compensation from 30 cents to 40 cents per hour.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator think it is fair to the man who does the work to keep his pay down solely because it makes a little difficulty of administration here in the city of Washington?

Mr. BOURNE. I think the first consideration in all legislation is as to the possibility of carrying out the provisions that may be put into law, the justice of the law itself, and the equities from the general standpoint of the Nation.

Mr. JONES. I think about the first consideration should be just and fair payment to the men who do the work.

Mr. BOURNE. Yes; but it must be put into such form that it can be administered.

Mr. JONES. They can certainly do it here. It simply means a little bit more work, possibly; that is all. It certainly can not be contended that they can not keep these accounts. A man one day does the work of a man who gets a certain pay, and the next day does the work, perhaps, of some other man who gets a little different pay. It certainly can not be contended that they can not keep the accounts satisfactorily.

Mr. BOURNE. That is not the contention.

Mr. JONES. It would make a little bit more work. It may be a little more difficult to do it.

Mr. BOURNE. And in all probability there would be far greater expense to the Government in keeping these accounts.

Mr. JONES. That may be true to some extent; but, nevertheless, it does not warrant us in requiring a man to do a certain kind of work and not paying him what he is entitled to for it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I was going to suggest that records are kept in the several post offices of the time the regular carriers are off duty, and also of the time the substitutes work. That being so, it seems to me it would not add very much to the labors of the post offices to state the number of hours which a substitute has worked; and if he is doing the work of a regular carrier, why should he not be paid for it?

Mr. BOURNE. Replying to the first part of the Senator's statement, if a man does service for two regular employees during the day it requires a dual account, because he has to be paid on two bases. If he does work for three, each in a different grade, it requires a triple account with the regular carrier and with the substitute performing the service, in order to get the basis of compensation to which he is entitled.

Mr. POMERENE. It seems to me that it is only adding a little bit to the work of the postmaster; and if there are any officers that are overpaid it is the postmasters, because usually their work is done by the deputies.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, all those accounts must be audited here in Washington, as well as by the local postmaster. It would require additional employees there and additional work in Washington.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator state what would be the cost of this extra work in the department here in Washington—the work of keeping these extra accounts?

Mr. BOURNE. If I remember correctly, it was estimated by the department that it would cost \$100,000 additional to operate under the House provision if it became law.

Mr. JONES. How are these substitutes paid now?

Mr. BOURNE. They are paid on the basis of 30 cents an hour.

Mr. JONES. Reports have to be made to the department here.

Mr. BOURNE. That is true, but the Senator does not get my point. If a man is paid on the basis of 30 cents an hour, it is fixed. If his time is divided up during the day, and he is also paid on a basis of 35 and 40 cents an hour, it makes three different schedules of payment and it requires triple work.

Mr. JONES. What would make the extra expense when that is set down? The report would simply include in it the salary paid to the man whose place was taken. I can not see where that would cause any great additional expense either here or at the local office.

Mr. BOURNE. I will read from the letter of the Postmaster General of January 21, 1913, to the committee. Referring to the section of the bill we have under consideration, the Postmaster General said:

PAY OF LETTER CARRIERS.

The bill as it passed the House contained the following:

"That after June 30, 1913, substitute letter carriers and substitute post-office clerks employed in first and second class post offices shall, when working for a carrier or clerk absent without pay, receive the rate of pay of the carrier or clerk in whose place the substitute is employed."

The department is very strongly opposed to the enactment of this provision, which would nullify the present law authorizing a uniform payment of 30 cents an hour for all kinds of substitute service. Under the proposed clause a substitute might receive three or four different rates of pay for work done on the same day, as he might be employed part of a day in place of a regular clerk or carrier whose salary is \$800, then part of the day in place of another whose salary is \$1,000, and then part of the day in place of one whose salary is \$1,200. The provision is evidently based on the theory that the substitute actually performs the work of the absent employee. While in the case of the carrier this may be true, it is rarely so in the case of the clerk. For instance, if a superintendent of mails is absent from the office his place is filled by the assistant superintendent, the assistant superintendent's place by a foreman, and so on down the line, the substitute actually filling the place of a low-grade man; and under this provision his compensation would be at the rate of pay of the absent superintendent of mails, which might be a salary of \$3,000 or more. If a substitute were employed during the absence of an expert distributor at \$1,300, the distributor's work would be done by a man next in line for promotion, while the substitute, notwithstanding he was paid at the rate given an expert distributor, would be performing a lower grade of work. Furthermore, the proposed change from the present law would involve much bookkeeping and a complicated system of accounting, both in the post offices and in the office of the Auditor for the Post Office Department. If it is the opinion of the committee that the present rate of pay (30 cents an hour) is not commensurate, it would be better to increase it rather than to adopt the system as provided in the bill.

Mr. JONES. The statements in the letter do not bear out the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, because this section proposes that the substitute shall be paid only the salary of the man whose place he actually takes. If the superintendent is gone somebody in the rank below him takes the place. The substitute may be necessary by reason of the various temporary promotions, I may say. The substitute would not get the superintendent's salary, but he simply gets the salary of the man whose place he takes. So I do not consider that that is a good argument against the proposition.

The proposition that it will cost a little more in the way of keeping the accounts does not appeal to me at all. The substitute carriers and clerks must be practically as well fitted to do the work as the men whose places they take. They must pass the same examination; they must go through the same preparation; they must acquaint themselves with the character of the work that is to be performed in the same way, and hold themselves in readiness at all times for the place whenever it is necessary for them to fill it. The Government guarantees nothing to these men except work, whenever there is a vacancy, at 30 cents an hour.

I have here a statement prepared by the Substitute Letter Carriers' Association showing the compensation that is received by these substitutes, and I desire to call the attention of the Senate to some facts shown by the statement. For instance, the average earnings per month of a substitute carrier in Montgomery, Ala., who had a length of service of five years as a substitute, was \$15 a month. It seems to me that the Government ought not to ask that men shall act as substitutes and make the preparation that is necessary to fill the place of the principal at a compensation of only \$15 a month.

At Santa Cruz, Cal., \$35 a month, with a possible service of four years as a substitute.

At Torrington, Conn., \$7 a month, with a possible service as a substitute of four years.

At Meriden, Conn., \$8 a month, with a possible service of 4 years and 10 months as a substitute.

And so on through this long list, which I will not take the time of the Senate to call its attention to, but I will ask permission to have it printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Facts about the employment of substitute letter carriers.

	Average earnings per month.	Length of service as substitutes.
Montgomery, Ala.	\$15.00	5 years.
Santa Cruz, Cal.	35.00	4 years.
San Jose, Cal.	50.00	2 years 6 months.
Fort Collins, Colo.	10.00	2 years.
Denver, Colo.	40.00	2 years 10 months.
New Haven, Conn.	35.00	5 years 8 months.
Stamford, Conn.	27.50	4 years 4 months.
Torrington, Conn.	7.00	4 years.
Danbury, Conn.	11.00	3 years 9 months.
Meriden, Conn.	8.00	4 years 10 months.
Wilmington, Del.	31.00	4 years 2 months.
Washington, D. C.	50.00	3 years.
Gainesville, Ga.	20.00	1 year 9 months.
Kewanee, Ill.	2.40	5 years.
Hoopeston, Ill.	12.00	5 years.
South Bend, Ind.	13.50	3 years 10 months.
Shelbyville, Ind.	35.00	4 years 1 month.
Wabash, Ind.	17.75	5 years 9 months.
Bluffton, Ind.	7.50	4 years.
Auburn, Ind.	3.00	5 years.
Boone, Iowa	31.00	5 years 6 months.
McPherson, Kans.	3.00	6 years.
Kansas City, Kans.	45.00	2 years 3 months.
Lexington, Ky.	30.00	3 years.
Covington, Ky.	22.00	3 years 7 months.
New Orleans, La.	36.50	4 years.
Portland, Me.	30.00	6 years 7 months.
Gardiner, Me.	9.50	4 years.
Cumberland, Md.	9.00	3 years 9 months.
Boston, Mass.	55.00	6 years 4 months.
New Bedford, Mass.	40.00	5 years 8 months.
Springfield, Mass.	27.50	4 years 1 month.
Northampton, Mass.	30.00	7 years.
Newburyport, Mass.	5.00	6 years 6 months.
Westfield, Mass.	12.75	6 years.
Plymouth, Mass.	9.00	4 years 6 months.
Greenfield, Mass.	5.00	5 years 6 months.
Wakefield, Mass.	16.00	6 years.
Natick, Mass.	10.00	11 years.
Attleboro, Mass.	13.00	6 years 4 months.
Orange, Mass.	13 years 7 months.
Chicopee, Mass.	10.00	5 years.
Hudson, Mass.	7.00	5 years.
Gloucester, Mass.	20.00	7 years 8 months.
Worcester, Mass.	20.00	5 years 6 months.
Gardner, Mass.	7.00	5 years.
Lowell, Mass.	30.00	5 years.
Brockton, Mass.	6 years.
North Adams, Mass.	50.00	8 years.
Muskegon, Mich.	8.93	3 years 8 months.
Saginaw, Mich.	45.00	2 years 8 months.
Hillsdale, Mich.	4 years.
Adrian, Mich.	35.00	3 years.
Three Rivers, Mich.	4 years.
Caro, Mich.	6.00	5 years.
Jackson, Mich.	42.00	4 years.
Faribault, Minn.	39.50	3 years 6 months.
Crookston, Minn.	10.50	3 years.
Vicksburg, Miss.	25.00	2 years 10 months.
Yazoo City, Miss.	7 years 4 months.
West Point, Miss.	5.00	5 years.
St. Joseph, Mo.	37.50	3 years 6 months.
St. Louis, Mo.	43.00	4 years 9 months.
Beatrice, Nebr.	40.00	3 years 8 months.
Fairbury, Nebr.	12.00	3 years.
South Omaha, Nebr.	15.00	3 years.
Laconia, N. H.	5.00	3 years 7 months.
Claremont, N. H.	12.50	2 years 8 months.
Newark, N. J.	30.00	4 years 10 months.
Elizabeth, N. J.	34.00	4 years 2 months.
Plainfield, N. J.	5.00	4 years.
Hackensack, N. J.	19.00	4 years.
New Brunswick, N. J.	40.00	5 years.
Perth Amboy, N. J.	3.00	4 years.
Camden, N. J.	23.00	4 years 2 months.
Phillipsburg, N. J.	12.00	5 years 3 months.
Madison, N. J.	10.00	4 years.
Elmira, N. Y.	20.00	4 years 7 months.
Batavia, N. Y.	12.00	4 years.
Syracuse, N. Y.	45.00	5 years 4 months.
Auburn, N. Y.	14.50	5 years.
Canandaigua, N. Y.	12.75	6 years 6 months.
Rochester, N. Y.	46.00	4 years.
Binghamton, N. Y.	30.00	4 years.
Schenectady, N. Y.	60.00	4 years 6 months.
Fort Jervis, N. Y.	11.00	7 years.
Hoosick Falls, N. Y.	Last appointee served 17 years.
Saratoga Springs, N. Y.	23.00	4 years.
Nyack, N. Y.	21.00	5 years.
Tompkinsville, N. Y.	12.00	5 years 6 months.
Amsterdam, N. Y.	20.00	5 years.
Buffalo, N. Y.	40.00	4 years.
Winston-Salem, N. C.	14.00	4 years.
Elizabeth City, N. C.	5.83	5 years.
Cleveland, Ohio	18.50	3 years 6 months.

Facts about the employment of substitute letter carriers—Continued.

	Average earnings per month.	Length of service as substitutes.
Ironton, Ohio	\$29.60	5 years.
Norwalk, Ohio	7.00	5 years.
Dayton, Ohio	55.00	3 years 6 months.
Marion, Ohio	40.00	4 years 8 months.
Washington C. H., Ohio	14.00	6 years.
Lancaster, Ohio	2.40	4 years 3 months.
Tiffin, Ohio	23.00	6 years.
Lebanon, Ohio	5.28	6 years 6 months.
Xenia, Ohio	10 years.
Cincinnati, Ohio	40.00	4 years.
Springfield, Ohio	40.00	3 years.
Chillicothe, Ohio	25.00	5 years.
Oklahoma, Okla.	26.32	1 year 6 months.
Alva, Okla.	18.00	3 years.
Blackwell, Okla.	7.23	3 years.
Albany, Oreg.	10.00	3 years.
Oregon City, Oreg.	5.00	2 years 6 months.
Mount Carmel, Pa.	10.00	5 years 3 months.
Union City, Pa.	3.50	4 years.
Mauch Chunk, Pa.	6.00	6 years 8 months.
Conshohocken, Pa.	20.00	5 years 10 months.
Philadelphia, Pa.	40.00	5 years 8 months.
Allentown, Pa.	25.00	4 years 6 months.
Harrisburg, Pa.	38.00	5 years 6 months.
Carlisle, Pa.	20.00	6 years.
Columbia, Pa.	2.40	13 years.
Washington, Pa.	12.00	6 years.
Tyrone, Pa.	7.00	5 years 4 months.
Bellefonte, Pa.	4.80	5 years.
Reading, Pa.	40.00	6 years.
Kane, Pa.	5.00	7 years 3 months.
Woonsocket, R. I.	25.00	4 years 6 months.
Newport, R. I.	35.00	7 years 6 months.
Pawtucket, R. I.	27.40	5 years.
Chester, S. C.	3 years.
Yankton, S. Dak.	4 years.
Harriman, Tenn.	5 years.
Beaumont, Tex.	27.00	2 years 2 months.
Salt Lake City, Utah	50.00	2 years 2 months.
Barre, Vt.	10.00	5 years 6 months.
Bellows Falls, Vt.	14.00	4 years 6 months.
St. Johnsbury, Vt.	7.00	4 years.
Staunton, Va.	21.50	5 years 7 months.
Charlottesville, Va.	15.00	4 years 6 months.
Winchester, Va.	6 years.
Parkersburg, W. Va.	40.00	8 years.
Morgantown, W. Va.	15.50	3 years 6 months.
Wheeling, W. Va.	40.00	2 years 6 months.
Marquette, Wis.	5.00	6 years.
Manitowoc, Wis.	25.00	7 years 6 months.
Merrill, Wis.	10.00	6 years.
Sheboygan, Wis.	20.00	4 years 6 months.

Mr. JONES. These statements show, to me at least, that these men ought to receive the compensation that the man receives whose place they take. With all the statements of the Post Office Department, I can not see any answer to the proposition that the man who does the work of another ought to receive that man's pay while he does it.

I hope that the Senate will disagree to the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee, to strike out lines 17 to 23, inclusive. [Putting the question.] The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I should like to have a division on the question. This is a very important matter. The department says the provision would be a very great inconvenience in administration and lead to a complication of accounts, not only in local post offices but in the department. It seems to me that the view of the Post Office Department, that has control of the accounts and can not be alleged to have any purpose except the best interests of the service, ought to have some weight with the Senate with regard to a provision of this kind, where it is a matter of administrative detail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas demands a division.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, some things that have been brought out in this debate have suggested to me that perhaps by disagreeing to the Senate amendment, and leaving the matter just as the House has provided, might work a comparative injustice to regular clerks. For instance, as soon as a substitute carrier or clerk is appointed to a regular position he receives the minimum salary of such clerk or carrier, which we have already fixed at \$800 per year. Now, is it right to say that a substitute, at the very beginning of his work as a substitute, shall receive as much as the regular employee, who may have served from three to five years before getting a permanent position? Take another case: The substitute may temporarily perform the work of a \$1,200 man, and under the House provision he would be entitled to pay while performing such work at the

rate of \$1,200 per year, or at a rate per year of \$400 more than he would receive after receiving a permanent appointment.

I ask permission of the Senate that this item may be passed over for the present with the hope that we may possibly decide upon and fix a sum in excess of 30 cents an hour, which would perhaps meet more justly the demands of the situation and not produce any inequality which might arise, and at the same time meet the seemingly valid objection to the House provision by the department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan that the item be temporarily passed over? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at page 16, line 4.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 2, after the word "hour," to strike out—

Every substitute carrier and substitute post-office clerk who has served as such substitute for a period of one year or more shall, when appointed to a regular position, receive the salary of a second-grade carrier or clerk, \$800 per annum, as his initial salary, and all other promotions shall be regulated according to the classification act approved March 2, 1907.

Mr. BOURNE. I ask that the Senate disagree to the committee amendment because of the Senate's disagreement to the committee amendment on page 12, lines 7 to 19, inclusive. This will conform with the action taken by the Senate in a previous part of the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 12, after the word "established," to strike out "\$2,285,000" and insert "\$2,500,000, of which amount not exceeding \$300,000 shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of substitutes for letter carriers absent with pay, and of auxiliary and temporary letter carriers at offices where city delivery is already established, \$2,500,000, of which amount not exceeding \$300,000 shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 19, after the word "vehicles," to strike out "\$1,530,000" and insert "\$1,830,000, of which amount \$250,000 shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For horse-hire allowance, the hiring of drivers, and the rental of vehicles, \$1,830,000, of which amount \$250,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. BOURNE. I ask the Senate to disagree to that portion of the committee recommendation reading as follows:

Of which amount \$250,000 shall be immediately available—

for the reason that that appropriation is covered, as I am informed, by the House in the deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question will first be taken on that part of the amendment which proposes to strike out "\$1,530,000" and insert "\$1,830,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the second part of the amendment, to insert the words "of which amount \$250,000 shall be immediately available."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 21, after the word "allowance," to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$500,000," so as to make the clause read:

For car fare and bicycle allowance, \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 3, after the word "purchase," to insert "and exchange," so as to make the clause read:

For incidental expenses of the City Delivery Service, including freight and drayage on equipment, furniture, and supplies, and erecting, painting, and repairing letter and package boxes and posts, repairing clocks and other equipment, and for the purchase and exchange of time recorders and maps, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 10, after the words "free-delivery service," to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

For experimental village-delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class that are not by law now entitled to free-delivery service, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 18, line 23, after the words "power-boat routes," to strike out "\$875,000" and insert "\$910,000," so as to make the clause read:

For inland transportation by steamboat or other power-boat routes, \$910,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 2, after "\$962,200," to insert "Provided, That the personnel of the membership of the committees and commissions created and provided for in sections 1 and 8 of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1912, shall continue with the same authorities, powers, and provisions for expenses until final report is made to Congress," so as to make the clause read:

For the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, \$962,200: *Provided*, That the personnel of the membership of the committees and commissions created and provided for in sections 1 and 8 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912, shall continue with the same authorities, powers, and provisions for expenses until final report is made to Congress.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM] handed to me an amendment. I have not had time to look it over to know whether it is in order now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By agreement the committee amendments are now being considered. If it is an amendment to a committee amendment, it will be in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. With reference to the amendment on page 19, after the word "Congress" in line 10, it has been suggested that perhaps it would be better to add:

Provided, That said report shall be made not later than December 1 next.

I should like to ask if that would not be satisfactory to the chairman of the committee?

Mr. BOURNE. I doubt very much if they would be able to complete all the work by December 1. Take the commission on second-class postage and railway-mail pay. They have been going into an investigation of the various questions regarding railway-mail pay and have not yet taken up second-class postage. I think if they complete the investigation of railway-mail pay during the present year and make a demonstration of that problem they will be doing very well.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to suggest to the chairman of the committee that some time should be fixed. I am willing to leave it to his discretion, but I do not think we should pass it without any limitation at all. It has been the subject of some adverse criticism.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me suggest that this does not carry any additional appropriation at all; it does not incur any additional expense. The appropriations have already been made, and it simply makes them available until the committees are ready to report. So it does not cost any more.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that explanation will probably be satisfactory to those who felt there should be a limitation upon the time of service.

Mr. BOURNE. The presumption is that the commission will complete their work and submit their report to Congress as soon as they possibly can.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that is undoubtedly true, but as a matter of legislation I think there ought to be a limitation of time in the legislation itself. It is a matter of general practice.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 15, after the words "For inland transportation by railroad routes," to strike out "\$49,000,000" and insert "\$51,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid for carrying the mail over the bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Mo., other than upon a mileage basis: *And provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, pay within the present law a fair and reasonable price for the special transfer and terminal service at the Union Station at East St. Louis, Ill., and at the Union Station at St. Louis, Mo., including the use, lighting, and heating of the mail building and transfer service at St. Louis, Mo., provided the amount so paid shall not exceed \$20,000."

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President I make the point of order that the proviso is general legislation.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, I think this is clearly a limitation of an appropriation and in no way general legislation. In the last Post Office appropriation bill this provision was enacted after the appropriation was made:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid for carrying the mail over the bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Mo., other than upon a mileage basis.

That was in the last bill which became a law. The result of a disagreement to the recommendation of the Senate committee would be that the law of 1899, which gave the Postmaster General discretionary power to pay up to \$50,000 for the use of the two bridges covered by the East St. Louis Terminal Co., un-

doubtedly, reasoning a priori, would result in the Government paying \$50,000 to that company.

There has been a great deal of discussion over this particular feature of the bill. The committee had it under consideration one day for over three hours. Hearings were held last session when this limitation was put in the bill that became a law. The second proviso in the last year's bill reads as follows:

That no part of this appropriation shall be paid for carrying the mail over the bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Mo., other than upon a mileage basis: *And provided further*, That the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, pay within the present law a fair and reasonable price for the special transfer and terminal service at the Union Station at East St. Louis, Ill., and at the Union Station at St. Louis, Mo., including the use, lighting, and heating of the mail building and transfer service at St. Louis, Mo., provided the amount so paid shall not exceed \$35,000.

The effect of a disagreement to the committee's recommendation would be that the Government undoubtedly would have to pay this terminal company \$50,000. An agreement to the Senate committee's recommendation would be the placing of a limitation of \$20,000.

At the last session Congress placed a limitation of \$35,000. So, if the Senate disagrees to the committee recommendation, the result would undoubtedly be that the Government will pay the St. Louis Terminal Co. \$50,000. There was a division of opinion in the committee. A majority of the committee were of the opinion—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, does not the bill as it passed the House limit the payment to \$35,000?

Mr. BOURNE. No; the bill as it comes from the House would undoubtedly recognize and restore the conditions existing under the law of 1899, which would give the Postmaster General the discretionary power of paying up to \$50,000. As the Postmaster General has paid that limit heretofore, the assumption is that he will continue to pay up to that amount unless some action is taken by Congress.

Mr. BRYAN and Mr. SMITH of Georgia addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia. Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Florida, who was on his feet first.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, when this item was first discussed in the committee I, like many other members of the committee, was of the opinion that the amendment as it appears on page 20 operated to increase the appropriation and to pay to this terminal company \$35,000, to which it would not be entitled but for the Senate committee amendment. Inasmuch as it is customary for terminal companies to be owned by corporations distinct from the railroads entering into a terminal station, because the railroad companies owning the terminal company usually form a separate corporation, I would be of the opinion that the pay to the St. Louis Terminal Association of \$35,000 was in and of itself a palpable discrimination against every other terminal company in this country.

It was stated by the chairman of the committee that unless we incorporate this provision we will be forced to pay \$50,000 under an act passed in 1899, which reads as follows:

That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to pay from appropriations for transportation by railroad routes for the special transfer and terminal service between the Union Station at East St. Louis, Ill., and the Union Station at St. Louis, Mo., including the use, lighting, and heating of mail buildings, and the transfer service at St. Louis, at the rate of not exceeding \$50,000 per annum, beginning on the 1st day of July, 1899.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida will permit the Chair to say that the question before the Senate is the point of order, on which the Chair is prepared to rule, but the Chair will hear the Senator on the point of order if he desires to discuss it.

Mr. BRYAN. I do not know how the Chair is going to rule, but I think in justice to the committee the reason that induced the committee to make this amendment ought to be stated. It is within the range of possibility that the Senate would not be satisfied with the ruling of the Chair. I will not detain the Senate more than a moment longer, and only to say that if this corporation is entitled to charge \$50,000 under this special act of Congress, whereas it would only be entitled to receive between \$10,000 and \$15,000 upon a mileage basis, then every other terminal association entering into a large city is being discriminated against in every post-office bill we pass.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I only wanted to say one word with regard to the point of order. This is exactly the provision that was ruled in order on our last Post Office appropriation bill, and, as I recollect, by the present presiding officer, the only difference being in the amount, \$20,000 instead of \$35,000.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator will allow me, I think that the question arose as it arises here to-day. As I remember,

last year the House changed existing law by providing for the payment of the amount of the appropriation on a mileage basis and reduced the amount provided in the general law to \$35,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That was the House provision. It was put in just in this language by the Post Office Committee, with the exception that we put in \$35,000 instead of \$20,000. Not having the accurate figures before us as to how much the cost would be, we wanted to be sure that we named a sufficient amount.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I was not on the committee last year, but my recollection is that the law was changed in the House, and therefore a point of order would not lie against it in the Senate.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, a clause in the House bill after the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes provided—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Last year?

Mr. BOURNE. Last year. It is as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid for carrying the mail over the bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, Mo., over and above the regular rates for transportation of mail by railroad routes.

That was inserted on the floor of the House and not considered by the committee. When the bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Senate committee, a motion was made to strike out that proviso and to insert the \$35,000 limitation. This was done after a series of hearings, at which the representatives of the East St. Louis Terminal Co. had an opportunity of appearing before the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think, Mr. President, that the Senator from Oregon has substantiated what I have said, namely, that the House last year changed existing law. I submit that if there had been no legislation on this subject in last year's appropriation bill there would now be no contention that this provision now would not be subject to the point of order, because it clearly would be new legislation; in other words, it would be changing the statute of 1899. The House last year made a change in the general law while the bill was pending before that body; it came here; a point of order was made against the provision reported by the Senate committee on the ground that it was new legislation. My understanding is—but Senators who were on the committee perhaps will remember better than I—that the point was overruled on the ground that the House having already inserted a proposition it was competent for the Senate to amend that provision. However, this year the identical item carried in last year's bill was stricken out in the House. The bill comes over here under existing law, namely, the law of 1899. It is now proposed to amend that law, which, I submit, is existing law, for the purposes of considering this question on this bill. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to ask the Senator from Michigan if he does not consider that the Senate has a right on an appropriation bill to limit the purpose for which an appropriation made is to be used?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Of course it has.

Mr. BRYAN. Of course we could not undertake, and are not undertaking in this bill, to repeal the act of 1899 giving to this terminal association the right to be paid \$50,000; but the sum total of our action would be that they can not have it out of this appropriation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. In further answer to the Senator from Florida, I will state that I have no doubt that the Senate could legislate in a way that would simply amount to a limitation; but if the law of 1899 is in force, this amendment that is proposed here does more than to limit it. It provides that this compensation shall be made on a mileage basis. The law of 1899 does not provide any such thing as that.

The second provision, limiting the discretion of the Postmaster General to \$20,000 instead of \$50,000, evidently would not be subject to a point of order; but the first provision, changing the statute so as to make it apply the appropriation to a mileage basis is a change in the existing law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. For one, I think the first part of this provision changes existing law.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the law of 1899 is in force, I think it does.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the first part of this provision changes existing law, then, Mr. President, I desire to ask this Senator if, when we inserted it a year ago, we did not change existing law by that insertion, and if, therefore, his position be true, the law is not now just what it is in this provision?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I contend, Mr. President, that you do not change permanent law by a provision on an appropriation bill. Such a provision only lasts for the current year and affects only that particular appropriation. The House of Representatives departed from the provision in the appropriation bill of last year and went back to the law of 1899, and that is the form in which the bill comes here to-day.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I merely want to say one word upon this point in addition to what has been said.

Either this provision is simply a limitation of the use of the present appropriation and, therefore, changes no existing law and is pertinent to the appropriation and legally placed here, or it does change existing law. If it could change an existing law, exactly the same language was used in the last appropriation bill, and the existing law, to which the Senator from Michigan refers, has already been changed. In point of fact, I do not think the legislation a year ago changed the existing law, and I do not think that this provision does. It simply follows existing law, for, as I have said, the same words were in the appropriation bill a year ago. So, Mr. President, we insist beyond any question that this language only limits the use of this present appropriation.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I want to make a single suggestion. It has already been stated that when this bill was passed at the last session this amendment had been placed in the bill in the other House. Having come to the Senate, it was therefore held that a point of order could not be made. So far as the law was concerned which was adopted one year ago, or at the last session, it applied only to the fiscal year. It was a change of the existing law, it is true, for one year; but at the end of one year the change ceased and the existing law was revived. The object of this amendment, as I understand, is to change an existing law by an amendment in the Senate. It does not come from the House in that shape.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Upon a preliminary examination of the bill, the Chair discovered the language "upon a mileage basis," and, assuming that that was new language, was clearly of opinion that a point of order would lie, but since that time the Chair has examined the act of last year and has discovered the fact that the language is identical with the language in last year's act. That changes the matter very materially. The law of last year is still in existence; and, looking the matter over with a great deal of care, the Chair is impressed with the view that the language not having been changed from the law of last year, and the further fact that this is intended as a limitation of the appropriation, he therefore is constrained to overrule the point of order. The question is upon the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, are we discussing clause 76 of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The matter under discussion is the amendment on page 20, beginning on line 15.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of the bill the reason for the enormous increase over last year in the moneys to be paid to the railroads for carrying the mails?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will suggest that that amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. I should like to recur to it, if there be no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator permit the Chair to put the question on the pending amendment, which is the language following that?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Now the Senator may address himself to the other amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, recurring to page 20, paragraph 76, I find to my astonishment that there is an increase from \$49,000,000 to \$51,500,000 to pay for inland transportation on railroad routes. I have received much literature from the "down-trodden" railroads of the country stating that they are insufficiently paid for the transportation of the mail. I believe, however, that I can demonstrate in a moment to the satisfaction of the Senate that the railroad companies instead of being underpaid for the transportation of the mails are overpaid. These railroad companies while pretending to be underpaid are overpaid for transporting the mails. The table which I hold in my hand gives a comparison of the railroad rates for carrying mail, freight, and express. I request the Secretary to read the table of figures which I send to the desk.

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

The Secretary read as follows:

THE RAILWAY POSTAL GRAFT.

The following table, giving a comparison of the railroad rates for carrying mail, freight, and express, was prepared by Prof. Henry C. Adams, statistician of the United States Postal Commission (generally known as the Wolcott Commission). Some revisions have since been made (1907), but they are too slight to affect the disparity in charges here shown:

New York City to Buffalo, 440 miles:	
1 ton mail	\$31.65
1 ton freight	7.80
1 ton express	12.50
100 pounds mail	1.58
100 pounds freight	.39
100 pounds express	.63
New York City to Chicago, 1,000 miles:	
1 ton mail	\$71.30
1 ton freight	15.00
1 ton express	25.00
New York City to San Francisco, via New York Central, Lake Shore, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy, Union Pacific, and the Southern Pacific:	
1 ton mail	\$265.53
1 ton freight	60.00
1 ton express	135.00
100 pounds mail	15.28
100 pounds freight	3.00
100 pounds express	6.75

The railroad rate for mail, however, is much higher than shown in the foregoing table. The Government is cheated in the weighing of the mails, and is charged exorbitant rent for the use of the mail cars. In 1911 the Government paid an average rental of \$3,575.10 for each postal car. The average original cost of a wooden mail car is between \$6,500 and \$7,000. Taking all this into consideration, the cost of carrying mail is probably eight or nine times the cost of carrying express matter.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, being impressed with the injustice perpetrated by some mail-carrying railroads, I made an investigation. I do not know that I could more succinctly state my conclusions and findings with respect to that investigation than by reading what I said, upon the occasion of my election to the Senate, in my address to both houses of the Legislature of the State of Arizona. I read from that address as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT COULD SAVE MILLIONS BY USING ITS OWN POSTAL CARS.

The United States pays each year to the railroads \$4,800,000 for rent of postal cars with which to carry the mails, and the railroads usually furnish wooden cars that "telescope" during wrecks and kill or maim the underpaid and overworked postal clerks. Remember that this \$4,800,000 paid to the railroad companies each year as rental for the post-office cars is in addition to the \$46,000,000 paid each year to the railroad companies for carrying the mails. Consider for a moment what an enormous sum of money could be saved to the Government if it would build its own cars.

The most expensive car, all steel, costs \$12,000 and its average life is 25 years, so that with this \$4,800,000 which the Government pays the railroads each year for the rent of cars we could build 400 steel cars annually.

The sum of money, aggregating \$46,000,000 annually—

That was the amount when these figures were prepared by me. Now it is proposed to increase the amount to the sum of \$51,500,000—

for carrying mail, is reached because railroads charge the United States 42 cents per pound for carrying mail matter, but the railroads carry the express matter for express companies at three-fourths of a cent per pound. Such robbery of the Government must not be permitted to continue.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am prompted, in view of my knowledge of these facts, to inquire the reason for the increase, as indicated on page 20 of this bill, from \$49,000,000 to \$51,500,000 for the transportation of the mails, when the pay received by the railroad companies for transporting the mails is about two and one-half times greater than the compensation they receive for transporting express matter; and, in addition, the Government pays for the rent of the postal cars?

Mr. BOURNE. Has the Senator completed his inquiry?

Mr. ASHURST. I have.

Mr. BOURNE. The average increase in postal receipts and postal expenses is about 7 per cent per annum, according to the tables of the last 10 years. That is the normal growth of our postal service. The appropriations for railway mail pay are based upon estimates to comply with existing law. The estimate of the department is much higher than the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee. The House bill proposes to appropriate \$49,000,000. Last year Congress appropriated \$47,647,000.

Mr. ASHURST. May I interrupt the Senator just long enough to ask a question?

Mr. BOURNE. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. Is it not true that the railroad companies receive two or three times more from the Government for carrying the mails than they do from the express companies for carrying express matter?

Mr. BOURNE. In my opinion, most certainly not. In my opinion, and I am simply stating my own personal opinion—

Mr. ASHURST. I have a high regard for the Senator's opinion.

Mr. BOURNE. There exists a gross misapprehension on the question of overpayment to the railroads in the way of railway-mail pay. In my opinion—not yet a conviction, but an opinion—a misapprehension also exists in reference to the desirability of Government ownership and operation of railway post-office cars. Postmaster General Vilas, in 1887, made a statement in his report which, I assume, led the American people to the conviction that it would be cheaper for the Government to own and operate the railway post-office cars, and that they would save inferentially, according to his presentation, a million dollars and a half over the annual appropriations made for the railway post-office car service. Under the last Post Office appropriation bill a joint committee was created to investigate and report to Congress in reference to railway-mail pay and second-class postage. That committee, of which I am a member, has held a number of hearings, and in the testimony before the committee, under oath, a number of railroad representatives have stated that they receive less pay for carrying the mail than they receive for passenger service or express service. The committee has not yet concluded its investigations or formed its conclusions. I am satisfied, however, that the problem can be solved, and that the facts can be demonstrated clearly to the satisfaction of every Member of Congress and to the edification and education of the American people on those points.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, do I understand the Senator to say that some gentlemen appearing before the commission testified that they receive no larger sum of money for carrying the mails than they receive for carrying express matter?

Mr. BOURNE. That they received less.

Mr. ASHURST. For carrying the mail?

Mr. BOURNE. For carrying the mail than they received for passenger service or express service, and, as I have said, they made that statement under oath. That is their testimony.

I will say, for the information of the Senator from Arizona, that I believe the problem will be solved and the facts will be clearly demonstrated. My own opinion is that the public are greatly mistaken in their judgment, based on the report of Postmaster General Vilas, in 1887, and on what is known as Document 105, in which the Postmaster General, in his suggestion of the plan of the department of the substitution of space for weight as the measure of the service rendered, leaves the reader to infer that we are overpaying the railroads \$9,000,000.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am glad I asked the question, because the Senator has courteously and very clearly stated his opinion. In asking the question I am not in any manner criticizing the committee nor the honorable Senator from Oregon, whose services to the public, in my judgment, are probably not appreciated as much as they should be. I am glad to have him give me this explanation, but if some gentlemen have testified before his committee or before any committee that the railroads do not receive more for carrying the mails than they do for carrying express matter, I am shocked. I will not characterize such testimony further, but I believe it is common knowledge—

Mr. BOURNE. Common opinion, I think.

Mr. ASHURST. Common opinion—I beg the Senator's pardon—common opinion based on fact—that the railroad companies do receive much more money for carrying the mails than they do for carrying express matter.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 21, beginning in line 1, to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That on account of the increased weight of mails resulting from the establishment of the parcel post the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to weigh the mails on railroad routes, beginning September 1, 1913, for not less than 30 successive working days, and to readjust compensation from the date of the commencement of said weighing at not exceeding the rates provided by law: *Provided further*, That from the commencement of said weighing the transportation of second-class matter in fast freight trains and the manner of handling incident thereto shall be discontinued, and thereafter said mail shall be carried in the regular mail trains, and compensation allowed therefor, the purpose being to reestablish the system in vogue prior to the establishment of the blue-tag system.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I observe in this amendment a change in the law in respect to weighing the mails. I had hoped that if there was to be a change in the present law as to mail weighing it would be done in some way that would not permit the railroad companies to ascertain in advance the date of the weighing, for the reason that in some instances in the past various railroad companies, being aware of the date upon which the mails were to be weighed, are alleged to have caused the mails at that particular time to be laden far beyond their

ordinary volume, to the end that the average weight might be increased. I insist, therefore, that the law should provide for a weighing to take place upon a date and at a time of which the railroad companies have no previous notice. In one of our Western States, as has been suggested by a western Senator, a railroad increased the weight on one of the mail routes to the capacity of a carload in order that the additional weight might be thrown into the scales to increase the general average. I suggest that if there is to be a change in the system of weighing the railroad companies ought not to know in advance the date of such weighing.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator how that could be done?

Mr. ASHURST. Well, the weighing should be done upon some date or dates known to the department and unknown to the railroad companies. The department can send its officers and its agents to the proper places and there do the weighing upon different days, of which previous notice has not been given to the railroad companies.

Mr. BOURNE. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. BOURNE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that of his knowledge there were instances where, during the weighing period, the mails had been packed?

Mr. ASHURST. Not to my personal knowledge.

Mr. BOURNE. I was wondering, if that was the case, whether the Senator had informed the Department of Justice, in order that the individuals who were party to such a conspiracy against the Government might be criminally prosecuted.

Mr. ASHURST. If the Senator from Arizona had known of his own knowledge of any such occurrence or any other criminal occurrence, he would not decline to give the testimony to the proper officer.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ayes seem to have it. The ayes have it; and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, several Senators addressed the Chair. My colleague did so before the Chair put the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair had not observed that fact.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not rise, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There were not "several Senators," or the Chair would have discovered that fact.

Mr. BACON. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing the Chair. Evidently the Chair did not hear them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the Senator.

Mr. BACON. I think my colleague desired to say something on the subject; and if he does not, I myself desire to say something.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to ask, Mr. President, that the exact provision we are now voting upon be again stated by the Secretary.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that the instance of overweight referred to by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] was a matter which was called to my attention some 14 years ago, and I spoke to the Senator about it this morning for the first time.

Mr. BOURNE. Fourteen years ago?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. It occurred a long time ago, but in our hurried conversation I did not have the opportunity, or at least I did not avail myself of it, of going into particulars.

While I am on my feet I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon whether the statement that the railway companies receive less for carrying the mails than for carrying express and passengers includes their percentage of the profits of the express business?

Mr. BOURNE. In their method of presentation and statements, I will say yes.

As I say, the joint committee have come to no conclusions whatever. They are studying the problem now. I simply stated my own personal opinion about it—that the problem can be solved and clearly demonstrated, and the American people informed as to the actual facts, which I know the Senator will agree with me in saying is highly desirable.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator, of course, is well acquainted and thoroughly familiar with all of these details. I know none of them; but for information I should like to inquire further whether the Senator has any knowledge as to the percentage of profits paid to the railroad companies out of the profits of the express companies?

Mr. BOURNE. I can not answer that question, Mr. President. That matter has been under consideration by the Interstate Commerce Commission for a period of over three years. They came to their conclusions in reference to rates for the express companies, and made suggestions, but the recommended rates have not yet gone into effect. The matter is in process of determination. But I should like to say to the Senator, answering the inquiry to the Senator from Arizona in reference to the increase, that the increase made by the committee is some \$7,000,000 less than the increase asked by the department. If the department is right in its opinion, there will be a deficit under the railway-mail pay of a number of million dollars next year, and the matter will come up before the Appropriations Committee for a deficiency appropriation.

The Senator will remember that on the 1st of January, fourth-class mail matter was extended by the parcel-post legislation.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say now that I think the country owes a great deal to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for that very efficient legislation.

Mr. BOURNE. The department believes that the appropriation for railway-mail pay should be increased \$9,000,000 because of the increased weight the transportation companies will have to carry on account of the increased business in fourth-class mail matter, due to what is known as the parcel-post legislation. I figure that probably there will be a million and a half dollars of increased compensation on account of the increase in weight.

In other words, my estimate as to the increase of fourth-class mail matter resulting from the parcel-post legislation does not agree with the department's estimate. They estimate \$9,000,000 and I estimate about a million and a half dollars. We have increased the appropriation here two and a half million dollars over the House provision, \$500,000 of which is to provide for the special weighing, which I am sure the Senator from Arizona will agree is just and right and something to which the transportation companies are entitled, in view of the fact that Congress put upon them an increased burden going into operation the 1st of January. Certainly it is the duty of Congress to reach an early determination as to what that burden is, and give reasonable compensation for the increased burden put by Congress upon the transportation companies of the country.

The special weighing is provided for the 1st of September. Under the provision as recommended, if agreed to by Congress, the railroads will receive no compensation whatever from the 1st of January to the 1st of September for the increased amount of fourth-class mail matter. From the 1st of September on, however, they will receive compensation, in accordance with the present laws and methods of adjustment, upon the weight ascertained in the special weighing provided for in the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think it is due to the incoming administration that the estimate of the department of the increased expense which this provision on page 21 will place upon the Post Office Department should be fully presented.

The estimate of the department is that with the appropriation now provided in the bill, in view of this paragraph, if it is adopted, there will be a deficit of \$8,018,000. That is made up in this way: First, an estimated increase in compensation, on account of increase in weight of regular mails since last weighing in the contract sections, of \$3,861,000.

The mail contracts run over a period of years after each weighing. The price paid contemplates covering the increase of mail matter. It is more at first than it otherwise would be, because with the lapse of time and the growth of the mails it is supposed that more mail matter will be carried by the end of the contract than was carried at the time of the weighing. For us now to reweigh, in the opinion of the department, will cause an increase of \$3,861,000 in the price of our existing contracts.

The department also estimates that there will be an increase by reason of the parcel post of \$4,011,000, an estimated cost of 35 days' weighing and tabulation of \$500,000, and an estimated increase in compensation by reason of the return of "blue-tag" mail to the regular mail trains of \$1,485,000, making a total of \$9,857,000. The increase provided by the Senate amendment is \$1,839,000, leaving, therefore, according to the estimate of the department, a deficit of \$8,018,000 if this provision becomes a law.

I have no fixed conviction with reference to the prices which we pay the railroads for carrying the mails. I do not know whether or not they are excessive. I have not had an opportunity to make such an investigation as would justify a conclusion. I have entertained the popular impression that we were paying excessive prices, but impressions, of course, are not reliable. I trust we shall obtain from the commission which has been provided for, and which is in existence, that accurate

knowledge which will justify us either in demanding a reduction of the charges or else in going to the public and saying that they are mistaken and that the charges are just. If they are excessive, we ought to reduce them. If they are just, the popular impression that they are excessive should be removed.

I sympathize somewhat with the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] that it is not best in this bill to name the time when this weighing is to take place. It seems to me we could very well leave that to the department. For that reason, if we should strike out, in the third line, the words "and directed," and also, in the fourth and fifth lines, "beginning September 1, 1913," and leave it to read:

The Postmaster General is authorized to weigh the mails on railroad routes for not less than 30 successive working days—

We would leave some discretion in the department as to when this weighing should take place, and I think it would improve our amendment.

Mr. BOURNE. I am perfectly willing to accept the suggestion of the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Georgia to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My amendment is, in line 3, to strike out the two words "and directed," and in lines 4 and 5 to strike out the words "beginning"—

Mr. BOURNE. Oh, I did not understand the Senator to say he wished to strike out the words "and directed."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That would leave him authorized to do it.

Mr. BOURNE. I think he should be directed to do it. I think it is the duty of Congress, and I do not think we have any right, or that it is desirable, for us to leave to the head of a department a matter that is purely and admittedly a function of Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, first, I will offer the amendment to strike out, in lines 4 and 5, the words "beginning September 1, 1913."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 21, lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to strike out the words "beginning September 1, 1913."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOURNE. Will not that leave it imperfect? Would it not be necessary to insert some substitute for the language stricken out?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; it would leave it directing the department to weigh the mails and would leave the time when they were to be weighed still to be fixed by the department.

Mr. BOURNE. Should we not say that it shall be done in the fall? In other words, Congress and not the department has put upon the transportation companies this burden in the way of increased weight, due to increased mail matter.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How would it do to say "within the next 12 months"?

Mr. BOURNE. I think it should be done in the fall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was, on page 22, line 2, before the word "each," to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$3,500"; in line 3, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,200" and insert "\$2,500"; in line 4, before the word "each," to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$2,500"; in line 6, before the word "clerks," to strike out "three hundred and twelve" and insert "thirty-two"; in line 8, before the word "clerks," to strike out "one thousand three hundred and sixty-six" and insert "three hundred and four"; in line 10, before the word "clerks," to strike out "three hundred and two" and insert "one thousand five hundred and twenty-seven"; in line 12, before the word "clerks," to strike out "two thousand nine hundred and thirty-four" and insert "one thousand one hundred and sixty-eight"; in line 14, before the word "clerks," to strike out "two thousand three hundred and eighteen" and insert "four thousand two hundred and one"; in line 20, before the word "hundred," to strike out "six" and insert "eight"; in line 21, before the word "hundred," to strike out "seven" and insert "nine"; in line 22, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$24,826,000" and insert "\$24,755,850; and the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during the fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than this sum"; on page 23, line 2, after the word "clerks," to insert "and make necessary appointments and promotions," and in line 6, after the word "exceeded," to insert "Provided further, That hereafter the Postmaster Gen-

eral may, in his discretion, under such regulations as he may provide, allow any railway postal clerk who is not entitled to annual leave under other provision of law leave of absence with pay for a period not exceeding 30 days, with the understanding that his duties will be performed without expense to the Government during the period for which leave is granted, he to provide a substitute at his own expense," so as to make the clause read:

Railway Mail Service: For 15 division superintendents, at \$3,500 each; 4 assistant superintendents, at \$2,500 each; 15 assistant division superintendents, at \$2,500 each; 112 chief clerks, at not exceeding \$2,000 each; 32 clerks, grade 10, at not exceeding \$1,800 each; 304 clerks, grade 9, at not exceeding \$1,700 each; 1,527 clerks, grade 8, at not exceeding \$1,600 each; 1,168 clerks, grade 7, at not exceeding \$1,500 each; 4,201 clerks, grade 6, at not exceeding \$1,400 each; 5,292 clerks, grade 5, at not exceeding \$1,300 each; 3,656 clerks, grade 4, at not exceeding \$1,200 each; 405 clerks, grade 3, at not exceeding \$1,100 each; 1,895 clerks, grade 2, at not exceeding \$1,000 each; 1,950 clerks, grade 1, at not exceeding \$900 each; in all, \$24,755,850; and the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during the fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than this sum; and, to enable the Postmaster General to reclassify the salaries of railway postal clerks and make necessary appointments and promotions, he may exceed the number of clerks in such of the grades as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the number of clerks in the aggregate as herein authorized be not exceeded: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, under such regulations as he may provide, allow any railway postal clerk who is not entitled to annual leave under other provision of law leave of absence with pay for a period not exceeding 30 days, with the understanding that his duties will be performed without expense to the Government during the period for which leave is granted, he to provide a substitute at his own expense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 24, after line 13, to strike out:

For rent, light, fuel, telegraph, miscellaneous and office expenses, schedules of mail trains, telephone service, and badges for railway postal clerks, \$80,000, including rental of offices for division headquarters, and chief clerk Railway Mail Service, in Washington, D. C.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 18, to insert:

For rent, light, fuel, telegraph, miscellaneous and office expenses, schedules of mail trains, telephone service, badges for railway postal clerks, including rental of offices for division headquarters, and chief clerks, Railway Mail Service, in Washington, D. C. and rental of space in railroad stations or elsewhere for terminal railway post offices for distribution of mails when the furnishing of space for such distribution can not under the postal laws and regulations properly be required of railroad companies without additional compensation, and for rental of railway post-office cars placed at railroad stations and used as terminal railway post offices when the cars are needed for such purpose 12 or more consecutive hours, \$280,000, of which \$50,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may hereafter make leases for terminal railway post offices other than in railway post-office cars for terms not exceeding 10 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 11, after the word "allowance," to insert "covering actual expenses"; in line 14, after the word "headquarters," to strike out "at a rate to be fixed by the Postmaster General"; in line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$3" and insert "\$4"; in the same line, after the words "per day," to insert "\$5,108"; and in line 17, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$4,531" and insert "\$5,808," so as to make the clause read:

For per diem allowance covering actual expenses of four assistant superintendents while actually traveling on official business away from their home, their official domicile, and their headquarters, not to exceed \$4 per day, \$5,108, and for their necessary official expenses not covered by their per diem allowance, not exceeding \$700; in all, \$5,808.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 18, after the words "cable cars," to strike out "\$800,000" and insert "\$847,400," so as to read:

For inland transportation of mail by electric and cable cars, \$847,400.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 19, before the word "service," to strike out "seaboard" and insert "seapost"; in the same line before the word "steamships," to strike out "of" and insert "on"; in line 22, after the word "piers," to strike out "and"; in line 24, after the word "for," to strike out "transporting" and insert "transferring"; in the same line, after the word "foreign," to strike out "mails" and insert "mail"; and, on page 27, line 3, before the word "acting," to insert "hereafter," so as to make the clause read:

For transportation of foreign mails, \$3,900,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General shall be authorized to expend such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding \$112,800, to cover the cost to the United States of maintaining sea-post service on steamships conveying the mails, and not exceeding \$88,100 for transferring the foreign mail from incoming steamships in New York Bay to the steamship and railway piers, for transferring the foreign mail from incoming steamships in San Francisco Bay to the piers, and for transferring the foreign mail from incoming steamships at Honolulu from quarantine to the piers; also for transferring the mail from steamships performing service under contract for transporting United States mail: *Provided*, That hereafter acting clerks may be employed in place of clerks or substitutes injured while on duty who shall be granted leave of absence with full pay during the period of disability, but not exceeding one year, then at the

rate of 50 per cent of the clerk's annual salary for the period of disability exceeding one year but not exceeding 12 months additional, and that the Postmaster General may pay the sum of \$2,000, which shall be exempt from payment of debts of the deceased, to the legal representative of any sea-post clerk or substitute sea-post clerk who shall be killed while on duty, or who, being injured while on duty, shall die within one year thereafter as the result of such injury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General," on page 27, line 23, after the word "stamps," to strike out "\$800,000" and insert "\$822,000," so as to make the clause read:

For manufacture of adhesive postage stamps, special-delivery stamps, books of stamps, and for colling of stamps, \$822,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 2, after the word "wrappers," to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,664,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the manufacture of stamped envelopes and newspaper wrappers, \$1,664,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 4, before the word "envelopes," to insert "and official," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of agent and assistants to examine and distribute stamped and official envelopes and newspaper wrappers, and expenses of agency at Dayton, Ohio, \$22,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 6, after the words "postal cards," to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$335,000," so as to make the clause read:

For manufacture of postal cards, \$335,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 7, to strike out:

For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of pieces of domestic registered matter, first, third, and fourth classes, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 10, to strike out:

For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of registered articles in the international mails, in accordance with convention stipulations, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 13, to insert:

For payment of limited indemnity for the loss of registered and insured mail, domestic and international, the payment of international indemnity to be made in accordance with convention stipulations, \$100,000: *Provided*, That all unexpended balances to the credit of existing appropriations for indemnity for lost registered mail, either domestic or international, irrespective of the fiscal years for which such appropriations were made, together with all moneys in the hands of officers and agents of the Post Office Department, and all moneys which shall hereafter be recovered, collected, or received from any source whatever on account of lost registered and insured mail, either foreign or domestic, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the service of the Post Office Department, to constitute a continuous reimbursable appropriation, to be denominated "indemnity for lost registered and insured mail." All appropriations for the payment of indemnity for the loss of registered and insured mail, either foreign or domestic, and all moneys deposited as herein provided, shall be available until expended, without regard to fiscal years, for payment of indemnity for lost registered and insured mail, either foreign or domestic, and for the reimbursement to the owners of moneys collected in excess of the amount of indemnity or insurance provided, and to which they are entitled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 30, line 3, after the words "registry system," to strike out "\$4,500" and insert "\$6,500," so as to make the clause read:

For blanks, books, and printed matter of urgent or special character, including the preparation, publication, and free distribution by postmasters to the public of a pamphlet containing general postal information, intaglio seals, and other miscellaneous items of immediate necessity for the registry system, \$6,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 24, before the word "miscellaneous," to insert "of," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase, exchange, and repair of typewriting machines, envelope-opening machines, computing machines, copying presses, numbering machines, and of miscellaneous articles purchased and furnished directly to the postal service, \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 5, before the word "furniture," to strike out "and," and, in the same line, after the word "furniture," to insert "and map supplies," so as to make the clause read:

Supplies for the Rural Delivery Service, including collection boxes, furniture, satchels, straps, map supplies, repairing satchels, furniture and map supplies, repairing, erecting, and painting collection boxes in the Rural Delivery Service, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 10, before the word "laborers," to strike out "three" and insert "six," and, in line 11, after the word "therewith," to strike out "\$120,000" and insert "\$135,000," so as to make the clause read:

To defray expenses incident to the shipment of supplies, including hardware, boxing, packing, cartage, freight, and the pay of 1 carpenter and 6 laborers for assignment in connection therewith, \$135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, the last page in the bill, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

That after the passage of this act employees in the postal service who have become incapacitated through superannuation shall be granted an indefinite leave of absence under the following conditions: *Provided*, That an employee in the postal service who has served for a period of 25 years or more can be recommended by the postmaster of the city in which he is employed for indefinite leave of absence to the Postmaster General under the following conditions: An employee who has become incapacitated from performing his duties through superannuation shall appear before a board of examiners appointed by the Postmaster General, who shall serve without compensation with the exception of a physician, who must examine the applicant and make minute inquiry into his physical and mental condition, and make a report of their findings to the Postmaster General. If the application for indefinite leave of absence is recommended by the board of examiners and approved by the Postmaster General, the applicant shall be granted an extended leave of absence, together with an allowance of \$600 per annum. This allowance shall be divided pro rata into equal daily installments and shall be payable monthly. If it is found necessary to employ a substitute to fill the place of the employee who has been granted an extended leave of absence, said substitute shall be paid at the rate of \$600 per annum: *Provided, however*, That this will in no way interfere with the substitute's promotion provided a vacancy in the regular force occurs and said substitute is in line of promotion by virtue of his standing on the substitute list: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General can order an employee who is on an extended leave of absence to report for duty at the office in which he was last employed during seasons of the year when the mail is extraordinarily heavy and the services of the employee could be utilized to good advantage: *Provided further*, That in the event of an employee being required to perform duty during such emergency periods he shall not receive any extra compensation for such service other than the allowance granted him while on an extended leave of absence.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I particularly call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to this amendment. There has been for many years in both branches of Congress considerable discussion relative to the pensioning and retirement of postal employees. The proposition which I have embodied in this amendment is the most conservative of any of the propositions partaking of the character of a pension system. It is, however, not really a pension proposition. It relates entirely to superannuated employees. In my opinion, after a careful investigation, it would not practically cost the Government of the United States any additional expense, while, on the other hand, the gain in efficiency would be immeasurably great.

This amendment, which is known as the indefinite leave-of-absence plan, will, if enacted into law, insure a greater degree of efficiency among the employees in the postal service. It will provide for the retirement of employees who have devoted their whole lives to the postal service and have arrived at an age where they can no longer keep up the pace that is necessary to maintain the service at a high standard.

Employees will not be eligible to the benefits of this provision until they have served for a period of 25 years or more, and they must be recommended for an indefinite leave of absence by the local postmaster to the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General is to judge as to whether the application should receive consideration, and if he approves of it he refers the application to a board of examiners, one of whom shall be a competent physician. The applicant must appear before this board and be examined as to his physical and mental condition, and the report of their findings to the Postmaster General must be made.

It is a well-known fact that there are a number of civil-service employees who are so incapacitated by reason of infirmities that they can no longer render efficient service, but the chiefs of divisions and postmasters, realizing that these employees would be thrown on the charity of the world if they were dismissed from the service, have not the heart or the desire to remove them. In such instances it would not be necessary to employ a substitute to fill the places of these employees, and in cases where no substitute would be assigned the Government would be the gainer financially.

The expense of putting this system into effect would not be great, for the reason that these employees in the postal service are as a rule men who are drawing salaries of \$1,100 or \$1,200 per annum. The employees who are so incapacitated that they would be granted indefinite leaves of absence under this provi-

sion would be allowed \$600 per annum, and substitutes assigned to take their places would be paid at the same rate as is now allowed for vacation work.

This amendment only applies to employees who have been in the service since 1889, as none of the employees who have entered the service since that date can come under its provisions until they have served at least 25 years. The report of the Post Office Department for 1889, page 332, shows that on June 30, 1888, there were 5,094 employees in the Railway Mail Service, and page 89 discloses the fact that there were 6,346 letter carriers in the City Delivery Service, and it is estimated that there were about 7,000 clerks in first and second class post offices. Bulletin No. 94, published by the Census Bureau, showing the status of employees in the civil service of the United States, 1907, contains the information, on page 51, that 10.1 per cent of the railway mail clerks have served for a period ranging from 20 to 29 years; that 8.8 per cent of the letter carriers and 5.4 per cent of the post-office clerks have served a like period. Thus it will be seen that but 515 railway mail clerks, 558 letter carriers, and 378 post-office clerks, or a total of 1,451 postal employees, could possibly come under the benefits of this provision.

The Rural Delivery Service was established in 1896, so that the employees of this service will not be entitled to the benefit of this provision for another eight years.

It is further provided in this amendment that the Postmaster General can order these employees to report for duty in the offices in which they were last employed during the seasons of the year when the mail is extraordinarily heavy, and the services of these men can be used to good advantage. In the event of their being requested to perform service, they shall not be granted any extra compensation other than the allowance granted them while on an extended leave of absence. It is a reasonable provision; it can be put into practical effect with very little expenditure of money and it will relieve the service of the deadwood and raise the standard of efficiency among the employees by injecting young and vigorous blood in the places of the worn-out men.

On January 2, 1913, I introduced a bill—S. 7887—to provide for the retirement of all employees in the classified civil service. This bill was introduced after mature deliberation and considerable study. All the big corporations of the country are pensioning their old and faithful employees and the entire expense is borne by the corporations themselves. A very able paper has been written on this question by Andrew W. McKee, which was delivered before the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, House of Representatives, January 17, 1912. In this paper Mr. McKee takes occasion to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the following corporations and municipalities have retirement plans for the benefit of their employees:

TEACHERS, FIREMEN, AND POLICE PENSION FUNDS WITHOUT CONTRIBUTION FROM SALARIES.

TEACHERS.

Maryland: Teachers' retirement list. State board of education. Annapolis. Entire State.
Massachusetts: Boston, permanent pension fund.
Nebraska: Omaha.
New Jersey: Entire State.
New York: Retirement fund for the College of the City of New York.
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia, Elkin fund.
Rhode Island: Entire State.
South Carolina: Charleston.

FIREMEN.

California: Oakland and San Francisco.
Connecticut: New Britain and New Haven.
Georgia: Savannah.
Maryland: Baltimore.
Massachusetts: Boston, Cambridge, Holyoke, Lowell, Springfield.
Michigan: Detroit, Grand Rapids, Jackson.
Nebraska: Omaha.
New York: Albany, Buffalo, Elmira, New York.
Ohio: Canton, Columbus, Springfield, Toledo, Youngstown.
Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh.
South Carolina: Charleston.

POLICEMEN.

Connecticut: Hartford, New Britain, Waterbury.
Florida: Jacksonville.
Georgia: Augusta, Savannah.
Louisiana: New Orleans.
Maine: Portland.
Massachusetts: Boston, Cambridge, Fall River, Holyoke, Lowell, Lynn, Somerville, Springfield.
Michigan: Grand Rapids, Jackson, Saginaw.
Minnesota: Duluth.
New Jersey: Bayonne, Hoboken.
New York: Buffalo, Elmira.
Ohio: Akron, Columbus, Springfield, Youngstown.
South Carolina: Charleston.

Retirement under above fund are in the majority, after 20 years' service and over, upon half pay, with disability provision.

COMMERCIAL CORPORATIONS HAVING PENSION FUNDS WITHOUT CONTRIBUTIONS FROM SALARIES OF EMPLOYEES.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co.: Employees, 120,311. Retired at 60 years of age, with 20 or more years of service, continuously, upon

1 per cent of salary during the 10 years preceding retirement. Disability provision for 10 years or more of continuous service.

American Sugar Refining Co.: Employees, 7,500. Retired at 60 to 70 years of age, with 20 or more years of service, upon 1 per cent of salary during the 10 years preceding retirement. One reason for deciding against the type of plan which requires contribution from employees was the high cost of living, which would make any tax on salaries a hardship. Statement of the directors.

Carnegie Foundation: Grants pensions to teachers of universities, colleges, and technical schools, \$15,000.00 having been provided. Average retirement allowance, \$1,628.41. Maximum allowance, \$4,000.

Consolidated Gas Co., New York: Retirement after 35 years service upon 1 per cent of salary during the 5 years preceding retirement.

International Harvester Co.: Employees, 33,900. Retired at 50 years of age for women and 65 years for men, with 20 years or more of service upon 1 per cent of salary during the 10 years preceding retirement.

Mr. George W. Perkins, the supervisory head of the concern, over his own signature, makes the following statement:

"The Harvester Co. does not do this out of pure philanthropy. It had no intentions of passing around a hat full of money that employees might help themselves. It went into it in a purely business spirit, believing that the plan would so knit its vast organization together, would so stimulate individual initiative, would so strengthen and develop the esprit de corps of the organization as to make it possible for the company to increase its business and its earnings, and with the spirit of being willing to share this increased success with its employees. So far the company has every reason to congratulate itself on the result. In all parts of the company's business, at home and abroad, in the office force, in the factories, in the sales department—everywhere—the average interest of the individual in the business is greater than formerly. The employees throughout the organization are vying with one another more and more to improve their respective branches of the business. This means profits for the stockholder; in short, means co-operation that is real, and therefore beneficial to one and all."

National Electric Light Association: Employees, 600,000.

AN INADEQUATE TERM.

By unanimous vote the term "pension," as being inadequate or subject to wrong interpretation, has been eliminated. We recommend as a substitute "service annuity." Our opinion is that the latter is to be paid as a form of compensation for a definite service that can not be rightly included within ordinary wages. It is compensation for continuous service over a period of several years and is to be paid upon carefully prearranged and understood conditions.

That the entire cost of service annuities should be contributed by the company as part of the annual cost of labor.

That this is to be the compensation to which the employee is entitled, in addition to his wages, for rendering continuous and satisfactory service throughout his term of employment.

That any employee having a minimum record of 10 years of continuous and satisfactory service, and who in the opinion of the company has become unfitted for duty, may be retired at any age and given a service annuity; that any such employee may make application for retirement or that the recommendation may be made by his employing officer.

The suggested basis of service annuities is from 1 to 2 per cent of the yearly wages, as may be adopted by the company, for each year of continuous service, based upon the employee's wages during the highest 10 consecutive years of employment.

Provident Loan Society, of New York: The rules are now being formulated, the directors reporting that the minimum pension granted will be 1 per cent of the maximum salary received for each year of service. That pension payments made in any year be charged as of the operating expenses of that year.

Public Service Corporation of New Jersey: Employees, 11,000. Retired age, 60 to 70 years, upon 1 per cent of salary for 10 years preceding retirement.

Standard Oil Co. and Yale University: Pension system under jurisdiction of board of trustees.

United States Steel and Carnegie Pension Fund: Employees, 225,000. Retired age, 60 years for men and 50 years for women, with 20 years or more of service, upon 1 per cent of salary for the 10 years preceding retirement. Disability provision for single men, 35 per cent of present salary; married men, 50 per cent.

RAILROADS.

Railroads having pension systems without contributions from salaries of employees:

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway.
Atlantic Coast Line Railroad.
Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.
Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad.
Brooklyn Rapid Transit Railroad Co.
Buffalo, Rochester & Pittsburgh Railway.
Chicago & North Western Railway.
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway.
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway.
Cleveland, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railway.
Cleveland Valley & Terminal Railroad.
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad.
Illinois Central Railroad.
Lake Shore & Michigan Southern Railway.
Michigan Central Railroad.
Newburg Railway Co.
New York Central & Hudson River Railroad.
New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.
New York Railways Co.
Oregon Railroad & Navigation.
Oregon Short Line Railroad.
Pennsylvania Railroad, Hues east of Pittsburgh.
Pennsylvania lines, west of Pittsburgh.
Philadelphia & Reading Railway.
Southern Pacific.
Union Pacific Railroad.
Washington (D. C.) Street Railway Co.

The pension allowances granted to the employees of the above-named roads are from 1 to 2 per cent of the average salary for the 10 years preceding retirement.

The permanent disabled employees are retired from 10 years' service and thereafter.

The age of retirement is from 60 to 70 years. Compulsory retirement at age of 70.

There are over 800,000 employees in service upon the roads granting civil or straight pensions, which is more than three times the number of civil-service employees in the Federal Government.

The total number of railroad employees in 1908 was 1,436,275, their average daily salary was \$3.24.

The total number in 1910 was 1,609,420, and their average daily salary was \$3.29.

These figures effectively disprove the statement made in some quarters that the establishment of a straight pension is a disbarment of an increase of salary. The Pennsylvania Railroad has increased the salaries of their employees during the past 10 years 26 per cent, and they have been the heaviest contributors to straight pension, having paid since 1900, \$5,512,529.57."

This very interesting information, if authentic, should satisfy the most skeptical that the system adopted by these corporations must be a good business proposition or it would not have been made part of the policy of these institutions and charged, as it is, to their regular running expenses. In the February, 1912, Postal Record appears a copy of an address delivered before the American Civic League, in Washington, by Mr. Miles M. Dawson, a consulting actuary. In this address Mr. Dawson is quoted as saying:

There are now before Congress several bills to provide for the superannuation of civil-service employees. The bill which has been most favored provides for requiring the employees to contribute out of their salaries to a fund estimated by actuaries to be sufficient to purchase certain annuities upon arriving at certain ages, their contributions to be treated in the meantime as a mere savings account withdrawable if the contributor retires from the service without coming into receipt of the annuity.

In commenting on this plan, Mr. Dawson states that he wrote to Mr. Henry William Manly, the greatest expert in Europe upon the subject of pension laws and an actuary of international standing, an author of the most important technical works upon this topic, asking if he favored the contributory bill. The reason Mr. Dawson wrote Mr. Manly was that Mr. Manly had been quoted in a public document as in favor of it. In replying to this communication Mr. Manly is quoted in the following words:

You state that I have been quoted in favor of a compulsory savings-bank plan.

I have had a very large practice in pension-fund finances, have been consulted by the British Government, municipal corporations, many of the great railway companies and banks, as well as large commercial firms, and have written largely on the subject, but I can not understand how any words of mine could be construed as being favorable to the savings-bank principle. I consider it to be the worst scheme ever proposed.

All through the paper of Mr. Dawson appear convincing arguments in favor of retirement plans that are supported without expense to the employees.

In a communication from Mr. Henry William Manly to Mr. George T. Morgan, of Philadelphia, printed in the April, 1912, Postal Record, page 83, Mr. Manly sums up his conclusions of the whole question of retirement as follows:

1. That the straight-out pension attracts the services of the best men, secures contentment, efficiency, loyalty, and a steady flow of promotion, and is the most economical for the employer.

2. That the next best plan is for the employer and employees to contribute equally to a pension fund, because then efficiency is secured by superannuating the old and inefficient, thus providing for the promotion of the best men and for the introduction of young and vigorous men.

3. That a pension fund to which the employees alone contribute is better than nothing; but the service does not attract the higher-grade man; it breeds discontent and keeps the staff inefficient, and all that can be said for it is that it provides for the superannuation of those men who remain in the service long enough to qualify for it. From a monetary point of view it is more expensive than a service without any pension at all.

4. That the compulsory savings-fund scheme is the worst of all. There is nothing attractive whatever about it. If the savings are to be large enough to provide for a pension at 60, they will be so great that the employer must help by increasing the salaries; but the fact that the savings are the property of the employee is a direct incentive for him to leave the service and withdraw them. Thus all but the most inefficient would leave at the first opportunity, and the result would be that the employer would have to pay most of the savings and have a most inefficient staff. This I know from experience, for I have been consulted by large employers of labor who had savings-fund schemes and who found them to work out most unsatisfactorily.

H. W. MANLY.

All the leading foreign Governments have provided retirement plans for their superannuated employees. If these Governments of older and more ripe experience have found it necessary to enact retirement laws to maintain a high standard of efficiency among their civil-service employees, and with all the other evidence before us of like policies being incorporated by the various municipalities and large corporations in our own country doing likewise, I believe that it is time for us to meet this question squarely in the hope of arriving at a proper and satisfactory solution of the problem.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will give this proposition the consideration which it deserves. It is a humanitarian proposition, and I hope it will be placed in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make two points upon this proposed amendment. First, it is general legislation which can not be added to an appropriation bill; and, second, it provides for an increased appropriation, which has not been estimated for by the department or presented by the committee.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, it ought not to be surprising to anyone that an amendment of this kind should be offered. The surprise to me is that men in the civil service of the Government, who are so independent as to believe themselves able to earn their own living without asking any favors of the Government under which they live and which protects them, should ask for a pension. Those who can connect themselves either by blood or marriage with anyone who ever enlisted in any war in the United States is already on the pension roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will venture to suggest to the Senator from Florida that the Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. BRYAN. The Chair has been so kind as to make that suggestion to me the second time quite recently. In connection with the observation of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I want it to appear just exactly what this amendment of his points us to. It points us to a pensioning of the 400,000 civil-service employees of the Government, at an expense of \$40,000,000. It points us to the old-age pension bill now pending in Congress, and that idea is borrowed from the war pension list.

Here is a bill introduced by Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania, the title of which is "to organize an Army Corps, prescribe qualifications for enlistment, define the duties, and fix the compensation and term of enlistment of privates, and for other purposes." They are to be known as the old-age home guard of the United States Army, and anyone who is 65 years of age is a member of the United States Army in the department of the old-age home guard. There is a peculiar provision in one section of it, reading as follows:

Provided, That persons related as husband and wife shall not both be eligible for enlistment, enrollment, and service therein at the same time, and in case of dispute as to whether husband or wife shall be enlisted and enrolled, as herein provided, the question shall be decided by the Secretary of War, by and with the approval of the President.

In other words, you make the President of the United States the arbiter of family quarrels as to which one of them shall be enlisted in the Home Guard of the United States.

Let us see what it is. Section 6 provides:

That no private or applicant for enlistment as private shall be required to leave his or her home for the purpose of enlistment, enrollment, or service in the Old Age Home Guard of the United States Army, nor shall they be required to assemble, drill, or perform any of the other maneuvers nor be subject to any of the regulations of the United States Army, except as herein provided.

Here are the duties they have to perform:

Sec. 7. That privates in the Old Age Home Guard of the United States Army shall be required to report annually, in writing, to the Secretary of War, on blanks furnished by him for the purpose—

What?—

the condition of military and patriotic sentiment in the community where such private lives; but no private shall be discharged, disciplined, or otherwise punished for failure to make such report.

Sec. 8. That the number of persons enlisted in the Old Age Home Guard of the United States Army shall be in addition to the number of officers and privates now required by law in the United States Army.

Senators may say that is not a bill for which any man of reasonable discretion would be asked or expected to vote. Let us see, Mr. President. There are now on the war-pension rolls 400,000 noncombatants, as compared with 500,000, in round numbers, of those who enlisted. It will not be long before the number of noncombatants will exceed the number who enlisted in the war, and it is already true that less than 25 per cent of those who saw actual service in the war are now upon the pension roll. Yet you have more pensioners on it and the amount paid for pensions is larger to-day than has ever been the case heretofore in the history of this Republic.

I heard here last night, in the discussion of the pending appropriation bill, men rise and speak in favor of an increased appropriation for clerks in the postal service. We were told we ought not to be content to pay men only \$60 a month, and the Senate adopted a requirement that the minimum pay should be \$800 a year. Why was the amount raised to \$800? Because of the power of organization demanding the increase.

Why have the pensions for wars mounted up from day to day? Because of the organizations behind them, because whenever a bill is introduced they have men always present to urge them, and because the people whom we are supposed also to represent here are always absent and have to depend upon their Representatives to look out for their interests.

If you can not resist the temptation to give whatever is denominated a war pension increase, will you be able to resist the temptation to give civil pensions? They will have an organization; they have it now. The Senator from Pennsylvania says that there are not so many postal employees and the expense would be small. But let us see. If you put the postal employees on, by what process of reasoning in justice and fairness will you deny to the other civil-service employees a like place upon the pension roll?

Then, Mr. President, this bill which I read—

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. Let me inquire of the Senator if the civil-service employees are placed on the pension roll why should not all other citizens be placed on the pension roll under the same circumstances?

Mr. BRYAN. Certainly; they ought to be.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question, if I may. I am curious to know whether the Senator approves of the pension funds for policemen and firemen in our municipalities, the pensions for teachers in our school systems, and the system of pensions which all the great corporations, the railroads and others, are inaugurating for their employees?

Mr. BRYAN. I will be very glad to answer the Senator if in the meantime the Chair does not again suggest to me that he is ready to rule on the question of order. But I hope the Chair will bear himself with patience for just a few minutes and I will undertake to do that.

Mr. PENROSE. I think a little discussion on this proposition by unanimous consent will be very beneficial. I hope it will be permitted to go on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The discussion, it appears to the Chair, ought to be on the point of order, if discussion is to be had. The rule is explicit that a point of order shall be decided without debate, unless submitted to the Senate.

Mr. BRYAN. Will the Senator from Georgia withhold his point of order? I want really to answer the question asked me by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I dislike to be the cause of preventing any Senator from occupying the floor when he wishes to do so, but we have only about three days longer in which to pass the appropriation bills, and I really think, Mr. President, the point of order ought to be passed on and we ought to go on with the pending bill.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, just a moment before the Chair rules. Inasmuch as there will be another opportunity for me to make the speech I started out to make, I will wait until that time comes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM] has asked me to present for him an amendment, on page 19, line 10, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, after line 10, insert:

The Postmaster General is authorized and directed to procure and submit to Congress at the beginning of the next session, at an expenditure not to exceed \$5,000, plans, specifications, and estimate of cost of a pneumatic, electric or other underground tube system of connection, for the transmission of letters, messages, documents, etc., between the Capitol, Office Buildings of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Executive Departments, and other Government establishments in the city of Washington.

Mr. BOURNE. I accept the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does that require the Postmaster General to report by April 1?

Mr. TOWNSEND. December 1, I think is meant.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It says "at the beginning of the next session."

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think evidently the 1st of December is meant.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My suggestion is that it ought to be modified so as to read "by December 1."

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I understand, a commission has been appointed to make this investigation, has it not?

Mr. BOURNE. A commission has been appointed.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, a commission is now making an investigation into the matter of pneumatic tubes, is it not?

Mr. BOURNE. That is true; but this is to estimate the cost of a connection between the Senate and the House of Representatives in Washington and—

Mr. SMITH, of Georgia. Mr. President, the commission is not charged in any sense with the duty of an investigation of this character. I will say to the Senator that the resolution under which the commission is conducting its work—I am upon that commission—applies solely to the existing lines of pneumatic tubes in certain cities of the United States; as to the advisability of their purchase by the Government; and the price at which the Government can afford to purchase them.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, that commission will ascertain and report upon the efficiency, the saving, and the cost of

the pneumatic-tube system. The question of pneumatic tubes has been before Congress and committees of Congress for 20 years. The companies have always got some designs that they wish the Government to adopt. It seems to me that the commission is already empowered to examine the efficiency. They have the system in New York and in other cities to test its saving, its cost, and its value; and it seems to me, under this proposition, we would have two commissions, engaged very much in the same business, at a double cost. I am willing for the existing commission, which is examining the pneumatic-tube system in New York and elsewhere, to be empowered to do this work.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will yield a moment, I will say that I think this amendment is clearly subject to a point of order. It has not been estimated for and it has not been recommended by a standing committee. So I make the point of order against it.

Mr. SWANSON. I intended to make the point of order unless the power was conferred upon the existing commission. I have no objection to the present commission making this investigation.

Mr. BRISTOW. I insist upon the point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TOWNSEND. At the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM] I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan, in behalf of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM], offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 19, after line 10, it is proposed to insert:

And provided further, That the commission authorized to investigate the feasibility and desirability of the Government purchasing and operating the equipment for pneumatic-tube service in the cities in which such service is now installed is hereby directed to include in its report to Congress plans, specifications, and estimate of cost of a pneumatic, electric, or other underground tube system of connection for the transmission of letters, messages, documents, etc., between the Capitol, office buildings of the Senate and House of Representatives, the executive departments, and other Government establishments in the city of Washington.

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. LODGE. That amendment, as now drawn, is clearly not subject to a point of order. It carries no appropriation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment carries no appropriation.

Mr. LODGE. And it is not general legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It simply defines the duties of a commission. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, we have a commission that is making this investigation, and I do not see why it is necessary for us to go into the details of construction. This commission should be left with the authority it has to make the investigation and report as it sees proper, it seems to me.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to say for the commission that we have no funds to make this investigation with reference to the city of Washington. It would require engineers to study the cost. We will do the best we can if Congress passes the legislation, but I want to put Congress on notice beforehand that we are not engineers and that we would not have the time to do the work even though we were.

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

Mr. BRISTOW. What becomes of the other amendment, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order made on the amendment is overruled.

Mr. BRISTOW. But what, then, becomes of the amendment? The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by striking out, on lines 24 and 25, on page 16, and on lines 1 and 2, on page 17, the words, "That substitute carriers and clerks when assigned to perform the work of regular employees absent on vacations, or when performing auxiliary or temporary work, shall be paid at the rate of 30 cents an hour," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That after June 30, 1913, substitute letter carriers and substitute post-office clerks employed in first and second class post

offices shall, when working for a carrier or clerk absent without pay, or when assigned to perform the work of regular employees absent on vacations, or when performing auxiliary or temporary work, be paid at the rate of 35 cents an hour.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I make the point of order that that amendment involves increases in expenditures and that it has not been estimated for by the department or reported by a committee.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think that objection, Mr. President, is supported by the record. The only substantial change it is proposed to make in the bill is as to the rate of pay, from 30 cents an hour to 35 cents an hour.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is an increase, and no increases can be made from the floor of the Senate, unless estimated for by the department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the amendment does not propose an increase, but rather a decrease in the total estimate. The appropriation contained in the bill as it passed the other House provided that these substitute letter carriers should be paid at the same rate as the clerks for whom they were substituted, in the lines from 17 to 23 on page 16 of the bill. Those lines were stricken out by the Senate committee, and I understand that the amendment was passed over very largely upon the objection made by the Post Office Department that it would require a complicated and expensive system of bookkeeping to keep the accounts of the men at the various uncertain rates of pay corresponding to that of the different men for whom they were substituted.

Mr. JONES. I want to suggest to my colleague that the amendment reported by the committee on page 16 has not yet been acted upon, and the chairman of the committee has agreed to put in a substitute for what is proposed to be stricken out, giving these substitute letter carriers 30 and 40 cents an hour, covering the first part stricken out, which has not yet been acted upon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Thirty and forty cents an hour?

Mr. JONES. Yes; giving them 40 cents an hour. It does not cover the provision which my colleague has also included giving them 30 cents an hour, on lines 24 and 25, that seeming to be a separate provision.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to withdraw the point of order. I do not think it is well taken. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] is right about it. I did not know that the legislation was still in its present condition. I thought it was an effort to change from 30 cents, but the House provision takes it entirely out of the view that I had suggested. I am, therefore, confident that the amendment is in order. I would not embarrass the Chair to make a ruling on the point of order, and I withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That feature of the paragraph was passed over and the Senator from Washington has moved the amendment which has been stated.

Mr. JONES. I merely wanted to state to my colleague that if he would allow the amendment of the committee to be adopted with the substitute offered then he may offer his amendment and change from 30 cents to 35 and 40 cents.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have no objection as to the order in which it is done.

Mr. JONES. It would accomplish just what my colleague desires.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington withdraw his amendment for the present?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I withdraw the amendment for the present.

Mr. BOURNE. I offer the amendment drafted by the Senator from Washington, and move the adoption of it. On page 16, after the amount, I move to insert the following:

Provided, That after June 30, 1913, substitute letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and substitute post-office clerks employed in first and second class post offices shall be paid at the rate of 40 cents an hour when working for a carrier or clerk absent without pay.

In order for that to go in, the Senate should agree to the committee amendment, striking out, beginning with the word "Provided," in line 18, and going down to the end of line 23, and substituting this in place thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator moves to strike out?

Mr. BOURNE. To strike out and insert.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be stricken out of the House text insert the following:

Provided, That after June 30, 1913, substitute letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and substitute post-office clerks employed in first and second class post offices shall be paid at the rate of 40 cents an hour when working for a carrier or clerk absent without pay.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I now submit the amendment which I have already sent to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington submits an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 16 it is proposed to strike out lines 24 and 25 on that page down to and including the word "hour," in line 2, page 7, and in lieu thereof to insert:

Provided, That after June 30, 1913, substitute letter carriers and substitute post-office clerks employed in first and second class post offices shall, when working for a carrier or clerk absent without pay or when assigned to perform the work of regular employees absent on vacations, or when performing auxiliary or temporary work, be paid at the rate of 35 cents an hour.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in view of the amendment which has just been adopted on the motion of the chairman of the committee as a substitute for the amendment which I have just offered, I move to amend the bill by striking out the figure "30," in line 2, page 17, and substituting "35."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington withdraws his first amendment?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I withdraw the former amendment and offer this one in its place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 17, line 2, before the words "cents an hour," it is proposed to strike out "30" and insert "35."

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that the amendment be again stated.

The Secretary again stated the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is an increase, I think. I have not the entire text here so that I can examine it, but I think that is an increase not estimated for and not recommended by the committee.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is estimated for. The bill as it is now framed provides for the service which is estimated for by the department. I should like to say, in explanation of the amendment—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The proposition is to increase the rate from 30 to 35 cents. It is, therefore, an increase, not recommended by the committee and not estimated for by the department, is it not?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not know, Mr. President, if there is any rule upon which that point of order can be made. Certainly, the Senate has a right to increase the recommendation of the committee and also to increase the amounts estimated by the department.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The rule, Mr. President, as the Presiding Officer well understands, is intended to prevent that very course. Increases to be considered must be offered formally to the committee and be considered there. It is to prevent the individual suggestion of an increase to a bill that the rule has been framed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. The rule is, if I may be pardoned a moment, that—

no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation * * * unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the departments.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from Georgia to make a point of order against the amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Georgia to make a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I made the point of order on the proposed amendment.

Mr. OLIVER. I make the point of order, and I am constrained to do so because of the way in which time is going by. I understand the point of order is not debatable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not debatable; and the Chair will rule that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. BOURNE. On behalf of the committee I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 32, line 3, after the word "substations," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the appropriation of \$500,000 made in the Post Office appropriation act approved August 24, 1912, for the improvement of highways, is hereby continued as to any unexpended balance thereof, subject to the conditions of the original appropriation.

Mr. BOURNE. I offer that amendment at the suggestion of the Postmaster General, who thinks there might be some question in reference to the appropriation of \$500,000 for experimentation in road building, which was made in the last Post Office appropriation bill; and, as he has been in correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture and with a number of governors of the States, if any question should arise in reference to the availability of that appropriation, it might create decided embarrassment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 28766, the public buildings bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 28766) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for amendment, the committee amendments to be first considered. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I rose to ask that the bill be read.

Mr. WARREN. The bill will have to be read now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 2, after line 14, to insert:

United States post office at Santa Barbara, Cal., \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 18, after the word "Colorado," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at La Junta, Colo., \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 2, to insert:

United States post office at Dublin, Ga., \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 4, after the name "Georgia," to strike out "\$6,250" and insert "\$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Elberton, Ga., \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

United States post office at Cedartown, Ga., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office, courthouse, and customhouse at Honolulu, Hawaii, \$450,000: *Provided*, That so much of this sum as may be necessary shall be used for the enlargement of the present site.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 17, to insert:

United States post office at New Albany, Ind., \$38,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, at that point I desire to offer an amendment which was omitted by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, after line 19, it is proposed to insert:

United States post office and courthouse at Salina, Kans., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 4, line 1, after the word "Massa-

chusetts," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$18,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Milford, Mass., \$18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 8, to insert:

United States post office at Moorhead, Minn., \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Miles City, Mont., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 3, to insert:

United States post office and courthouse at Lincoln, Nebr., \$175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 7, to insert:

That the limit of cost for the extension, alteration, and improvement of the public building in the city of Concord, N. H., contained in an act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911, and for other purposes, approved June 25, 1910, be, and hereby is, increased from \$32,000 to \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 17, to insert:

United States post office at Plainfield, N. J., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 20, after "\$15,000," to insert "Provided, That not to exceed \$4,000 of said amount may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the present site," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Tarboro, N. C., \$15,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000 of said amount may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the present site.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 3, after the word "Ohio," to strike out "\$45,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Piqua, Ohio, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 5, after the word "Ohio," to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$45,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Alliance, Ohio, \$45,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

For the enlargement of the site for a post-office building at Ashland, Ohio, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 10, to insert:

For the extension and enlargement of the United States post office and courthouse at Oklahoma City, Okla., or for an additional building, \$250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 15, after the word "Oklahoma," to strike out "\$114,750" and insert "\$215,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office and courthouse at Tulsa, Okla., \$215,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 15, to insert:

United States post office at Albany, Oreg., \$10,000, and the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908, is hereby amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to construct said building in such a way as to provide suitable accommodations for the Federal bureaus.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 21, to insert:

United States post office at The Dalles, Oreg., \$24,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

United States post office at Corry, Pa., \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office, courthouse, and customhouse at San Juan, P. R., \$32,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 6, to insert:

United States post office at Narragansett Pier, R. I., \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 3, after the word "reconstruction," to strike out "for a" and insert "to adapt it for use as a United States," so as to make the clause read:

For remodeling and reconstruction, to adapt it for use as a United States courthouse, the building now used for appraisers' stores, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 10, before the words "post office," to insert "United States"; and in the same

line, after the word "building," to insert "and work incident thereto," so as to make the clause read:

For rearranging and constructing offices in the third story of the United States post office and customhouse building, and work incident thereto, \$15,000. The act of Congress approved August 24, 1912, authorizing an expenditure of \$8,000 for rented quarters and moving expenses, is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 15, to insert:

United States post office at Hillsboro, Tex., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 16, to insert:

For the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of additional ground adjoining the post office and courthouse at Sherman, Tex., \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 2, to insert:

United States post office and customhouse at Everett, Wash., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 8, to insert:

That the provisions of the acts of Congress of May 27, 1908, and August 22, 1911, fixing the limit of cost for the new building for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing in Washington, D. C., be, and the same are hereby, amended so as to fix the limit of cost for said new building, including vaults, at \$2,880,000, and any unexpended balance of the appropriations for said vaults remaining after their construction is hereby made available for the purpose of said building, but said limit of cost of \$2,880,000 shall not be exceeded.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should be glad to have the chairman of the committee explain to us what has already been appropriated for this building, and what increase is carried by this bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the original authorization of this building was for \$2,600,000, so that the increase is \$280,000. The building is in process of construction, and the increase is absolutely necessary in order that it may be completed in accordance with the bids which are now before the department. The items that will be covered by the \$280,000 include the interior finish, for which there is a proposal amounting to \$481,344; mechanical equipment, for which there is a proposal amounting to \$295,295; elevators, for which there is a proposal for \$84,844; additional work, for which no proposals are on hand, estimated at \$14,000; and contingencies, \$40,000. That makes a total of \$915,483. The balance available of the amount originally authorized is \$636,319.25, leaving a deficit of \$279,163.75. The committee has put in the round figures, \$280,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Did the original act provide that the building should be constructed for the amount appropriated?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No amount is appropriated at all. Congress passes a bill, as we are now undertaking to pass this bill, authorizing the construction of the building, and fixes a limit of cost. It very often happens that by the time we get around to let contracts for the construction of the building, for various reasons it costs more than was originally estimated. The items that we have thus far read in this bill are all items of that character. The price of labor increases, the price of material increases, contingencies arise that are not foreseen, and therefore it is necessary, in order that the buildings may be completed and may be made available for use, that these increases should be made, or the building abandoned.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in section 2, page 10, line 22, after the word "rebuilding," to insert "reconstruction," so as to make the clause read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter into contracts for the enlargement, extension, remodeling, rebuilding, reconstruction, or improvement of the following-named buildings within the respective limits of cost hereby fixed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 2, after the word "California," to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$115,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office and customhouse at Oakland, Cal., \$115,000: *Provided*, That this amount, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be used for the acquisition of additional land for the enlargement of the present site.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 7, after the word "Illinois," to strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$240,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office, courthouse, and other governmental offices at East St. Louis, Ill., \$240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 10, to strike out:

United States post office at New Albany, Ind., \$38,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 20, to insert: United States post office at Hagerstown, Md., \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 4, to insert: United States post office at Moberly, Mo., \$35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 5, to insert: United States post office at Missoula, Mont., \$125,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In line 6, page 12, after the word "post office," I move to insert the words:

Courthouse, and other governmental offices.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 12, line 6, in the committee amendment, after the word "post office," it is proposed to insert a comma and the words:

Courthouse, and other governmental offices.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 12, after line 7, to strike out:

United States post office and courthouse at Lincoln, Nebr., \$175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 15, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in his discretion, to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, the remainder of the block in which the post office in the borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, State of New York, is located, at a cost not exceeding \$350,000, and any unexpended balance of the appropriation for this enlargement of said site may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the alteration or remodeling and repair of the buildings upon such newly acquired property to adapt such structures, or any of them, for temporary use for the purposes of the Government pending the completion of an extension of the present Federal building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the chairman of the committee if the word "adopt" in line 25 is not a misprint for "adapt"?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; that should be corrected.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the word "adopt" on line 25, page 12, and insert the word "adapt."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 13, after line 6, to strike out:

For the enlargement of the site for a post-office building at Ashland, Ohio, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 8, to insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to enlarge the site of the public building belonging to the United States in the city of Newport, R. I., by the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of adjoining property within a limit of cost not to exceed \$100,000, and upon the present site so enlarged the Secretary is authorized and directed to cause to be erected a suitable new building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office, customhouse, United States engineer office, Navy pay office, constructing quartermaster's office, Weather Bureau, Civil Service Commission, and other Government offices, within the limit of cost, including the building and addition to site hereby fixed, of \$400,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should be glad to have the chairman of the committee explain the size of that appropriation, the size of the place, and the amount of mail handled by it.

Mr. WETMORE. Mr. President, it is proposed by the pending amendment to enlarge the present Federal building site at Newport, R. I., at a cost not exceeding \$100,000, and erect on the enlarged site a new building at a limit of cost for building and enlarged site of \$400,000. The estimate of the Treasury Department was \$450,000. If there are any other questions the Senator would like to ask, I shall be pleased to answer them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How is it that the appropriation seems so much larger than the usual appropriation for a building in a city of 30,000 inhabitants?

Mr. WETMORE. It is less than the amount estimated. The Treasury Department estimated \$450,000, and this is \$50,000 under the estimate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course the estimate would depend upon the character of the finish of the building. My ob-

jection to it is that as buildings are erected throughout the country, I do not think a \$400,000 investment is usually made for a city of 30,000 population.

Mr. WETMORE. If the Senator will observe the different branches of the Government that are to occupy offices in this building he will see there is an unusually large number—the post office, the customhouse, the Navy pay office, the United States engineer office, the constructing quartermaster's office, the Civil Service Commission, the Weather Bureau, and the Department of Justice.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, those additional features of service are found in a great many cities. The objection I have is that there ought to be some uniformity in these appropriations in proportion to population and postal receipts. My objection to the present appropriation is that it is so much larger than is usually made for cities of that size or of that amount of postal receipts.

I do not think there is any necessity to make the building more ornate because it is at Newport. Of course I appreciate the fact that there is a very charming class of people going there during the summer; but I can not understand why, for that reason or for any other reason, we should make an exception and appropriate more in proportion at one place than we do at another.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Rhode Island will yield to me, the amount which should be spent for a Government building in a given place can not always be determined by ascertaining the population. For example, in a town of five or six thousand people, where only a post office is needed, a comparatively small building will suffice, but if a Federal court is held in that town a larger building is necessary. If, in addition to that, it is a port of entry, and a customhouse is maintained there, a still larger building must be provided.

In the case of Newport there is not only a post office which would be found in any town of this size but there is a branch of the Department of Justice and there is a branch of the customs service. This is an exceedingly important point. There is a very large harbor there. In addition to that, the Civil Service Commission must be taken care of. The Agricultural Department must be taken care of there. It has employees at that point. The War Department maintains a station at that point, and so does the Navy Department. When we come to consider that all these officials of the Government are to be housed, it becomes necessary to appropriate a larger sum of money than a mere post office would require.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator tell us what floor space is occupied by these Government officials now? Is it the floor space or the character of the building that is being erected that causes the difference?

Mr. WETMORE. I think the present building has about 20,000 square feet of space on all floors, and the requirements are for about twice that amount. The building, of course, would be a substantial structure; but as to being an ornate structure, I should be the last person in the world to urge anything of that sort, because I do not believe in over-decoration or over-ornamentation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is estimated by the department that it will require a two-story-and-basement building, covering 15,000 square feet of ground area, and it is upon that that the estimate is made. Of course, it is to be a building of fireproof construction. The Government ought to construct no other kind of buildings, in my judgment. I can tell the Senator no more about it than appears in the report of the Supervising Architect, who is the expert employed to look into these matters and report upon them.

Mr. WETMORE. The present site, purchased in 1828, comprises 9,038 square feet. The building, with the additions made at different times since 1829, covers the entire site, except a small entrance way in one corner, with an adjoining building on the south, practically touching the Government building. There is no reserved space for fire protection, and neither the Government building nor any of the adjoining buildings are fireproof, being principally of frame construction. The Government building is placed directly on the corner of two streets—one of them narrow—with only a four or five foot sidewalk, which is blocked a part of the time by wagons delivering and taking away mail and carrying merchandise to and from the bonded warehouse.

Owing to great increase of business the present building is overcrowded and the Government is renting quarters. Recently as much as \$1,450 a year has been paid for outside offices, exclusive of rent of post-office stations.

In the proposed new building the following branches of the Federal service will require accommodation: Post office, cus-

toms service, Navy pay office, War Department (headquarters Newport engineer district and constructing quartermaster), Civil Service Commission, Weather Bureau, and the Department of Justice.

The postal receipts in 20 years have increased as follows:

1892	-----	\$33,997.59
1902	-----	58,107.75
1912	-----	90,801.66

The post office has 59 employees, with additional carriers and clerks during the summer months.

The gross receipts of the Newport customhouse have increased from \$2,372.61 in 1892 to \$46,559.22 in 1912.

The gross revenue of the post office and customhouse, therefore, for 1912 was \$137,360.88.

The permanent population of Newport in 1910 was 27,149. In 1913 it is about 30,000, and is increased during the summer months to about 35,000. In addition, Newport Harbor is now the headquarters for half the year of the North Atlantic Fleet, with from 10,000 to 12,000 men at maximum. Newport is the headquarters of the Narragansett Bay Naval Station, including the naval training station, with about 2,500 apprentice seamen, the Naval War College, naval torpedo station, employing 800 men, naval hospital, and the Narragansett naval coal depot. It is also the Army headquarters of the Narragansett coast-defense district, comprising Fort Adams, with a garrison of over 500 men, Fort Getty, Fort Greble, Fort Mansfield, and Fort Wetherill. The heavy official mail of the Government stations at Newport requires additional work and facilities, but for which Newport gets no credit in its statement of gross receipts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would rather the Chair would not put the question in that way. I wish to announce my objection.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 23, to insert:

United States post office and courthouse at Chattanooga, Tenn., \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 2, to insert:

For the completion of the tower and installation of a clock therein in the post office and courthouse at Danville, Va., \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 5, to insert:

United States post office at Martinsburg, W. Va., \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 7, to insert:

United States post office at Huntington, W. Va., \$225,000.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee as to what necessity there is requiring an appropriation so large for Huntington, W. Va. I understand that Huntington has a population of 30,000 and an appropriation of \$225,000 for a public building seems rather extravagant.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The original building erected at Huntington some years ago cost \$150,000. The town of Huntington has grown very rapidly since that time. It has become a very large business center.

I have in my hand a card which shows the old public building which is altogether inadequate. The Senator will see back of it a modern 12 or 14 story business house. As I recall it, the proposed building will accommodate not only the post office but a number of other governmental offices, including the court. I have not at hand at this moment the memorandum to which I wanted to refer.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator know the population of Huntington?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is about 30,000, as the Senator stated.

Mr. KENYON. Has it recently increased?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am mistaken. As reported by the last census the population was 40,000 and information we have is that it has increased very greatly since that time. The remarkable growth will be shown by a comparison of the population in 1902 with that in 1912. The population in 1902 was only 11,923 so that it has more than trebled in population during that period.

The matter was considered by the committee and it was believed that all things considered it was necessary to make this increase in the building.

I have here a statement from the Representative in Congress from that district, Mr. HUGHES. In the course of his letter he says:

The workroom of this post office is so congested that it is almost impossible to handle the business. In addition to this the court room—

I thought there was a court room—

In addition to this the court room is not more than one-third the size that is really required, and, in addition to that, it is located on a street where the noise is such that at times court has to suspend until after the heavy wagons pass by the building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill and read to line 18, on page 15, the last clause read being as follows:

United States post office and courthouse at Jasper, Ala., \$100,000.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee what were the postal receipts in the town of Jasper last year?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The town of Jasper, Ala., is not a large town.

Mr. O'GORMAN. What is the population?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is less than 3,000.

Mr. O'GORMAN. What are the postal receipts?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My best recollection is that the postal receipts are over \$8,000—nearly \$9,000. It is a very busy town. I call attention to the fact that not only is there a post office at Jasper but the Federal court is held there. It is necessary not only to have a building for post-office purposes but for the Federal court. This is a House item. It is not a Senate committee item.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I understand that. What is the present rental paid by the Government for post-office facilities in that town?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am not able to tell the Senator. That is not found in the memorandum which I have from the Treasury Department.

Mr. O'GORMAN. This is simply typical of a great many provisions in the bill. Here is a town with a population of less than 3,000, with an annual postal business of about \$8,000, where the probable rent now being paid by the Government is less than a thousand dollars a year, perhaps not more than \$500 or \$600, and it is proposed to erect a public building at an expense of \$100,000.

I understand that for many years it has been the policy of the Government to erect no public buildings for post-office purposes where the annual postal receipts were less than \$10,000, that being the minimum condition which would warrant an expenditure by the Government for the erection of a Federal building. Why that rule, observed for so many years, has been disregarded at this time I do not know, but I do know that in the pending bill there are provisions for 92 or 96 public buildings which would not be erected if the rule to which I refer were respected. If we are to expend \$100,000 for a building in a town with less than 3,000 population, there is no limit to the waste and extravagance which will mark our public expenditures.

I should like to know very much from the chairman of the committee that recommends the bill the exact amount of rent that is now being paid by the Federal Government for post-office purposes in that town.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The bill carries several hundred items. The chairman of the committee is unable to state to the Senator what rent is paid for this building, as the chairman has already stated. The fact is that it is a town of less than 3,000 people and the receipts of the post-office are extraordinarily large for a town of that size.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Yet you confess that the receipts do not exceed \$8,000 a year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In addition to that there is a Federal court held there, for which quarters must be supplied. The Federal Government can not confiscate property down there and hold its court in them. It must provide quarters for the court. The amount to be expended for a public building in a town of this size is not to be determined by the post-office receipts alone nor by its population alone.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Can it not be determined fairly well by ascertaining what you could rent suitable quarters for?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think that always ought to be the test. We are providing here not for appropriations but for authorizations. In the natural course it will be four or five years before these buildings can be put up. In the meantime these towns are growing, and unless we can make the authorizations a sufficient time in advance we are lagging far behind what is necessary.

I think, in addition to all that, it is a little bit important to have the Federal Government in a town like this where it is holding its courts represented by a building, with the flag flying at the top of it, and to have the physical presence of the Federal Government in that way before the eyes of the people. I think that consideration is of some consequence.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Can you not have the American flag flying over a building that the Federal Government rents? I notice one item with respect to the State of Alabama proposed by the Senate committee for a building in the town of Greenville. The amount appropriated for that is \$71,000. There is a population of 12,000. The rental paid at the present time, presumably for suitable accommodations, is but \$480 a year. Capitalize that, and the extreme cost of building should not exceed \$20,000. Yet this bill recommends an expenditure of \$71,000; \$75,000 was asked. It is estimated that \$71,000 will be required.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARREN. I do not know what town the Senator is alluding to, but these rentals are the poorest standards in the world to judge by, because oftentimes the town is, I may say, taken by the ears and the merchants and office people bid against one another in order to have the post office housed in their particular merchandise or office building.

I have in mind a piece of property which was to be rented at \$1,800 a year for a business purpose. A pool was made up, and the owner rented it to the Government for \$4 a year, neighbors in the town making up the difference to the owner. That rental would not show the population or business of that post office.

Mr. O'GORMAN. If there be such anxiety among owners of real estate to secure the United States Government as a tenant, why should not the Government take advantage of that keen rivalry and get cheap rents, rather than expend hundreds of thousands of dollars for buildings which are not required.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator thinks that the Government should go into towns and undertake to make trouble and set every man's hands against another, he has a different view of the duties of the Government, or even its privileges, than I have.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The Senator from Wyoming knows that the Senator from New York has made no such suggestion. I know of no place where the Government has caused trouble by renting a building for public purposes.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator may not know of these disturbances that I speak of in smaller towns. They do occur and have occurred. I have always deprecated the practice, and the Senator would do the same, I think, if he lived in any one of those towns.

The Senator said he thought the Government ought to take advantage of these things. I think legitimate advantages should be taken by the Government, but I do not believe it is a good practice to undertake, as I said before, to sell to some grocer or dry-goods man the influence of the post office and take it out in low rent.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming, who has had large experience on the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Public Buildings, why there has been an abandonment of the old rule which was recognized for at least 10 years, that the Government would erect no building for the use of a post office unless the postal receipts were at least \$10,000 a year?

Mr. WARREN. I know of no such rule. It must have been prior to my time.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I am assured that it is the rule which has been applied. There are 92 items in this bill which would not be favorably considered if that rule were enforced now.

Mr. WARREN. I say again, in my 21 years' service, I know of no such rule, except I know that sometimes in committee, and I think this was the practice in the House committee, the proposition was made to confine, as far as possible, the buildings to those that covered towns of \$10,000 postal receipts, but the House did not strictly follow it. The Senate has not followed it entirely, because in some one town the growth may be complete or it may be even receding, while in another town the surroundings are such as to show that the population must increase and double or triple or quadruple in one, two, or three years.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I think we ought to take the sense of the Senate on the proposition with respect to this particular item.

Mr. WARREN. What is the item, please?

Mr. O'GORMAN. The item providing for \$100,000 to be spent in a building in the city of Jasper, which has a population of less than 3,000 and total postal receipts for last year amounting to \$8,508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York moves to strike out lines 17 and 18, page 15.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, with reference to the item selected by the Senator from New York, I desire to say that the town of Jasper is situated in the very center of the richest coal field in Alabama. A few years ago there was not a brick build-

ing in the town. Recently three trunk railroads have passed Jasper. The population has doubled two or three times in the last four or five years.

The county of Walker, in which Jasper is situated, has recently completed a courthouse at a cost of \$175,000. They have magnificent hotels and department stores, and it is one of the most rapidly growing towns that I know of anywhere in the country. The post-office rentals are very nominal, perhaps because the business men of the town wanted the post office located at a convenient point for the patrons of the post office. Therefore they made a contract, or arrangement, or a pool, as had been suggested, by which perhaps \$30 a month is paid by the Government for the office.

In addition to the post office a Federal court is held there.

The estimate of the department for this building was \$135,000. It was the estimate of the Treasury Department that that amount was necessary to construct a post office and courthouse at this rapidly growing town. Neither my colleague nor myself asked the committee to increase it; we were willing to accept that amount.

Again, I think the Senator from New York referred to an item in this bill for Greenville, Ala., and designated it as a Senate amendment. I think he is mistaken about that. I think that item came over from the House in the bill.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have the record here showing the Senate amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I know that I did not go before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ask for an increase for anything or for any additional building, and I do not think my colleague made any request for this one. That is all I care to say about the public building contained in this item for Jasper and the post office and courthouse to be provided. The estimate of the department was that \$135,000 was necessary to do it. The House appropriated \$100,000, and I hope the Senate will stand by the action of the House.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] has moved to strike out lines 17 and 18, on page 15.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to say that I can not get the consent of my mind to vote for a \$100,000 building in a town that has not even a free-delivery postal service, and with a population of less than a thousand people.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I only select this as an illustration of what is becoming a crying abuse and evil, which the Senate ought to correct. I should be glad to see every town and city in Alabama have a splendid edifice if it were possible for the Government to afford similar structures for every small town and village throughout the country.

The Senator tells us that at the present time the Government is paying \$30 a month—\$360 a year—for the post office in that town. That sum capitalized would represent a structure worth about \$7,000. It is now proposed that, instead of spending \$360 a year for rent, we expend at once \$100,000 for a structure which, at 5 per cent, would represent the minimum cost of \$5,000 a year. If the Senate is prepared to use public funds in that indiscriminate manner, the Senate, of course, can take the responsibility; I can not.

I understand that my attitude may imperil provisions in this bill which, I think, are vitally necessary to the State of New York at this time. But this consideration will not deter me from doing what I conceive to be my duty. I hope at some time that the experience of this body will evolve some other method of legislation, rather than these omnibus bills, which contain some concededly meritorious propositions, but, at the same time, many measures which can not be defended.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I desire to say that the committee made it a rule to report no appropriation for a building in excess of the estimates made by the Treasury Department. To expect this committee to visit the different localities, to ascertain the value of the land, and the land needed in every individual case for the purposes of the Government and the building needed would be to expect an utter impossibility. I wish to say for the committee that the rule was established that the committee would report an appropriation for no building in excess of the amount recommended by the Treasury Department after an investigation. That is the machinery which Congress has seen proper to establish for the purpose of ascertaining the cost of the land, the cost of the building, and what the Government will need. The Secretary of the Treasury writes to the Post Office Department, to the Department of Justice, to the Agricultural Department, to the customs department to ascertain the amount of space needed, if a building is recommended for construction, and what will be needed for

some time in the future. Then they figure the cubic feet of space required, and figure what that space will cost on an average from estimates which have been made in the past. If anyone can suggest to the committee any other or better way to ascertain what can be done, I should like to know it.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I simply wish to ask the Senator from Virginia a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The Senator from Virginia asks if there is any other way that I know by which this information may be obtained. I will try to answer that by the inquiry: If you get what is needed for \$360 a year, what is the necessity of taking \$100,000 of public money to put up a building?

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, it will be four years before that building can be constructed. If you are going to construct a building there at all, you had as well construct one which is necessary for Government purposes.

This bill carries millions of dollars. Why? Because when public buildings were heretofore constructed they were not constructed with a view to their being satisfactory for more than 25 or 30 years. In the very bill which the Senator from New York is looking over there are provisions for additional buildings, for pulling down old buildings, and putting up new ones. I think the wise policy is if you are going to erect a building at any place to erect one which will answer its purpose certainly for 25 or 50 years. It is absolute loss and folly to construct a building and in 5 or 10 years have to pull it down. By so doing you lose what you have put in it.

Take the small buildings which are complained of by different Senators. We have inaugurated a system of parcels post. There is scarcely a post office in the United States to-day without the parcels post. Nearly all those post offices are crowded, and they will be more crowded in five years from now. In five years from now there is not one of those buildings which it will not be impossible to occupy. The Government will be compelled to construct new buildings on account of the great increase of the parcels post.

I repeat, the committee has recommended no appropriation except on an estimate made by the Treasury Department. I wish to say for the committee, and, speaking for it, I, as a member of the committee, and the other members refused to vote to report any appropriation unless the Treasury Department would estimate for it. Some Senators came and represented to the committee that the appropriation provided for a building was not adequate; that conditions had changed; that rural free delivery routes had been established; that more space was needed, and so forth. If I recollect correctly, every such Senator was told, "Unless you can get from the Treasury Department, by its method of investigation, an estimate of what is needed we can not recommend the appropriation." The committee has refused to increase such appropriations even at the request of Senators.

The Senator from New York has a provision, if I mistake not, to buy land for a court in New York, is it not?

Mr. O'GORMAN. It is.

Mr. SWANSON. For a court, though they have already got a good court, a far better court, which far exceeds anything Jasper has got. Here is an appropriation of \$3,000,000. Why? Because it is needed, because the court is congested, and to get land now, because the land will become more valuable in the future. It seems to me that for a town like Jasper, Ala., that is growing by leaps and bounds, with a courthouse and a post office and other buildings, the appropriation is not excessive when the Treasury Department has estimated that \$31,000 would be required for the future. Instead of being extravagant the committee has been economical. If you want to erect a post office and courthouse building there, I do not think it is wise to put it off. You can put one there for \$10,000; but two years from now you will want to tear it down and to put up one to cost \$20,000. You can then put up one for \$20,000, but two years from that time you will be wanting to tear that down and put up another, and 40 or 50 years from now they will want more. There has been an absolute waste of public money by putting up small, inconsiderable buildings, which have been torn down and others put up in their stead.

The only question to decide is, whether you want a building there; and that is for the Senate to decide. If they want a building there, you had better put up one which will last for 25 years, rather than a small building that will hardly answer for present purposes, and then be eliminated by putting a new structure there.

The committee has had that difficulty to contend with; and if there is any criticism of these expenses and of the amount

which is proposed to be given for the construction of buildings, it lies with the Treasury Department, which has made the estimates for the purpose. I think the economical way is to let every building stand on its own merits. I think these omnibus bills, whether claims bills, whether river and harbor bills, whether public building bills, or whether pension bills, increase expenditures. I think if you want to have economy in these matters and Congress had the time, it would be better to let every measure stand on its own individual merits. This bill has been prepared along the lines I have indicated, and the estimates of the Treasury Department have not been exceeded, so far as I know, in a single instance.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, some reference has been made to a provision in this bill making an appropriation for a site for a new Federal building in the city of New York. Three million dollars was the amount fixed by the subcommittee. A bill for this purpose was introduced by me upward of a year ago. Everyone seemed to recognize the necessity of a new building in New York. The Department of Justice, the Federal judges, and all the public officials recognized its urgent need; and \$3,000,000 was allowed for a site. In New York the postal receipts exceed \$25,000,000 a year—not \$8,000 a year.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, that item is not for a post office, is it?

Mr. O'GORMAN. It is for the purpose of doing away with the present post office and erecting a separate courthouse building and a separate post office, the immediate provision for the post office being deferred until the new court building is constructed.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, that shows the unwisdom of the policy advocated by the Senator from New York. When the original post office and courthouse in New York was constructed, if they had made it large enough to answer the purposes at that time and to allow for future growth and expansion, we would not have to go to the expense of possibly twenty-five or fifty million dollars, before we get through, to provide proper Federal facilities in the city of New York.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have to observe, Mr. President, that if a town of 3,000 people justifies a public expenditure of \$100,000 for a Federal building, the city of New York, with its more than 5,000,000 people, would be entitled to several hundred million dollars of public money for public buildings.

Of the \$25,000,000 of postal receipts in the post office in the city of New York annually, \$20,000,000 is clear profit to the Government, making it possible to extend our postal system throughout different parts of this country at a minimum of loss to the Government because of the \$20,000,000 profit annually derived from the operation of the New York office. Moreover, the United States courts in New York City contribute to the National Treasury annually upward of \$5,000,000, the proceeds of fines and other proceedings in those courts. But there is nothing in common between the provision for New York and the one which I have ventured to criticize; but I have to observe that if one town of 3,000 people is entitled to a public building costing \$100,000, then every other town throughout the country of the same size is entitled to the same treatment, and it would not be long before the National Treasury would be bankrupt if this system were tolerated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator from New York keeps on insisting that this town has a population of 3,000. We have a thousand children in our public schools in Jasper and two magnificent school buildings. The population is more than 6,000. Jasper has more than doubled in population since the census of 1900, and within the next five years it will double in population if it keeps on growing as it has done in the past.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from New York is not in order now, because the Senate has agreed to take up the bill and first consider committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the amendment of the Senator from New York will not be in order until after the committee amendments have been acted upon.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I did not catch the ruling of the Chair. Did the Chair rule that committee amendments must first be passed on, and then, at the end, when they have been disposed of, that we may have the right to amend the committee amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate agreed by unanimous consent that the committee amendments should be first considered.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Then we can amend them afterwards?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course the committee amendments can be amended.

Mr. BACON. As they are taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As they are taken up.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is what I meant.

Mr. BACON. The inquiry of the Senator from Arizona was whether they could be subsequently taken up. As I understand the ruling of the Chair, when a committee amendment is presented it is open then to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly; but individual amendments are not in order until the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood that the agreement was that the bill should be read and that it could be amended paragraph by paragraph as we reached them. I think that is the mode upon which we have been proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not in the chair when the agreement was made; but he is informed that the agreement was the usual one, to the effect that committee amendments were to be first considered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I chanced to be in the chair at the time, and the agreement was that the committee amendments should first be considered. There was no objection when the request was put by the Chair.

Mr. O'GORMAN. What becomes of my motion, Mr. President, to strike out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will have to wait until the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, in section 3, page 15, after line 20, to insert:

United States post office at Globe, Ariz., \$100,000.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish we might have some information as to that. I understand that Globe is a town of about 7,000 people. Is court held there also?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; but there is a customhouse at Globe, Ariz.

Mr. KENYON. I will ask the Senator if he can inform me as to the population of Globe?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I can not give the Senator the exact figures. The population is less than 8,000—between 7,000 and 8,000. I said there was a customhouse at Globe, Ariz. I beg the Senator's pardon. I was looking at the time at the previous item. There is no customhouse at Globe. I was mistaken. There is, however, a branch office of the Civil Service Commission there.

Mr. KENYON. Do they need a building?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; they do not need a building, but they need some room.

Mr. KENYON. Objection was made to the item of \$400,000 for Newport, which is a city of 30,000 people, while this is a city of but 7,000 people, and it is proposed to appropriate \$100,000 for it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The postal receipts are \$18,718, according to the last statement. The Treasury Department estimates that the necessary building will cost \$100,000 for a one-story and basement building covering 6,000 square feet of ground. The committee have no other way of determining what the necessities of the towns are except from the report of the experts of the Treasury Department.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee, whether this provision for a public building at Globe, Ariz., for which \$100,000 is to be appropriated, is intended to cover the purchase of a site alone?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, as I understand, the site has already been purchased at Globe. There are from 7,500 to 8,500 or 9,000 people there. It is a great mining district, supplying a great country. Some of the largest mines in the territory are in that city.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator means in that State.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will assure the Senator that it does not fall within any of the objections I have heard him making, for the town is very much in need of it. Arizona has had the misfortune of having received no appropriations whatever for 30, 40, or 50 years, and these that may seem large because you are unused to them, I can assure the Senator are of sufficient necessity.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the last report which we have from the Treasury Department with reference to Globe is that the postal receipts for 1912 were \$21,142.75. The figures I gave before were \$18,718, applying to a previous year. The

same report shows that 10 years prior to that time the postal receipts were \$5,549.84, showing that the postal receipts had quadrupled in that period of time.

There is one thing that ought to be said with reference to practically all of these western towns. They are the centers of large areas of country. The people about them are engaged in the cattle business, the sheep business, the mining business, and so on. They are very unlike some of the towns in the Eastern States, where they are very numerous, each town not being the center of a large population. They are growing more rapidly than the eastern towns; and of course all of those elements are taken into consideration by the Treasury Department, as well as by the committee, in passing upon these amounts.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I wanted simply to call the attention of the Senator from New York to a single point. It seems to me that it is fallacious to base the necessities of a postal building upon the size of the population, because frequently smaller towns are the centers of a network of rural deliveries from the surrounding country, which bring a much enlarged amount of business to such towns and make it necessary for them to have much larger facilities than the population would seem to indicate. This is particularly true, and becoming more and more true every day, because of the parcel post, which brings an increasing amount of packages of every description, which require room and space to handle them. An estimate, therefore, of the size of a post-office building based solely on population would seem to be misleading.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 16, line 1, after the word "California," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$135,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Bakersfield, Cal., \$135,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 5, after the word "Colorado," to strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$60,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Fort Morgan, Colo., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 6, to insert: United States post office at Naugatuck, Conn., \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 10, to insert: United States post office at Seymour, Conn., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 14, to insert: United States post office at Bartow, Fla., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 15, to insert: United States post office at De Land, Fla., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 14, after the word "Kentucky," to strike out "\$80,000" and insert "\$100,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Ashland, Ky., \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 15, to insert: United States post office at Lancaster, Ky., \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 5, to insert: United States post office, land office, and Weather Bureau building at Alliance, Nebr., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 8, to insert: United States post office at Falls City, Nebr., \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 10, to insert: United States post office at Wahoo, Nebr., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 20, after the words "New York," to strike out "\$450,000" and insert "\$550,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Syracuse, N. Y., \$550,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 17, after the words "North Carolina," to strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$65,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Shelby, N. C., \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 20, to insert: United States post office at Jamestown, N. Dak., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 22, to insert: United States post office at Valley City, N. Dak., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 24, to insert: United States post office at Ashland, Ohio, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 21, to insert:

United States post office at Sandusky, Ohio, \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued down to the following item on page 21, line 8:

United States post office at Roseburg, Oreg., \$100,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I suppose the Senate is now considering only the amendments of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is all.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to offer an amendment to that item later.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 21, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Ridgway, Pa., \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 23, after the words "South Carolina," to strike out "\$225,000" and insert "\$265,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Columbia, S. C., \$265,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, after the words "South Dakota," to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$65,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Redfield, S. Dak., \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office at Madison, S. Dak., \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 12, to insert:

United States post office at Martin, Tenn., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 15, to insert:

United States post office at Memphis, Tenn., \$160,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 17, to insert:

United States post office at Bay City, Tex., \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 18, to insert:

United States post office at Stamford, Tex., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 25, after the word "Yoakum," to insert "Texas," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Yoakum, Tex., \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office at Richfield, Utah, \$55,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the sense of that place and the amount of the postal receipts.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is a place of 3,600 people. The postal receipts are \$5,316.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 23, after line 5, to insert:

United States post office at Warrenton, Va., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 8, to insert:

United States post office at Pulaski, Va., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 11, to insert:

United States post office at Waynesboro, Va., \$52,500, \$2,500 of which may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a site, in addition to the sum heretofore authorized for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 18, to insert:

United States post office at Wenatchee, Wash., \$85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to insert:

United States post office and land office at Vancouver, Wash., \$140,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 15, to insert:

United States post office at Basin, Wyo., \$50,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make the same inquiry about this place, as to the size of the place and the size of the postal receipts.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the present inhabitants who get mail at Basin number something over 2,000, and the post-office receipts are about \$6,000. I will say to the Senator that the office is located not far from one of the large Government irrigation systems that cost several million dollars and near several strong, large corporate and individual irrigation projects; oil and natural gas have lately been developed in this valley, and it is a place that is rapidly increasing in population and business and will increase still more rapidly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I find, by reference to the report of the Treasury Department, that the population of Basin is given as 763 people, and the postal receipts as \$5,700.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, of course, if the Senator wishes to strike out that item, I shall make no objection; but I wish to say this, though it is rather a pitiful thing to have to state:

When the selection was made for the taking of the last United States census in my State, a man who had taken the census there 20 years ago, when a young man, and had taken it most admirably, was an applicant and was appointed. Just at the time when the census was entering upon its busiest season an illness attacked this superintendent and within a short time he was hopelessly insane and confined in an asylum. His assistant, who was appointed to take the census in the northern part of the State, either resigned or was discharged. The consequence of all of this was that the census in some of those places in northern Wyoming and elsewhere was utterly and entirely incomplete. For the sake of avoiding comment and harrowing up painful memories, the delegation from that State has raised no issue with the Census Office. But when a town or city has had enumerated as its inhabitants only a fraction of the number of votes duly registered and voted, we, of course, know that there has been an error.

If the Senator wishes to stand upon old and erroneous figures rather than upon my statement, I have nothing further to say. But the town itself is one of the most growing towns, one of the most promising towns, in the entire West. Long before we shall get to the point where this building will be actually built it will be too small for that town, although I shall not now ask to have the amount in the bill increased.

Another thing, the entire amount provided in this bill for the whole State of Wyoming is only \$167,500. If the Senator from Georgia and the Senate think that is too much, wipe it out.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I only had the record before me; and I felt that at least, seeing the statement that there were only some 700 and odd people there, something else ought to be in the Record before quietly permitting it to pass.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator is right about that, and I am only sorry I had to make this painful explanation; but that is the true status of the case.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the report of the Treasury Department shows that over 2,000 people are served from the post office, which indicates that there is a ranching population, or mining population, or something of that kind, close by.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question? Is it a fact that at the present time the post-office rental is but \$374 per annum?

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator in charge of the bill will allow me to answer that, the town of Cody and the town of Basin are both, in the bill before us, enumerated for \$50,000 each. In one the rental is between fifteen and sixteen hundred dollars per annum, and in the other it is about \$300. That, as I indicated in my earlier remarks, is because of the bidding of one against the other, on account of the location of the post office in the town.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 16, to insert: United States post office and other Government offices at Cody, Wyo., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, page 24, line 20, after the words "directed to," to strike out "acquire" and insert "contract for the acquisition," and in line 21, after the word "purchase," to strike out "condemnation," so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the acquisition, by purchase or otherwise, a site and to contract for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office and other governmental offices in each of the cities enumerated in this section, within its respective limit of cost, including site, hereby fixed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 4, after "\$65,000," to insert "to be erected at such point as shall be equally convenient, so far as possible, to the cities of Decatur and New Decatur," so as to read:

United States post office at Decatur, Ala., \$65,000, to be erected at such point as shall be equally convenient, so far as possible, to the cities of Decatur and New Decatur.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 11, after the words "post office," to strike out "United States courts" and insert "courthouse," so as to read:

United States post office, courthouse, and jail at Cordova, Alaska, \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 12, to insert:

United States customhouse at Nogales, Ariz., \$110,000.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is it in order now to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An amendment to the amendment may be offered.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I move to strike out, in line 14, "\$110,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$175,000." I ask the Secretary to read from the desk a letter received from the Treasury Department in regard to this item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read by the Secretary.

The Secretary read as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1913.

Hon. GEORGE SUTHERLAND,
Chairman Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
United States Senate.

SIR: At the request of the Hon. MARK A. SMITH, I have the honor to refer to report of this department, dated May 10, 1912, on Senate bill 6565. This report was for a two-story building of 5,000 square feet ground area, to cost \$110,000, the cost of site being estimated at \$10,000, for the accommodation of Federal officials in the city of Nogales, Ariz.

Since this report was submitted additional information has been received indicating that more space will be required by the customs service, and that accommodations are needed for the Civil Service Commission and for the Department of Agriculture.

In order to provide for the needs of the public service it is now estimated that a three-story building of 5,000 square feet ground area will be required, and the cost of such a building of fireproof construction is estimated at \$175,000 if faced with stone. If the building is faced with brick the sum of \$165,000 will be sufficient.

Respectfully,

R. O. BAILEY, Acting Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I will not detain the Senate further than to say that this is one of the important ports of entry in the Southwest. I do not think I misstate the fact when I say that the collections from that port are something over \$300,000 annually that are turned into the Treasury. On the American side of the line our customs quarters are a disgrace to a civilized country. On the Mexican side of the line they have a building worthy of any civilized people. It is a common criticism by anyone who goes through that port, which is on a railroad that is destined, as soon as a short block is closed to Guadalajara, to open a line of transportation by rail directly from the City of Mexico along the western coast of Mexico and the United States, through the towns of Nogales and Tucson, in Arizona, through Los Angeles and San Francisco, to Portland, Oreg. Nogales is destined to be a port that will, in my judgment, within a few years after the unfortunate conditions now existing in Mexico have been somewhat modified, collect more than a million dollars a year in customs duties.

It would be ridiculous to erect a \$110,000 building there. We ought to have not only the customhouse, but in addition to what the Treasury Department has said, we should have some place for the detention of the many people who are arrested there, who come across the line against our laws. They are now taken long distances, at great expense, and tried and sent back to the place where arrested, when there should be a provision on the very border where these matters could be attended to and these immigrants heard and admitted or rejected, as the case may be, at more convenience and less expense to the United States.

Besides, in the examination of our customs imports there, when our people come in from Mexico their baggage is exposed to the weather out on the platform of a railroad depot or shoved into dirty and overcrowded and disgraceful quarters.

I hope the Senate will at least let the amount go in the bill as recommended in the letter just read from the desk. I think it is not more than half the amount which will be required within the next 10 years for the accommodation of that port. I hope there will be no objection to the amendment. There should not be, for sooner or later—and I think before the present appropriation becomes available—the necessities of the

situation there will more than justify twice what I am now contending for.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Senate committee gave very careful attention to this matter and it was the unanimous opinion that an appropriation of \$110,000 would be sufficient. It provides only for a customhouse. It does not include the post office; it does not include anything else.

I recognize what the Senator from Arizona says, that Nogales is an important place, and that the Mexican Government has upon the other side of the line a building which may have cost more money than this one will cost; but it was the judgment of the committee that, all things considered, \$110,000 would be sufficient for a customhouse building.

I hope the amendment suggested by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the committee will not be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the committee was of that opinion before they got the statement I had read at the desk. I had no doubt that the further investigation of the department and its report as read would have some weight with the committee, because if it was only a customhouse building it is still not enough money. It may be possible that they can put the post office in it, but I hardly think so. But it is not enough money for the customhouse alone. Besides, the customhouse may be in a position in that growing town where it might not be convenient to the line of the railroad traffic and to the importers and travelers. The proper location of the customhouse might be very inconvenient to the patrons of the post office. That is possible. On the contrary, it may be very convenient. I think the present appropriation would serve for the next six or seven years for both purposes, but ultimately one building at that price—\$110,000—can not possibly accommodate both post office and customhouse.

I hope the chairman of the committee will not insist on cutting the item down any smaller than the Treasury Department last reported. In my judgment it would be simply throwing that much money away in building a customhouse so insignificant that it will bring on the United States of America the ridicule of the world. Men from every part of the world passing across that line will see that it is in marked contrast with the building erected by the southern Republic within a few hundred yards of it. My national as well as State pride impels me to plead with the Congress to protect both State and Nation from the just contempt of the balance of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 16, to insert:

United States post office at Prescott, Ark., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 3, after the words "post office," to insert "and other Government offices," and in line 4, before the word "California," to strike out "Willows" and insert "Willow," so as to read:

United States post office and other Government offices at Willow, Cal., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 5, after the words "post office," to insert "land office, and other Government offices," so as to read:

United States post office, land office, and other Government offices at Glenwood Springs, Colo., \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office and customhouse at Apalachicola, Fla., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office at Geneseo, Ill., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Mount Carmel, Ill., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Girard, Kans., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 11, to insert:

United States branch post office at North Topeka, Kans., \$71,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 19, to insert: United States post office and customhouse at Fort Fairfield, Me., \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 23, to insert: United States post office at Cambridge, Md., \$90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 1, after the word "Maryland," to strike out "\$80,000" and insert "\$90,000," so as to read:

United States post office at Salisbury, Md., \$90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 8, after the word "donated," to strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$175,000," and in line 11, after the word "section," to strike out "twenty-six" and insert "thirty-four," so as to read:

United States post office at Malden, Mass., on a site to be donated, \$175,000: *Provided*, That the construction of said building shall not be begun until the site for same has been donated and title thereto accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury, as provided in section 34 of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 14, to insert: United States post office at Winchester, Mass., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 20, to insert:

United States post office at Hastings, Mich., \$81,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 21, to insert:

United States post office at Midland, Mich., \$70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Harrisonville, Mo., \$52,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 21, to insert:

United States post office at Fallon, Nev., \$60,000.

Mr. KENYON. I wish that we may have some information on this appropriation. I understood that Fallon, Nev., had a population of 740. I may be in error.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. According to the last census it had a population of 2,500. The Senator probably is in error there. I visited the town a year or two ago. It is in the center of a very large irrigating project which is being settled upon. It is a new town and has had a wonderful development.

Mr. KENYON. What are the postal receipts?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The postal receipts in the last report we had were \$5,970. They may be more now. That is not the last report.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 22, to insert:

United States post office at Winnemucca, Nev., \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 31, to insert:

United States post office at Franklin, N. H., \$90,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 6, to insert:

United States post office at Raton, N. Mex., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 7, to insert:

United States post office and courthouse at Santa Fe, N. Mex., \$295,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, after line 22, to insert:

United States post office at Chapel Hill, N. C., \$65,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Altus, Okla., \$82,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 13, to insert:

United States post office and other Government offices at Shawnee, Okla., \$145,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 18, to insert:

United States post office at Phoenixville, Pa., \$80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 22, to insert:

United States post office and other Government offices at State College, Pa., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 6, to insert:

United States post office at Clinton, S. C., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 12, to insert: United States post office and land office at Chamberlain, S. Dak., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 20, to insert: United States post office at Denton, Tex., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, after line 23, to insert:

United States post office at Gilmer, Tex., \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the chairman of the committee that, on page 34, line 21 should be placed below lines 22 and 23. The clerks can be authorized to change the order of those lines.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let the lines be transposed so as to bring the item for Denton, Tex., and the item for Gilmer, Tex., together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will bring the Tennessee items together. That change will be made.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 2, to insert:

United States post office at Honey Grove, Tex., \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office at Orange, Tex., \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 9, to insert:

United States post office at Eureka, Utah, \$60,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Vernal, Utah, \$50,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. After the word "office," I move to insert "and other Government offices."

Mr. KENYON. I wish to ask the Senator what are the postal receipts of this town?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The postal receipts were \$5,548 and a population is served of about 7,000. The town is in the center of a valley and there is a farming population with farm lands all about it. They get their mail at that office. I can look up the exact population in the incorporated town.

Mr. KENYON. I understand the population is 836.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should say that there is a population of at least 2,000. Besides that there is a land office at Vernal and some other offices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the words "post office" insert "and other Government offices."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 11, to insert:

United States post office and other Government offices at Spanish Fork, Utah, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 15, to strike out:

United States post office at Waynesboro, Va., \$52,500, \$2,500 of which may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a site, in addition to the sum heretofore authorized for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 4, after the word "Virginia," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$55,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Front Royal, Va., \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 6, after the word

"Virginia," to strike out "\$55,000" and insert "\$62,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Leesburg, Va., \$62,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 15, to insert:

United States post office at Rhinelander, Wis., \$91,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 17, to insert:

United States post office at Ripon, Wis., \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section , page 36, line 22, after the words "directed to," to strike out "acquire" and insert "contract for the acquisition," so as to make the clause read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site for the United States post office and other governmental offices in each of the cities enumerated in this section within its respective limit of cost hereby fixed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On page 36, line 23, after the word "otherwise," I move to insert the word "of."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 36, line 23, after the word "otherwise," in the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to insert the word "of," so as to read:

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a suitable site for the United States post office and other governmental offices in each of the cities enumerated in this section within its respective limit of cost hereby fixed.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 37, after line 12, to insert:

United States post office at Prescott, Ariz., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 13, to insert:

United States post office at Conway, Ark., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 17, to insert:

United States post office at Forrest City, Ark., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 22, to insert:

United States post office at Canyon City, Colo., \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 38, to insert:

United States post office at Monte Vista, Colo., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 2, to insert:

United States post office and courthouse at Montrose, Colo., \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office and land office at Sterling, Colo., \$15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, adverting to the item making an appropriation for a post-office site at Prescott, Ariz., if it be in order, I should like to propose an amendment increasing the amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be necessary to reconsider the vote by which that amendment was adopted. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment on page 37, line 13, was adopted is reconsidered, and the amendment is before the Senate and is open to amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the sum of \$5,000 in that amendment be stricken out and that \$7,500 be inserted in lieu thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 37, line 13, after the name "Arizona," it is proposed to amend the committee amendment by striking out "\$5,000" and inserting "\$7,500," so as to read:

United States post office at Prescott, Ariz., \$7,500.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the committee gave consideration to that item. Prescott has a population of about 5,000, as I remember.

Mr. ASHURST. Something over 5,000, I will say to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It has a population of about 5,000, and it was thought by the committee, after investigating the subject, that \$5,000 would be ample to buy a site for a public building there, and I think it will be. Therefore, I must resist the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I desire to say that the committee gave careful consideration not only to this item, but to every other item in this bill; to my knowledge the committee sat several days and held many hearings. I respectfully insist that the appropriation for the purchase of a site in the city of Prescott be increased from \$5,000 to \$7,500.

The population of Prescott, as shown by the census of 1910, numbered 5,092 persons, and the census returns respecting Prescott for 1910 are notoriously and admittedly deficient. That the city of Prescott has a population of over 6,000 persons can not successfully be contradicted. Moreover, a large number of persons who do not live within the corporate limits of the city receive their mail in Prescott. The postal receipts for the year 1901 were \$12,097, while the postal receipts for the year 1911 amounted to \$21,793. I do not believe an appropriate and suitable site for a Federal building could be purchased in Prescott for \$5,000, but I feel reasonably certain that a suitable site could be procured for the sum of \$7,500.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 38, after line 7, to insert:

United States post office at De Funiak Springs, Fla., \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 11, to insert:

United States post office at Kissimmee, Fla., \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 14, after the word "Georgia," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Toccoa, Ga., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 18, after the word "Georgia," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Sandersville, Ga., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 19, to insert:

United States post office at Forsyth, Ga., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 20, to insert:

United States post office at Thomson, Ga., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 21, to insert:

United States post office at Waynesboro, Ga., \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 23, to insert:

United States post office at Monroe, Ga., \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 24, to insert:

United States post office at Madison, Ga., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 39, to insert:

United States post office at Eatonton, Ga., \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 1, to insert:

United States post office at Nampa, Idaho, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 2, to insert:

United States post office at Caldwell, Idaho, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 5, before the word "Illinois," to strike out "Hillsboro" and insert "Carlinville," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Carlinville, Ill., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 6, to insert:

United States post office at Highland, Ill., \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 7, to strike out:

United States post office at Geneseo, Ill., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 8, to insert:

United States post office at Carrollton, Ill., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 12, before the word "Illinois," to strike out "Spring Valley" and insert "Springvalley," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Springvalley, Ill., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 7, to insert:

United States post office at Albia, Iowa, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, after line 14, to insert:

United States post office at Barboursville, Ky., \$5,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have dropped down here to postal receipts of \$4,000. I merely want to bring the attention of the Senate, before they agree to this amendment, to the fact that the postal receipts of this town are less than \$4,000 per annum, and the population is about 1,600.

Mr. TOWNSEND. To what amendment is the Senator referring?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am referring to Barboursville, Ky., a new item which has been added. The postal receipts there are only \$4,000 a year.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, Barboursville is situated in eastern Kentucky. That section of our State has been improving in the last three years by leaps and bounds. There are many valuable coal mines and also oil interests around that place. In the last decade its population more than doubled. Since the census was taken it has increased about 400; and the population is now about 2,000. It is a growing, live town. It has two colleges, a number of banks, and is an exceedingly prosperous community. There are other towns in Kentucky of less population than this that to-day have public buildings.

This is a section of the State that has received but little attention, and it is now demanding the attention of the whole people. I do hope that my good and great friend from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] will withdraw his objection to this little pittance of \$5,000 to purchase a site for a building at this place. I appeal to his generosity. I know he is generous.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there is no point of order that can be made on the amendment. I wish merely to say that I was surprised that such small receipts were deemed sufficient for the erection of a public building, and so I called attention to it. It is for the Senate to determine.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 40, line 23, after the word "Kentucky," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Paintsville, Ky., \$7,500.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I really do not think the Senator from Kentucky ought to ask for this increase. This is a town with about 700 inhabitants, and only has \$2,000 postal receipts.

Mr. BRADLEY. What town is that?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Paintsville.

Mr. BRADLEY. How many people does the Senator say reside there?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Perhaps I have overestimated. It has 900 inhabitants and the postal receipts, I find, are \$3,700. Surely \$500 is enough to buy a site in that town—or \$5,000. I said "\$500," and I ought to stand by my statement, but the House proposed \$5,000. The proposition, however, is to increase the appropriation for a site for a public building in that little town to \$7,500. Surely the Senator will not urge that, but will be satisfied with what the House has given.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I appealed to the Senator's generosity a moment ago without avail, and now he appeals to mine. [Laughter.] The fact is, the Senator from Georgia does not understand the condition of affairs. I tried to explain awhile ago about eastern Kentucky. For this town the department's estimate for a building site was \$8,000, and the committee allowed \$7,500, which is \$500 less than the department's estimate. The post-office receipts—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRADLEY. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky whether this town is on the Green River? [Laughter.]

Mr. BRADLEY. No, sir; it is not. I am satisfied if it were that no objection would be made to the increase by any Senator on this floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, the post-office receipts in this town, as shown by the latest estimate of the department, are \$5,000.

Now, let me tell the Senate some things about this town. In the first place, the present population of this town is 2,000. It has expended \$100,000 for concrete pavement; its banks have over a million dollars of deposits, and it has several manufacturing concerns. These improvements have lately taken place. Within sight of this town, less than a mile away, is the town of Van Lear, which is growing up close to Paintsville. It has grown within three years to have 2,500 population. On the other side and less than a mile from Paintsville is another town which has sprung up within the last three years with 2,000 population. This country is—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator tell me how far on each side are these two other towns?

Mr. BRADLEY. I have said that one of them was within less than a mile and the other is in sight. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How far can you see?

Mr. BRADLEY. I suppose if the Senator from Georgia were interested, as he usually is, when speaking in the Senate, you could hear him speak without any difficulty from one town to the other. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this portion of Kentucky, as I understand, has not a single public building in it. There is not a public building in that congressional district, and yet the growth of population and wealth in that district is absolutely marvelous. Property is increasing in value every day. Living there is a great money king, as well as a Democrat, a friend of the Senator from Georgia, known as John C. C. Mayo. Only a short time ago they built a church there costing \$75,000. They believe in worshipping the Lord in that section. They have put up there, as I have said, a number of manufacturing concerns, and the growth of that town is one of the marvels of eastern Kentucky. I insist that if we do not buy a site now, or provide for one, by the time we pass another public-buildings bill it will take a great deal more money to buy it and the Government will lose by the delay. That whole section is filled with valuable coal, the development of which accounts for its prosperity. I again appeal to the generosity of my friend from Georgia and will give him another opportunity to redeem himself before this body.

Mr. PAYNTER. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] has so well stated the claims of Paintsville to this appropriation that there is nothing I could add to what he has already said. Such an effort—

To gild refined gold, to paint the lily,
To throw a perfume on the violet,
To smooth the ice, or add another hue
Unto the rainbow, or with taper light
To seek the beauteous eye of heaven to garnish,
Is wasteful and ridiculous excess.

It is true, as stated by him, that there has been a great growth and development in the valley of the Big Sandy River. In addition to the church which he has mentioned, there has been a large school established at Paintsville; it promises to be a city of very great importance in the near future. There is no part of Kentucky where there has been such development as there has been in eastern Kentucky. There are great coal fields lying not far from there, and there is one railroad running to the town on the Kentucky side of the Big Sandy River and another one on the West Virginia side of the river. So, as I have said, it promises to be a city of very great importance, and I trust the Senate will stand by the action of the committee in fixing the amount at \$7,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 41, line 1, after the words "post office," to insert "and courthouse," and, in line 2, after the word "Kentucky," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office and courthouse at Pikeville, Ky., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 7, to insert: United States post office at Falmouth, Ky., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 11, to insert: United States post office at Morgan City, La., \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 13, to strike out:

United States post office at Cambridge, Md., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 15, to insert: United States post office and customhouse at Provincetown, Mass., \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 18, after the word "Massachusetts," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at South Framingham, Mass., \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 21, to insert: United States post office at Caruthersville, Mo., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 42, to insert:

United States post office at Farmington, Mo., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 11, to insert: United States post office at Somersworth, N. H., \$5,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, Somersworth, N. H., is a city of 8,000 population, with postal receipts of \$10,000. My information is that \$5,000 will not buy a proper site, and I trust the Senator in charge of the bill will agree to an amendment to the amendment making the amount \$7,500.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will not object to such an amendment, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 42, line 5, in the amendment of the committee it is proposed to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$7,500."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 42, line 17, after the name "New York," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Oneida, N. Y., \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 43, to insert:

United States post office at Mount Airy, N. C., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office at Wadesboro, N. C., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 6, to insert:

United States post office at Rockingham, N. C., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 9, after the words "post office and" to strike out "customhouse" and insert "courthouse," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office and courthouse at Fargo, N. Dak., \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 14, to insert:

United States post office at Delphos, Ohio, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 3, after the words "South Carolina," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Dillon, S. C., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 4, to insert:

United States post office at Milbank, S. Dak., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 6, to insert:

United States post office at Vermillion, S. Dak., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 10, to insert:

United States post office at Elizabethton, Tenn., \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 16, to strike out:

For the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of additional ground adjoining the post office and courthouse at Sherman, Tex., \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 20, to strike out:

United States post office at Gilmer, Tex., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 22, after the word "Texas," to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$6,000," so as to make the clause read:

United States post office at Crockett, Tex., \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 23, to insert:

United States post office at Memphis, Tex., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 24, to insert:

United States post office at Sweetwater, Tex., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 45, to insert:

United States post office at Seguin, Tex., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 2, to strike out:

United States post office at Orange, Tex., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 16, to insert: United States post office at Cape Charles, Va., \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 18, to insert:

United States post office at Buena Vista, Va., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 20, to insert:

United States post office at Woodstock, Va., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 22, to insert:

United States post office at Manassas, Va., \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 46, to insert:

United States post office at Pasco, Wash., \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, after line 8, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter into contracts for the construction of a suitable building for a post office only upon the site heretofore acquired, bounded by Seventh, Eighth, Hoyt, and Glisan Streets, in the city of Portland, Oreg., at a total limit of cost for said building, complete, including mechanical equipment, heating, ventilating, vacuum-cleaning and air-washing systems, machinery, mechanical appliances and devices for handling mail, intercommunicating telephones and clock systems, and such other labor-saving devices and appliances as may be deemed necessary, at a total limit of cost, exclusive of site, of \$1,000,000.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, further authorized and empowered, in his discretion, to secure the plans, specifications, and estimates for said building and the local supervision of its construction by competition among not less than five architects, and to make payment for the services of the architect whose plan may be selected out of the appropriation for said building, any statute to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it seems to me the chairman of the committee ought to explain to us the necessity for that appropriation.

Mr. BOURNE. Mr. President, if the chairman of the committee will permit me to do so, I shall be very glad to explain that.

In 1875 the Government bought a post-office site in Portland, for which they paid \$15,000, and erected a Federal building there. The postal receipts then were \$24,000 a year. For the fiscal year 1912 the postal receipts were over \$1,100,000. The present cash value of the site for which the Government paid \$15,000 in 1875 is, conservatively, a million dollars. That building is a Federal court building and also a post-office building.

About three years ago the Senate passed a bill providing half a million dollars for the purchase of a site and a million dollars for the construction of a post-office building. The House provided \$500,000, in the last public buildings bill, for the purchase of the site. The site was acquired for \$340,000. The Government now pays, I think, some \$25,000 per annum for rental of buildings that are necessary because of the increase in the postal service and the inability to handle the postal business at the present Portland post office.

I think this is a pretty good illustration of my viewpoint as to the desirability of the Government making liberal appropriations for the construction of its public buildings.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand, then, that the present public building in Portland is the one that was erected when it was really just a village?

Mr. BOURNE. The present public building in Portland is on the same site that they had when Portland was, you may say, a village, in 1875, when the postal receipts were only \$24,000 per annum.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In any event, it was comparatively a very little city?

Mr. BOURNE. Yes. According to the last census the city of Portland had 207,000 people, and I think it now has 250,000. The present postal receipts, I know, are \$1,100,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. And this is really necessary to meet the present demands of the city?

Mr. BOURNE. Absolutely necessary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in addition to what my colleague has said I desire to say that the present site is quite a long distance from the depot, and because of the increased population and increased business of the post office they have found it convenient and best to purchase a site near the depot, where the mail can be handled at very much less cost to the Government.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 47, line 4, to change the number of the section from "6" to "7"; in line 5, after the words "directed to," to strike out "acquire" and insert "contract for the acquisition"; in line 13, after the words "building and,"

to strike out "addition to site" and insert "additional ground"; in line 16, after the word "may," to insert "in his discretion"; and, in line 18, after the word "sale," to strike out "in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site, or additional ground adjoining the site already acquired, and to contract for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office, courts, and other governmental offices at Birmingham, Ala. The cost of said building and additional ground, or new site, and building shall not exceed \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That if the Secretary of the Treasury should decide to acquire a new site he may, in his discretion, sell the site already acquired at an upset price of not less than \$200,000, at public or private sale, at such time and upon such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States and deposit the proceeds in the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 22, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site for a suitable building and approaches in the borough of Manhattan, city, county, and State of New York, for the use and accommodation of the United States courts of the southern district of New York and the second circuit, the cost of said site not to exceed the sum of \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That the site proposed to be selected shall first be approved by the Attorney General of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 8, to change the number of the section from "7" to "9"; in line 10, before the words "post office," to insert "United States"; in the same line, after the words "post office," to insert "courthouse"; and in line 21, after the word "site," to strike out "before the completion of the new Federal building," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That the limit of cost for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a suitable building for the accommodation of the United States post office, courthouse, and other governmental offices at New Haven, Conn., as provided by the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910, is hereby increased by the sum of \$400,000, or so much thereof as may be realized from the sale of the old post-office and customhouse building and site thereof in the said city of New Haven, as provided in said act of June 25, 1910; and said act of June 25, 1910, is hereby amended so that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to sell said old post-office and customhouse building and site on such terms as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem to be to the best interest of the United States, subject to the provision and agreement that possession of same shall not be delivered until said new building is ready for occupancy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 3, to change the number of the section from "8" to "10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 14, before the words "and estimates," to strike out "designs" and insert "plans, specifications," so as to make the clause read:

That the plans, specifications, and estimates for said building shall be approved by a board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 19, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$596,000"; in line 23, after the word "employment," to insert "at customary rates of compensation"; on page 50, line 2, after the words "preparation of," to strike out "such" and insert "the necessary"; in line 3, before the word "specifications," to strike out "and," and in the same line, after the word "specifications," to insert "estimates," so as to make the clause read:

That for the purpose of beginning the construction of said building the sum of \$596,000 is hereby authorized, and the unexpended balance of the appropriation for the acquisition of said square 143 is hereby made available as a part of said authorization for the employment, at customary rates of compensation without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, of technical and engineering services in the Office of the Supervising Architect, exclusively to aid in the preparation of the necessary plans, specifications, estimates, and toward the commencement of the construction of said building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 15, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$2,596,000," so as to make the clause read:

That the foregoing authorization for the employment of technical and engineering services shall be in addition to and independent of the authorizations and appropriations for personal services for the Office of the Supervising Architect otherwise made: *Provided*, That this authorization shall not be construed as fixing the limit of cost of said building at the sum hereby named, but the building hereby authorized shall be constructed or so planned as to cost, complete, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, lighting fixtures, and approaches, but exclusive of site, not exceeding \$2,596,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, after line 19, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 11. That a building is hereby authorized to be erected in the District of Columbia to be known as the George Washington Memorial Building.

The control and administration of said building, when erected, shall be in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The George Washington Memorial Association is authorized to erect said building in accordance with plans to be procured by said association and to be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, said building to be fireproof, faced with granite, and to cost not less than \$2,000,000; it shall have an auditorium that will seat not less than 6,000 people, and such other smaller halls, reception rooms, office rooms, etc., as may be deemed necessary to carry out the purposes for which the building is erected. And the said George Washington Memorial Association shall in addition provide a permanent endowment fund of not less than \$500,000, to be administered by the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, the income from which shall, as far as necessary, be used for the maintenance of the said building.

Permission is granted the George Washington Memorial Association to erect said building in the north end of the reservation known as Armory Square, bounded by Sixth and Seventh Streets west and B Street north and B Street south. The south front of said building is to be on a line with the south front of the new National Museum Building, in the north end of the Smithsonian Park; and the said land is hereby set apart for that purpose: *Provided*, That the actual construction of said building shall not be undertaken until the sum of \$1,000,000 shall have been subscribed and paid into the treasury of the George Washington Memorial Association: *And provided further*, That the erection of said George Washington Memorial Building be begun within a period of two years from and after the passage of this act, and this section shall be null and void should the George Washington Memorial Association fail to comply with the provisions thereof which are conditions precedent to the authorization herein granted.

Said building may, among other purposes, be used for inaugural receptions and special public meetings authorized by Congress.

Congress may alter, amend, add to, or repeal any of the provisions of this section.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, we have already gone on record as spending more money, I believe, than any Congress that has ever been in session. I do not think there is any necessity for this appropriation at this time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I fear the Senator has not read the section carefully. It does not involve any expenditure at all upon the part of the Government. It simply gives a site for the construction of this building, and, in consideration of giving the site, it requires that a building shall be erected at the cost of this association, to cost not less than \$2,000,000, and that they shall furnish in addition to that an endowment fund of \$500,000 to guarantee the expense of operating the building and carrying it on. It is to be under the control of the Government, however, and can be used by the Government. It does not involve the expenditure of a single dollar on the part of the Government of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was almost impossible for me to keep up with the provision as it was being read. I have nothing further to say, in view of the statement of the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 52, after line 12, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter into contracts for all necessary plans and for the construction of an armory building for the National Guard of the District of Columbia, in accordance with the plans for such armory submitted by the commission appointed by the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908, or such modified plans as may be approved by the Secretary of War and the said commission at a limit of cost not to exceed \$1,750,000, one-half of which shall be borne by the District of Columbia.

That the northern portion of the Government reservation bounded by B Street north, B Street south, Twelfth Street west, and Fourteenth Street west, in the District of Columbia, comprising that portion of said reservation north of the line established for the south front of the new National Museum Building, be, and is hereby, selected and dedicated as a site for the said armory for the National Guard of the District of Columbia, after the removal of the temporary buildings now on said site, which removal is hereby authorized.

That the construction of said armory building shall be under the direction of the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, and all money expended shall be upon vouchers approved by him. All plans for said armory building shall be approved by the Secretary of War and the commission authorized by the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908 (35 Stat. L., p. 540).

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we have now reached some of the amendments that should be vigorously resisted. There is no more occasion to have this great armory here than there is in any other city of the United States; and there is no more occasion to take the money out of the National Treasury to build this armory than there is to build an armory in every other city of the size of this for the use of the National Guard. This really is to be an auditorium, in large part. We begin by contributing the land which belongs to the public, and we then propose to go on and put up a building to cost \$1,750,000.

The National Government now pays about \$600,000 a year rent in the city of Washington for buildings that ought to be constructed for \$4,000,000. We have ample land. We could

construct a model 400-room office building here for \$750,000, fireproof, of steel construction, concrete, brick, marble, and granite trimmings. These need not be extravagant buildings. I should be glad to see the Department of Justice and the Department of State each have a building of the same style as the present buildings. But the balance of the office space here can be amply provided for by the ordinary model office building. A 400-room office building, amply ornamental, can be erected upon the perfectly fireproof plan to which I have referred for \$750,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia will please suspend. Under the previous order of the Senate, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 8 o'clock.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CURTIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 28607) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, and 6, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CHARLES CURTIS,
GEORGE T. OLIVER,
THOMAS S. MARTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
H. D. FLOOD,
JOHN N. GAENER,
WILLIAM B. MCKINLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES presented telegrams in the nature of petitions from the city council, the Sailors' Union, the executive board of the State Federation of Labor, the Alaska Fishermen's Union, the Labor Council, the Marine Cooks and Stewards' Association, and of W. G. Potts, all of the city of Seattle, in the State of Washington, praying for the passage of the so-called seamen's bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a petition, from sundry wholesale grocers of the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of legislation to correct the misbranding of foods, drugs, and other products, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Salem, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

SEAMEN IN THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. BURTON. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with an amendment in the way of a substitute the bill (H. R. 23673) to abolish the involuntary servitude imposed upon seamen in the merchant marine of the United States while in foreign ports and the involuntary servitude imposed upon the seamen of the merchant marine of foreign countries while in ports of the United States, to prevent unskilled manning of American vessels, to encourage the training of boys in the American merchant marine, for the further protection of life at sea, and to amend the laws relative to seamen, and I submit a report (No. 1321) thereon.

I desire to give notice that on Friday morning, after the close of the routine morning business, I shall ask the consideration of the bill.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CRAWFORD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 23676) to regulate the officering and manning of vessels subject to the inspection laws of the United States, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1322) thereon.

Mr. PAYNTER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 228) for the relief of John H. Howlett, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1323) thereon.

AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,480,000 for eight submarine torpedo boats, 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.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 28766) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to insert as section 12 on page 52, line 13, to line 16 on page 53.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I suggest the lack of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia suggests the absence of a quorum. The roll will be called.

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

Ashurst	Chamberlain	Jones	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Clapp	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Borah	Clark, Wyo.	Martine, N. J.	Smoot
Bourne	Crawford	Nelson	Stone
Bradley	Culberson	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Brady	Cummins	Owen	Swanson
Brandegee	Curtis	Page	Thomas
Briggs	Dillingham	Perkins	Townsend
Bristow	Fletcher	Sheppard	Warren
Burnham	Gallinger	Shively	Wetmore
Burton	Johnston, Ala.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is still suffering with a severe cold, and while he comes out in the day, he is advised that he ought not to come out at night.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The names of the absentees will be called.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators and Mr. CATRON, Mr. KENYON, Mr. POINDEXTER, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina answered to their names when called.

Mr. KERN entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on the amendment of the committee, commencing at line 13, on page 52. The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, at the time the Senate took a recess I was calling attention to the fact that this amendment provides for an appropriation of \$1,750,000 to build an armory in the District. I had already called attention to the fact that the National Government does not build armories throughout the country, but in the different States armories, as a rule, are built by the personal friends of the members of the National Guard. It is true that this provision requires that one-half of the cost shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia, but the National Government furnishes the land on which it is to be erected.

This appropriation, together with others in the bill, make in all over \$10,000,000 to be spent in the District. I think I might well make the point that this appropriation is not an appropriation which should fall within the work of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I may later bring that point of order to the attention of the Chair.

The next appropriation is of \$400,000 to help erect a building to be used by the American Red Cross in the District.

There is a provision in these amendments which, when it is reached, I shall especially object to because it is limited to the commemoration of the services and sacrifices of the loyal women of the United States during the Civil War. I believe that the spirit of national love and universal friendship which pervades

our entire land would justify the commemoration of the sacrifices and character of all the women of the country.

The next one of these appropriations is for an amphitheater to cost \$850,000, together with \$50,000 additional to build at Arlington both a chapel and an amphitheater.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. On the subject the Senator passed a moment ago, I suppose he notices that probably the name was given because the appropriation is made in connection with the amount of money which has been raised by that association. The amount we appropriate will only be expended when the association shall have expended or raised about the same amount.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. The Red Cross, as the Senator knows, is about as universal as anything can be, not only for this country, but for all countries. I think we passed the bill in the Senate as a separate measure.

Mr. ROOT. Yes; we have passed it.

Mr. WARREN. The Senate has given its assent to it.

Mr. ROOT. The Senate passed it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will discuss the peculiar language of that amendment later on when it is taken up by itself. I am now calling the Senate's attention to the quantity of appropriations upon the line of local investment which this bill carries.

The next is an appropriation of \$2,300,000 for park purposes in the District.

The next is an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to build a bridge across the Potomac.

So, Mr. President, we start with \$1,750,000, one-half of which is to come from the National Treasury. We then have \$400,000—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask the Senator upon what page this \$5,000,000 appropriation for this bridge appears?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On page 68.

We then have \$750,000—\$800,000, rather, for there is \$50,000 in addition to that—we then have \$2,300,000, and we then have \$5,000,000, making about \$10,000,000 which this bill carries of funds belonging to the National Government to be spent practically in the District.

Mr. President, we are paying now about \$600,000 a year rent for Government buildings necessary to the accommodation of the departmental work of the District. I believe we could for \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 erect modern office buildings which would accommodate almost the whole of this part of the departmental service.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from Georgia speaks of our paying about \$600,000 a year rent. I take it the Senator thinks that it would be better for the Government to own the buildings than to rent them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was just proceeding to give my views on that subject.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, I was going to ask the Senator whether he knew we were now paying a pretty large sum of money for the rent of quarters for the National Guard?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; I will come to that; I will discuss that in a moment. We are paying \$600,000 a year for a class of buildings which could be erected for \$4,000,000. We are paying 3 per cent on \$20,000,000, and we have the ground. What I am objecting to is the expenditure of this large sum of money for things not now necessary, while we neglect those that are necessary, which, if we would attend to, would make so large a saving.

Now, with reference to what we are paying for the National Guard, I will say we are renting part of our own property for \$8,000 a year for the National Guard when we lease out that property and four times as much more for \$7,500. The Government is still the owner of the property, as I understand. I refer to the old market place which, as I understand, is leased out by the Government for \$7,500 a year, while we rent a part of it for \$8,000, renting it back for an armory. It is the utter lack of business treatment of the money belonging to the people of this District of which I complain.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand the Senator from Georgia to say that we rent out a certain property for \$7,500 and then rent back part of the same property for \$8,000?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I mean; that is what I understand is the case. I submit to correction by those Senators who have been here longer than I have been, if I am mistaken. I myself have not investigated it in detail, but I have seen the fact published that we lease out—

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment; let me finish, please—that we lease out the market place just across the little park from Pennsylvania Avenue for \$7,500 a year and then rent back for an armory a small part of it, paying \$8,000; though, perhaps, more properly speaking, that rental is by the District instead of by the Government, but the Government pays half.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. ASHURST addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been informed that the Government and the District did not pay for the building, but the company owning the lease put up the building and, in turn, rented a portion of the building to the Government and the District for the armory; or, in other words, all the interest that the Government and the District have in the property is the interest in the land. I was going to ask the Senator if he knows that to be the case.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understand that that is true, and I wish to add that the cost of the building is trivial. That \$8,000 a year would pay the interest on the cost of the building. I am calling attention to this fact to emphasize my proposition of the neglect of business management.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, it seems to me that the most effective and practical way to stop paying high and exorbitant rents would be to construct proper buildings, and it might be illuminating at this time if, with the consent of the Senator from Georgia, I should incorporate into the Record a statement of the amount of rent that the Government pays, for what purpose the property is used, and the condition of the buildings.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that this statement be read at the desk.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to have it read.

Mr. ASHURST. I have asked to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to ask what it is that is asked to be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a clipping from a newspaper, but the Chair is unable to determine the character of the clipping.

Mr. ROOT. Can we not be informed from what newspaper it is taken and who vouches for the figures which are given?

Mr. ASHURST. I said that it might be illuminating if the Senate knew the exact amount of rent paid by the Government in this District. I desire, if possible, to obviate the necessity of the Government paying these exorbitant sums for rent. The question is asked from what paper the clipping is taken. It is from a paper which is not popular in this Chamber, from a paper that very few Senators read, designated at times *The Appeal to Reason*. The accuracy, however, of these particular items is reasonably certain.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, that is what I wanted to know, whether the Senator from Arizona had checked the information up with the department as to the figures, so as to be certain they are correct.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not wish to be discourteous. I will say that the Senator from Arizona is not in the habit—

Mr. WARREN. It is entirely immaterial what paper it is, if the statements have been checked up.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Arizona is not in the habit of asking the Senate to incorporate into the *Record* figures and data that he believes to be incorrect.

Mr. WARREN. There is no insinuation that the Senator from Arizona would do that. The only thing is that newspapers sometimes make incorrect reports, and I wanted to know if the Senator had verified this. That is all I wanted to ask

before the clipping was read, so as not to seem to cast any aspersion upon the item itself.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, during the short time I have had the honor to be a Member of this body I have found that if you wish accurate information with respect to many matters of a public nature you are obliged to consult the newspapers. I ask that the clipping be read at the desk. It is very short.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the extract being read? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The following amounts were paid by the United States Government for rent of privately owned buildings in Washington during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912:

State Department	\$11,480.00
Treasury Department	52,000.00
War Department	15,220.00
Navy Department	40,326.24
Interior Department	59,100.00
Post Office Department	48,455.00
Department of Agriculture	85,329.00
Department of Commerce and Labor	87,521.24
Department of Justice	31,580.40
Quartermaster's Department of the Army	45,377.10
Commerce Court	11,772.00
Court of Customs Appeals	7,000.00
Interstate Commerce Commission	41,000.00
Public Printer	5,693.76
District of Columbia	44,360.00

Total 586,274.74

The majority of the buildings for which this rental is paid are old, rickety, and insanitary, and are ill adapted for the performance of public business. The rentals paid are notoriously excessive and out of all proportion to rents paid by private parties for similar quarters.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that the Secretary read the total once more. My attention was diverted for the moment.

Mr. WARREN. It is very near the amount the Senator gave.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY read as follows:

Total, \$586,274.74.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, 12 months ago I took the pains to check up the figures, and those just read are practically what I found the rentals then to be. As I have said, the total rental is approximately \$600,000.

Now, what I am seeking to urge upon the Senate is simply this: Can we excuse ourselves for expending public money for things in this District that are not necessary while we neglect to construct buildings that are necessary and while we continue to pay exorbitant rents for buildings that are necessary on account of our neglect to erect suitable buildings for ourselves?

I shall not repeat the stories I have heard about what has been made in the construction of buildings after contracts with the Government have first been entered into in the District. They may not be true. However, what I do insist upon is that, owning the land, we can house ourselves cheaper than private citizens can house the Government, and that the Government, not being compelled to purchase land on which to build, can certainly erect buildings to house its various services for less than any private individual can afford to buy land and erect buildings and rent them to the Government. The private owners have their taxes to pay, and we pay ours most liberally under the half-and-half policy. What I wish to do is to urge that all these items, amounting to \$10,000,000, even if Senators feel that the projects are worthy, be suspended, be left to wait until we have first done that which is necessary—erected buildings for our departmental work to meet the requirements of the department work, and stop this \$600,000 a year rent. It may be true that \$8,000 a year is paid for the armory. That would not be the interest on \$1,750,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The so-called armory is only one of the places which is rented for the use of the District Guard. There are seven others. There are eight places altogether in the District which are rented, and the rent now paid is about \$17,000 a year.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. How many guards are there in the District?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Recruited to their full strength, there would be 4,000. There are now possibly a little over 2,000. There should be three regiments and some detached organizations, which I do not just now recall.

Mr. WARREN. A brigade, is it not?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; it is a brigade. There should be 4,000. If the Senator could have taken the trip about the city

that I took some little time ago and visited these various quarters, I think he would have had a somewhat different idea as to the necessity of providing quarters for these men. The various places in which they are housed are insanitary; they are utterly discreditable to any Government to ask men to inhabit. For example, upon one of the streets just beyond the War Department they have rented half of a room in a building which has been constructed of the cheapest material and covered with corrugated iron. Through the center of a not very large room to begin with there has been a partition extended, making a narrow hall on each side, one side occupied as a bicycle repair shop and the other occupied by a company or more of the militia of the District.

There are not sufficient accommodations in that room for the men to hang their clothing. Space that would ordinarily be given to one man is given over to two or three men. There is no room to put their overcoats away, and they are compelled, when they have finished using their overcoats, to store them in dry-goods boxes, to lie there until they are needed the next time, perhaps being put away in a damp condition to mildew and to be destroyed. They have no place to drill, but are compelled to go out into the streets and while they are engaged in drilling dodge automobiles. In another place we have a fire trap back of the market in which we have stored over \$200,000 worth of Government supplies that may at any time be destroyed by fire.

It does seem to me that if there is anything in the way of a building that is necessary in this District, it is a building for the National Guard. It is not like the ordinary guard. It is not a District Guard, as the Senator intimates, but it is an organization—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is like the National Guard in every State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not at all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is not any other system to organize upon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not at all, Mr. President. It is an organization created by the laws of the United States, and of that organization the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief. They are subject to the call of the Federal Government; they are not District troops. It is as much our duty to take care of them as it is to take care of any part of the Regular Army of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is there a special statute distinguishing the District Guard from the guard of other States?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is a special statute; and the Senator will find it in the Twenty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 772, amended in Thirty-fifth Statutes at Large, page 620. The guard of the District is created by Federal statute, and it does materially from the State militia—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is no mere State militia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It differs in the respect to which I have called attention, namely, that it is under the command of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. It is the absolute duty of the National Government to take care of these troops. They are not like the State troops at all.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, there is no militia that I know of in the United States now. They are all members of the National Guard. The Dick bill reorganized the entire old militia of the whole country into the National Guard; they are all subject to duty; and the National Guard of this District, I think, stand practically upon the same footing, except that, this not being a State but the District of Columbia, they respond at once to the President, instead of first to the governor of a State, but their plan or organization, I think, as a part of the National Guard is practically the same, beyond that fact.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator says "that is all," as though that were nothing. That is all, but it is everything. It makes the difference between the mere State troops and the forces under the control of the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There are no State troops. They are not mere State troops in any of the States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, yes, they are. They are State militia, provided for by State law.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. ROOT. I think the Senator from Georgia is speaking on this subject without full consideration. His colleague has very definite ideas about it, upon which he has been insisting for many years in the Senate.

The Dick bill provided that the organizations in the States which were State troops, ordinarily known as the National

Guard of this, that, and the other State, which took advantage of certain specified appropriations of Congress should be the Organized Militia of the United States. They are still State troops. When they are acting under laws of Congress they are militia. The District National Guard, so called, is nothing else than militia. It is national militia and nothing else. The National Guards of the States have a double aspect. They are State troops, subject to the control of the governors of the States for State purposes, rendering State services; and when they are acting under the laws of Congress, then they are also militia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am reasonably familiar with the Dick bill. I think I am entirely familiar with the relation which the National Guard bears both to the State and to the Nation. I said there were no mere State troops, and I repeat it. They are not mere State troops. My language was that they were not merely State troops any longer; that the Dick bill changed their status; that they are now the National Guard; and while in times of peace when the Nation does not require them they respond to the command of the governor of the State, they are part of the National Guard of the country, subject in times of war to immediate service, and required to enlist for a definite length of service, but subject under their enlistment, whether they desire to do so or not, to national service in case of war.

Mr. ROOT. That is a State designation. "The National Guard" is the name of State organizations exclusively. The national designation is "militia."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yet, as I remember, all the communications from the War Department now come to them recognizing the term "National Guard."

Mr. ROOT. It is of no consequence whether the communications go to them under that name or under the other. The National Guard is a State organization. It has impressed upon it, as a part of the militia, or as the Organized Militia, certain national characteristics. But let me suggest this to the Senator: This bill is not making any other provision, nor any further or better provision, for the militia organization in the District of Columbia than that which the States are making for their own guard. At all events, in my own State we are spending fully as great amounts of money for the erection of armories for the National Guard as it is proposed to spend here in the District for this armory; and it is so, I know, in many other States.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator permit me, in line with what the Senator from New York has just suggested, to call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that the Seventh Regiment, a single regiment in New York, has an armory which cost \$1,938,268.50?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator also tell me who paid for it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The State.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is the Senator sure? Was that by State appropriation?

Mr. ROOT. It was. An armory board was created, under the laws of the State, to purchase the sites and to put up the buildings for these armories.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is the Senator from Utah sure that that entire fund was paid out of the State treasury?

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I will not say that a portion of it was not paid out of the city treasury; but it was paid entirely out of the funds of the State of New York, out of the State treasury or the city treasury.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was paid out of public moneys.

Mr. ROOT. Not moneys of the United States; moneys of the State.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I know it was not moneys of the United States, but I was under the impression that it was partly contributed by men connected with the National Guard themselves.

Mr. ROOT. No; it was paid from the public moneys.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Let me further call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Eighth Regiment has an armory which cost seven hundred and twenty-one thousand and some odd dollars; I will leave out the odd figures. The Ninth Regiment has an armory which cost \$809,000. The Twelfth Regiment has an armory which cost \$586,000. The Twenty-second Regiment has an armory which cost \$1,689,000. The Sixty-ninth Regiment has an armory which cost \$1,539,000. The Seventy-first Regiment has an armory which cost \$1,608,000. There are a number of others. I have not the complete list. Those are all single regiments.

Mr. ROOT. The Twenty-second Regiment has one, too.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I mentioned the Twenty-second Regiment—\$1,689,000. Those, as I say, are for single regiments. We propose to build an armory for an entire brigade, three

regiments—when recruited to the full force, that would make 4,000 men—at a cost of \$1,750,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But they are not recruited to the full force. There are only 2,000 of them now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. One of the great reasons why they are not recruited to the full force is because of the miserable, inadequate quarters that they are compelled to go into. Everybody understands that the construction of an armory of itself is an incitement to young men to join the National Guards of the States. They have a pleasant place to go. They have something to be proud of.

There is nothing to be proud of in the District of Columbia, with lofts above grocery stores, with this poor, miserable makeshift to which I have called attention, with a bicycle-repair shop upon one side, with no place to store their clothing. There is no feeling of pride about it. The colonel of one of the regiments, who came before our committee, and who has given this matter great study and investigation, said to us that he had not the slightest doubt that if this armory were built the brigade would be promptly recruited to its full strength.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As I said, Mr. President, there is not any brigade here. According to the Senator's own statement, there are 2,000 men. It does appear that the State of New York, from the treasury of that State, has with great liberality provided for the National Guard. But take the situation in Maryland: I am informed that the splendid armory there was built, not by the State, but largely by private subscription. We have where I live a large armory, together with an auditorium, which seats 10,000 people. Not a dollar of the cost of that armory came from the State. The relation of the members of the National Guard here, as I said before, differs from the relation of the members of the National Guard in other parts of the country to the National Government only in this respect: There being no governor here, the President is the Commander in Chief in times of peace, while in other States the governor is the commander in chief in times of peace. But in every State of the Union every member of the National Guard, just as in the District of Columbia, in times of war, is bound by his enlistment, and stands for the service of the Nation.

If we were to go to war to-day with a foreign country every member of the National Guard in every State of the Union would already be an enlisted soldier—not a member of the militia of the State, to volunteer or not as he saw fit, but he would be bound by his obligation to go to war. The relation which they bear to the Government all over the United States in case of war is practically the same. In time of peace they respond here to the President, while in the States they respond to the governor.

There may be some of these men who ought to be better quartered, and they easily could be. It would not take \$1,750,000 to build an armory even for a brigade. The plans of this building involve a great deal more than an armory. They involve, as I understand—I wish to be corrected by the Senator from Utah if I am mistaken—a charming auditorium.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know of any such arrangement. There is provision for a large drill hall, which may be used for an auditorium as well. For example, if we had the armory building in operation now, perhaps Mr. Wilson, the incoming President, would not have objected to an inaugural ball, because it might have been held there. But we have no place now for a function of that character unless we turn the Pension Office upside down.

Mr. ROOT. The George Washington Memorial Building is to have an auditorium.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It will provide for that, too; but there is no separate auditorium, at any rate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The clause just before that provides for an inauguration hall.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. As I understand, the inaugural ceremonies are provided for in the clause in the bill just before this. The inauguration ceremonies are fully provided for in that clause.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That can be used when it is built; but I was answering the suggestion of the Senator that there was an auditorium. He had stated it as though there were a drill hall and also an auditorium. That is not so. There is a large drill hall, which may be used upon occasion for a drill hall or which may not be; but it is primarily a drill hall.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Even, Mr. President, in providing for brigades of actual soldiers, we do not build in this lavish style. It is unnecessary; it is not an incident of a soldier's life. The appropriation of \$1,750,000 for building an auditorium or drill hall, if that name is preferable, is not an incident of the service of the National Guard at all. It goes far beyond it; it

means more. It is intended for more than to care for the National Guard.

The next provision to which I refer is \$750,000 for an auditorium out at Arlington, to be used once or twice a year. I would be glad to see one there, but there is no necessity for it now.

There is the appropriation of \$5,000,000, to build a bridge across the Potomac. I would be glad to see it built some time, but I can not conceive the propriety of spending the public money for such a purpose now, while we still pay \$600,000 a year rent in the District for quarters that we actually need for the use of Government employees. It seems that we pay \$17,000 for the quarters of the National Guard, and we are to quit that cheap rent for an investment of \$1,750,000, while we continue the payment of nearly \$600,000 rent for quarters that could be built at far less than a 3 per cent basis.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, like the Senator from Georgia, I was at one time commander in chief of the army and navy of one of the States of the Union. I am interested therefore in the National Guard, and I want a little information in regard to this particular appropriation from the chairman of the committee.

I do not make the same objection to it that has been suggested by the Senator from Georgia. My own observation is that if we would preserve the National Guard and make it as efficient as it ought to be, the country—either the State or the Nation—must supply the armory in which it is to make itself efficient.

But what bothers me is this: Does the Senator from Utah believe that there will ever be a regimental drill or a brigade drill in this armory? There never was an armory built large enough for a regiment to drill in or for a brigade to drill in. These armories are built for company drills, and the regimental drills are, as far as I have ever observed them, held as they ought to be in the open air, at the appropriate season of the year.

Now, just imagine if there were three regiments of the National Guard in the District of Columbia. Are there three or four?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are three regiments. There is a brigade.

Mr. CUMMINS. A brigade may be three or four or more regiments.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are three regiments and the other organizations.

Mr. CUMMINS. A brigade simply means in the National Guard that it has taken advantage of the law which enables it to have a brigade formation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think there are 4,000 troops.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well. If there are three regiments there will be 36 companies. Thirty-six companies will be recruited from men all over the District of Columbia, scattered from the northernmost to the southernmost limits and from the eastern to the western border.

Now, do you expect that all those men, in order to drill under their company commander, will come at a stated period once a week or once in two weeks into a central building located in the heart of the city of Washington? I do not believe it will serve any useful purpose if we confine the work of the National Guard—the drill, the preparation—to a central point like that. I can understand how it might be true in the city of New York, where a regiment might be gathered in three or four blocks of that very crowded population, but that is not true of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think they do come from all over the city.

Mr. CUMMINS. On the contrary—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is the only hall which they have.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Utah has just stated that there are many places all over the city in which these companies gather and drill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But they do, all of them, come to this central hall to drill as well.

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not imagine that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Because it is the only place that is under cover. They drill a part of the time, in the case I have illustrated, in the space beyond the War Department. They drill in the street at times.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well; they might drill in the street, but if you believe that three regiments or four regiments of the National Guard can be made efficient by company drill carried on in a single room in the city of Washington, you are bound to disappointment. It never has been done, and it never will be done so long as human nature remains as it is.

It is difficult enough to get these men together for drill, as we have known in the history of the National Guard, because from year to year we have been endeavoring to create additional inducements for men to drill regularly in order that they might become soldiers and understand the discipline and the learning of war. But they will not do it, according to my observation, if they are compelled to come from these far-distant points to a central place for that purpose.

If I were organizing a system for the District of Columbia, if I were trying to do something for the National Guard, instead of having a regimental armory, so called, I would have many company armories, because it is the company after all that makes the National Guard what it is. The regimental drill is largely ornamental and the brigade drill is still more ornamental.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I want to take issue with the Senator. He is stating the reverse of the fact.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from New York can have his own opinion about it. I have stated mine.

Mr. ROOT. The regimental drill is more important than the company drill, and the brigade drill is more important than the regimental drill.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think not. Whatever may be the view of the Senator from New York my judgment is otherwise, and whatever he may have had to do with the Regular Army, I have had more to do with the National Guard, probably, than he.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is it not true that brigade drill never takes place under cover?

Mr. CUMMINS. I never heard of a brigade drill taking place under cover. I never saw a regimental drill taking place under cover. It may be that there are buildings large enough for a complete regimental drill, but I never saw one. I have seen the National Guard of a good many States, and their regimental drills are held in encampments at certain seasons of the year, where the companies come together for that purpose; and if they have brigade formation they are also held at certain seasons of the year.

But I care nothing about that. I return to the original proposition, that in order to make a soldier he must be drilled by his company commander and the art of war is taught him by his company drill. I do not say that the regimental drill is not valuable. On the contrary, I assume that in time of war it would be very necessary; but, so far as the preparation made by the National Guard is concerned, the great important thing is the alertness and the completeness of the work in the company and under the captain of the company. I know that, because in most of the States of the Union they have no regimental drill save once or twice a year, and that for probably one week, whereas they have company drill every week or every two weeks.

Therefore, submitting my opinion with all deference to those of wider experience, I think that when we come to take care of the National Guard in the District of Columbia we will do well to care for them as companies.

I do not mean to say that we should have an armory for every company—that would be impracticable—but we ought to have armories so scattered over the District of Columbia that the members of a few companies may seek it easily and conveniently, alternating upon nights assigned for the drill. If we are to provide for regimental drills, they must be in open spaces in the District of Columbia. I would rather buy a parade ground in the District of Columbia for these maneuvers than attempt to cover them under a monumental structure of this character.

I am not objecting to the expenditure of money. I am simply objecting to the manner in which it is proposed to be expended in this bill. I know what many people believe about it—that we will rear a great monumental building, something like the Senate Office Building, or at least commanding like the new Post Office Building. Sooner or later we will have to draw the line between the monumental building, which is intended to convey the dignity and the greatness of the country, and the utilitarian structure, which is built purely upon business lines. I think an armory, especially in a city like Washington and in the District of Columbia, ought to take on the latter form rather than the former.

I would not object at all to the expenditure of money at the proper time. It may be that in view of the immense sums that are to be appropriated by this bill we are not ready for it, but when the time comes, if there is not public spirit enough here to build these armories individually, and I doubt whether there is, I think the welfare of the Government requires that we shall take care of the National Guard, and I will be very glad to do it.

We have in my State four regiments of the National Guard. It is not a large force, but it holds a very creditable place in the National Guard of the Union. Some of its members have won high honor, not only in national competition but in international competition as well. I suppose that we have 30 armories over the State, and I will venture to say that the 30 armories have not cost more than \$750,000; and not one penny was ever contributed by the State to either of them, although the State makes an allowance to every company in the way of rent for the armory property. We have endeavored to bring that guard to its present excellence by providing for company drill, and I am not willing to do more than that in the District of Columbia.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I move to lay section 12—

Mr. SUTHERLAND rose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I rose to move to lay the amendment on the table, but I will not do it, in view of the chairman of the committee rising.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have only a word or two to add to what I have already said upon this subject. The question is of no more concern to me than it is to anyone else, but I have taken the trouble to go through the city and examine the various quarters in which these men are housed. I undertook a moment ago to state the condition of some of them. I wish to read very briefly from what Col. Harvey said about some of the others. After describing some of them, the chairman asked the character of the buildings in which all these supplies are stored.

The CHAIRMAN. The character of buildings in which all of these supplies are stored, how does that compare with the Y. M. C. A. Building, for example?

Col. HARVEY. The Y. M. C. A. Building, in which the National Guard Company is quartered, is not a part of what is known as the Y. M. C. A. Building; it is a temporary shed. It was an old bicycle barn.

The CHAIRMAN. A wooden shed?

Col. HARVEY. It is a wooden shed, covered with corrugated iron.

The CHAIRMAN. And contains a good many inflammable materials?

Col. HARVEY. There are a good many inflammable materials all about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there some oil about there?

Col. HARVEY. I do not know about that. There is a livery stable next door, and they had a fire there not more than a year or so ago and considerable property was destroyed there.

Our main armory is over what is known as the Center Market, and there, in order to get storage accommodations, which the building did not afford in its original shape, they built up on iron girders a framework, which they filled in with wooden partitions covered with galvanized iron, and in that temporary sort of a building we have a considerable amount of property stored.

Then we have an old residence on Missouri Avenue, between Four-and-a-half and Sixth Streets, one of a row of very old houses in a run-down and unsightly neighborhood, in which we have quartermaster's stores deposited.

Our field battery is in two old houses, and we have a shed over one portion of them so as to afford gun room; and we have another storage room which is no more secure in one of the small, old buildings on B Street, between Sixth and Seventh Streets. The stores are at the mercy of fire at any time.

That was the premises of which I spoke when I said that they stored upward of \$200,000 worth of Government supplies in that old building.

He goes on and speaks of the condition. First, speaking of the State of New York, he says:

New York State, I will say here, has 59 armories owned by the State or county and maintains practically an entire division. She has something over 16,000 troops—and when I say "troops" in reference to New York guardsmen I think it is a correct statement. These soldiers are held up to a good standard of discipline, and it is possible to keep them to that standard.

They have spent in the State of New York for armories an aggregate, as I recall the figures, of over \$10,000,000, with their 16,000 troops.

Then he goes on and states that some of the men have to double up.

Some of the men have to double up and put the equipments of the two men in one locker. The standard locker adopted by the Army is 6 feet high, 24 inches wide, and 18 inches deep. The lockers which we have—80 per cent of them—are not half that size. We can not put all of a man's equipment in them. Take, for instance, our equipment of overcoats. We have not any place to put a man's overcoat to keep it except in packing boxes. We have stored in our main armory stack upon stack of big chests containing the overcoats. If a company is ordered out in winter, a man has to go to the armory superintendent, draw his box of overcoats, give a receipt for it, take it out, and issue it to the men. You can see how absolutely impossible it is to make a quick movement with that kind of accommodations.

There is much more to the same purpose, showing the utterly inadequate makeshift with which these men are compelled to put up.

I can only say in reply to what the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has suggested, that the committee heard this question at very great length and with a great deal of patience. Col. Harvey appeared on behalf of the militia and other officers

of the militia. In addition to that, Brig. Gen. Robert K. Evans, who is chief of the division of military affairs of the entire country, who has given this matter very great thought, came before us. All these officers, thoroughly familiar with the situation, agreed that this was a proper way to deal with the question.

Now, I am not a military expert, and I must take the judgment of these men who have familiarity with it, and I do take it in preference to my own.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Can the Senator from Utah tell me how many men are expected to drill in the proposed armory at one time?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know, Mr. President, how many men.

Mr. CUMMINS. More than one company?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; I should say so. The Senator spoke about a brigade drill. Of course nobody pretends that an entire brigade is going to drill in this hall. I made no such suggestion.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does anybody pretend that a whole regiment will drill in it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; not a whole regiment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Or any two companies at the same time?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I see no reason why two companies should not drill—perhaps more than two companies; I do not know. That is a detail which was not brought to our attention. We did hear these military men, who have made a study of this question for years and have been familiar with these plans. They are familiar with the fact that the building is to be constructed at a central place; they know where the men are coming from, and all of them agree that this is the proper way to put up this building.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. Can the Senator tell us how large this proposed building will be?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The building will have a drill hall 243 by 350 feet in area. That is not as large as several of the drill halls in the armories in New York. I have the figures here if the Senator cares to have them. I will not take up the time to quote them.

Mr. CLAPP. I should think that a battalion could be drilled in a hall of that size.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Two hundred and forty-three by 350 feet?

Mr. CLAPP. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well—

Mr. CLAPP. Personally I think this item ought to be on another bill. It seems to me the item should be in the District of Columbia appropriation bill; but aside from that I would be in favor of putting up the building.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. These officers speak of the necessity of having an armory constructed in such a way and with such material that it could be defended against attack if it were necessary. Of course, we may think that there will never be an occasion, yet there may be. Armories are built in that way. Col. Harvey spoke of the necessity of having it constructed in such a way that if attacks were made it could be successfully defended. We can not go out here and simply erect a barn, some frame structure. In addition to that, it is to be located in a central point, surrounded by all these beautiful buildings, and it ought to be a building in keeping with others in the city of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. I am not a military expert, so I am not interested in the military part of this proposition; but I have been very much impressed with the statement made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] in regard to the expense that we have here for the rent of buildings.

You may appropriate a million dollars for a building, and if it is built of steel, as is usual in the construction of our public buildings, there is a very heavy expense for small accommodation.

I will venture the suggestion that the Southern Building down here will hold as much of a working force as \$10,000,000 worth of Government buildings would, as they are constructed. We are using these new office buildings very largely. I think the

Government probably is the largest tenant of most of them. Why would it not be practicable to buy one of them and save some of the rent we are paying instead of waiting for years to have one built, and then have a building that will not accommodate many people in proportion to its expense.

The criticism on that will be, Oh, it is not in keeping. Well, I am in sympathy with the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] that there is not any use of these great monumental buildings like the Capitol and Senate Office Building for ordinary workshops and office buildings. You could take two office buildings in this city, the Southern Building and the Woodward Building, across from it, and buy them for less than \$5,000,000 and probably save half the rent that we are paying. I want to inquire of some of the more experienced Senators here, if that would not be a much more proper proposition than those that are contained in the bill, so far as usefulness to the Government is concerned?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator does not think that we can buy an armory building?

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh, no; I am not in on this military business. I am not impressed with it much myself. I would not think of spending \$750,000 for land that we already own for a parade ground. I would rather parade out here on sunny days in the park somewhere.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator knows the experience we have had with the Geological Survey building. That is a building constructed by private parties. Everything we have there is in danger of being destroyed at any time by fire. Some one has just told me that they had a fire there, I think it was last night. They are not fireproof buildings.

Mr. BRISTOW. But, then, is not the Southern Building fireproof? Have they not fireproof office buildings here that could be obtained?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It seems to me the Government of the United States can build these structures quite as cheaply as it can allow somebody else to build them, and then pay for them.

Mr. BRISTOW. That may be true; it ought to be true; but when we make an appropriation for a departmental building and it will be three or four years before it is constructed, while a private company will go to work, authorize a building tomorrow, and in a year from that time it will be occupied. Why can we not do the same thing? Why is it not done, if we can do it?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would not interrupt the Senator to ask for the reading of a letter but for the fact that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] has referred to a fire which occurred this morning. I have a letter here describing that fire and the manner in which it injured very valuable public property. I should like to have it read by the Secretary. I will, however, defer the request until the Senator concludes, if he desires that I shall do so.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am through. I simply wanted to make these suggestions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY,
Washington, February 26, 1913.

Hon. MILES POINDEXTER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The fire at 1320 F Street at 7.15 this morning calls attention to the imminent danger to the public records in the rented quarters of the United States Geological Survey. This fire was only 12 feet from the "annex," an alley building occupied by the engraving division of the survey, and a building itself a fire trap and termed "death trap" by Representative CANTRELL on the basis of an inspection made by a House committee. This small building contains not only the machinery and tools used in this Government work, the value of which is not less than \$100,000, but here are stored the engraved copper plates representing the work of 30 years to the number of 8,000. These have a replacement value of \$750,000, and would need to be reengraved at this cost to meet the public demands for the periodic resissue of the topographic maps which now sell to the amount of half a million annually.

The greatest loss that would surely result from a fire in the annex, however, would be the destruction of 150 or more manuscript maps in process of engraving. This loss would mean the resurvey of the areas represented, and thus necessitate at once the duplicate expenditure of from \$600,000 to \$1,000,000.

The fire loss possible in the main survey building at 1330 F Street would total between three and four million dollars in addition to that stated above.

In my opinion these facts present an unanswerable argument for the authorization of the public building proposed for the Geological Survey on a site outside the congested business section of the city.

Very respectfully,

GEO. OTIS SMITH, Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, Maj. L'Enfant and the first President of the United States and his Secretary of State had broad imaginations and long vision. They planned to make Washington an architecturally well-adorned place. They went back, not without reason, to those styles of architecture which had illustrated the public life of the ancient Republics, Athens and Rome, and I hope that the Congress of the United States will never permit any mere utilitarian purpose to destroy the architectural harmony of the city of Washington—a pillared classic, a white columnar architecture, now and then with a Græco-Roman dome. It is perfectly fitting that the greatest Republic of modern times should perpetuate the characteristic architecture of the two greatest Republics of the old times.

I am not very much in favor of splendid government; everybody knows that; I am in favor of simplicity of governmental machinery; but I do believe that the Capital of this Nation can be made full of illustrations of the grandest types of classical architecture that the world has ever seen. It is not quite that yet, although we have in the Capitol, the Congressional Library, the old Treasury building, and in some of the other buildings in the city some very splendid illustrations of it. The day will come when the best specimens of the public architecture of Rome and Athens will sink into absolute insignificance in comparison with that of the Capital of the American Republic. To allow the mere utilitarian consideration of getting the most room possible in a public building to destroy the harmony of it all is unutterably abhorrent to me.

In one case, at any rate, we can see what a blotch has been made. This new post-office building on Pennsylvania Avenue is a sort of cross between a medieval town hall and a modern brewery. Its presence destroys the great picture that Pennsylvania Avenue after a while will present when it is all lined with great, white-pillared, classic buildings, in harmony with one another and in harmony with the original classic architectural plan of the city of Washington, which, in my opinion, ought never to be departed from.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. In regard to the architectural beauty of our city, I suppose the Senator from Mississippi has in mind the Interior Department, the Land Department, the Post Office Building, and the Pension Office?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have in my mind the old Post Office Building, the old Interior Department Building, where the old Patent Office was—very creditable specimens of classic architecture—but I have not in my mind the present post-office building. I have just now said that it was a cross between a medieval town hall and a modern brewery building.

Mr. BORAH. I am not familiar with the latter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, nobody could carry in his mind for any great length of time without having the mental picture of it making him insane either the Pension Bureau or the Census structure down here below the Capitol. I want to avoid all future hybrid repetitions of either one of them.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for a division.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 31, noes 18.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A quorum has not voted. I make that point, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There were 49 votes, and 48 is a quorum. A quorum has voted.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then, I call for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIGGS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON], and will therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I will withhold my vote in his absence.

Mr. CULBERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], and will therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON], who is not present, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BRIGGS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON] to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I transfer the pair I have with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], with whom I have a pair, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PERKINS (after voting in the affirmative). I inquire if the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has voted?

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

Mr. PERKINS. I have a general pair with that Senator, and will therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. PAYNTER (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM] has voted?

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

Mr. PAYNTER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Colorado. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY] and will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bankhead	Clark, Wyo.	Kavanaugh	Smith, Md.
Bourne	Crawford	Lodge	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Curtis	McLean	Smoot
Brandeggee	Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Sutherland
Briggs	Fall	Page	Swanson
Burnham	Fletcher	Paynter	Townsend
Catron	Gallinger	Penrose	Warren
Chamberlain	Jackson	Poinexter	Wetmore
Clapp	Jones	Root	

NAYS—26.

Borah	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Pittman	Stone
Bryan	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Sheppard	Williams
Cummins	Lea	Shively	
Gore	Myers	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—34.

Ashurst	du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Bacon	Foster	Nelson	Stephenson
Brown	Gamble	Newlands	Thornton
Burton	Gardner	Oliver	Tillman
Chilton	Gronna	Overman	Watson
Crane	Guggenheim	Percy	Webb
Culbertson	La Follette	Perkins	Works
Cullom	Lippitt	Reed	
Dixon	McCumber	Richardson	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 53, after line 16, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 13. That the acquisition by the commission hereinafter mentioned of a site and the erection thereon of a memorial building in the District of Columbia to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the loyal women of the United States during the Civil War is hereby authorized. The said building shall be monumental in design and character and shall be used as the permanent headquarters of the American Red Cross, and shall cost, with the site, not less than \$700,000, of which sum the United States shall contribute \$400,000, which shall not be payable, however, until there shall have been raised by private subscription by the Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States an additional sum of \$300,000.

The money hereby authorized shall not be paid for any site nor toward the construction of any memorial unless the site and the plan for the proposed building shall have been approved by a commission consisting of the Secretary of War of the United States, a representative of the Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, and a representative of the American Red Cross, which representatives shall be duly designated by said associations, respectively, to act for them. The plans of the said memorial shall likewise be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. The expenditure for said site and memorial shall be made under the direction of the commission consisting of the Secretary of War and the representatives of the Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States and the American Red Cross; and the said memorial shall be constructed under the supervision of an officer of the Corps of Engineers appointed by the Secretary of War, who shall act as the executive disbursing officer of the commission.

The title to the site procured shall be taken by and the building erected thereon shall be the property of the United States, but the American National Red Cross shall at all times be charged with and be responsible for the care, keeping, and maintenance of the said memorial and grounds without expense to the United States, subject to such further direction and control as may be provided by law.

Should the commission hereby created be unable to acquire a suitable site at a price deemed by the commission to be fair, it is authorized to institute condemnation proceedings, in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, providing a site for the enlargement of the Government Printing Office (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 26, ch. 837).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I move to strike out, in line 20, page 53, the word "loyal."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment, on line 20, page 53, before the word "women," by striking out the word "loyal," so as to make the amendment read:

SEC. 13. That the acquisition by the commission hereinafter mentioned of a site and the erection thereon of a memorial building in the District of Columbia to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States during the Civil War is hereby authorized—

And so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, \$400,000 of this money is contributed from the Treasury of the United States. The total cost is to be \$700,000, and I would be perfectly willing that the entire \$700,000 should be contributed from the Treasury of the United States; in fact, I think that ought to be done.

Mr. President, Mississippi and Mississippians are as much in the Union to-day as Massachusetts and Massachusetts men and women. The money in the Treasury is paid by the citizens of the entire country—by the citizens of the South as much as by the citizens of the North. It would be a beautiful idea to erect here a beautiful building to commemorate the courage, fortitude, faithfulness, and sacrifices of the women of the United States during the American war between the States. During the four years of that war there was neither in the ante bellum nor in the post bellum sense any United States. There were a couple of congeries or groups of formerly united and subsequently reunited but temporarily disunited States.

It seems to me the time has about come when, in connection with the women at any rate, if not with the men, we might commemorate the courage and loyalty of both sides. It seems to me that it is not contributing half so much to the glory of the Republic to erect a beautiful building in commemoration of the sacrifices and courage of the women of only a part of the United States and leave uncommemorated the sacrifices and services of the women of the other part of the United States. I leave the question to the good sense of the Senate.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, if this were an original proposition, I should not hesitate for a moment to agree with the Senator from Mississippi. I do not think I ought to let it go, however, without calling the attention of the Senate to the fact that this amendment is in the terms of a bill which has already passed the Senate. I feel that I ought to call attention to it, because I think I reported that bill, and had charge of it.

The bill came before a committee of which I was a member, and was considered on the basis of the state of facts that \$300,000 had been subscribed for a building to commemorate the services of the loyal women of the United States during the Civil War, and that a change might imperil and lose that subscription. That is all. If the Government were to make up that subscription, I should be quite willing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether it would not be a great deal better that the Government should make up the whole \$700,000, and pay this tribute to all of the women of our entire country, than to put it in such shape that it would possibly estrange or wound the feelings of any of them.

Mr. ROOT. That would be very agreeable to me, if the Government would make it up; but I do not feel like letting this amendment pass sub silentio, so long as it might kill the whole enterprise by destroying the \$300,000 subscription.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to add a further amendment, changing the \$400,000 to \$700,000, and then I will vote for the provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Government of the United States is paying \$400,000 of this, whether it is paying the total cost or not; and that, it seems to me, would answer the objection that has been raised. But in order that there shall be no objection, I now give notice that if this amendment shall pass I shall move to strike out so much of the provision as makes it conditional upon the Commandery of the Loyal Legion of the State of New York paying \$300,000.

Let us try to get together upon a common ground. Let us quit making the United States Government the source of the celebra-

tion of the courage, fortitude, and valor of only one part of the United States. Especially is that the case when it comes to the question of the women who suffered in silence—and in my section of the country who frequently starved—who showed a courage infinitely superior to that of the men, because they had no shoulder-to-shoulder touch; no hurraing of the men and shouting of the captains to keep them spirited up.

I give notice that if the amendment which I now offer shall pass I shall then move to strike out the \$300,000 which the commandery of New York is expected to contribute and to have that sum assumed by the United States.

Mr. ROOT. I suppose the Senator means to increase the appropriation correspondingly?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course; to increase the Federal appropriation to \$700,000. I will let the Senator from New York draw up the amendment to suit himself, so that that will fix it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment submitted by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes appear to have it.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like a roll call on that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I ask that the amendment as finally proposed by the Senator from Mississippi may be again reported to the Senate. I understand it is proposed to strike out the word "loyal," and to strike out and insert in other parts of the section.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am only offering that now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the word "loyal" where it appears before the word "women."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from New York. I move to strike out all on line 25, page 53, after the amount "\$700,000," and all on lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 on page 54. Does not that accomplish the purpose?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, I beg the pardon of the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. The matter is still open to debate, however.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from New York, who are discussing the redrafting of this provision, to the fact that there are other provisions in the bill which would have to be redrafted also, because this whole proposition is to be controlled by a commission, of which the Loyal Legion of New York is to furnish one member.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, that need not be interfered with. There is no reason to interfere with that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have very serious doubts whether the Loyal Legion might wish to be connected with this matter at all if they were to be denied the privilege of concluding the plan which they originated, namely, of contributing a fund, they having raised the first \$300,000 and having proposed the whole plan.

Mr. ROOT. They would not be denied the right of contributing because the Government of the United States contributed \$700,000. If they chose to come in with this subscription they could do it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator from New York think they would want to do it?

Mr. ROOT. I do not know, Mr. President.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that I think these amendments ought all to go together.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is adopted, as I hope it will be and as it ought to be, the rest of the bill can be very easily amended in accordance with his amendment. It seems to me, when the roll call is taken on his amendment, if it is adopted the bill can be readily fixed to suit the amendment offered by him.

Mr. LODGE. The whole paragraph would have to be redrafted.

Mr. SWANSON. Not necessarily. We could simply take the first section and direct the Secretary of War to construct this building, to be the home of the Red Cross, and let the others contribute. It could be very easily reconstructed after the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, one word. The pending amendment contemplates striking out the word "loyal," leaving the balance of the paragraph to stand. That would be somewhat incongruous in view of all the provisions of the section. I agree with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], that all of the amendments, or the reformed and redrafted section, ought to be submitted as a substitute for the section as it now appears in the bill. We would then know what we were voting upon. We would have a concrete proposition that would be in contrast with the one in the bill, which is a wholly distinct proposition. I am not in favor of either.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I can state, with the permission of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who, I believe, has the floor, how the provision would read after making the full amendment. The first proposition was to strike out the word "loyal." The next would be to strike out the word "of," in line 5, page 53, and the next to strike out all of the balance of that clause after the word "contribute," in line 1, page 54, so that section 13 would read as follows:

SEC. 13. That the acquisition by the commission hereinafter mentioned of a site and the erection thereon of a memorial building in the District of Columbia to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States during the Civil War is hereby authorized. The said building shall be monumental in design and character and shall be used as the permanent headquarters of the American Red Cross, and shall cost, with the site, not less than \$700,000, which sum the United States shall contribute.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I am in thorough sympathy with the proposed amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] as a separate proposition; but it seems to me the adoption of the amendment would defeat the purpose of the committee amendment.

As I understand the committee amendment, it is probably inserted at the suggestion of the organization known as the Loyal Legion, the membership of which is confined to those who fought upon the Union side during the Civil War. That organization proposes to raise, or has raised, \$300,000 for a certain definite purpose, to wit, the erection of a memorial building in memory of the loyal women during the war between the States. Now it comes and asks that the Government of the United States shall add to the \$300,000 which it has raised for that distinct purpose \$400,000 out of the General Treasury.

It seems to me that the proposition of the Senator from Mississippi entirely takes the ground from under the proposition as reported by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me, the building would still be in commemoration of the services and sacrifices of our mothers and sisters, and we ask for no money.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator must understand the proposition which he presents and the proposition which is presented by the Loyal Legion are two separate and distinct propositions. It occurs to me that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. While I would be perfectly willing, and, indeed, very much gratified, to vote as an independent proposition for the amendment the Senator from Mississippi presents, I do not think that I ought to take it as a substitute for the proposition which the Loyal Legion present as a separate matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me a minute, there is nothing in this to prevent them from using their \$300,000 to commemorate what they choose. We are merely including all that they want to commemorate in a broader and more national commemoration.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. No; but—

Mr. WILLIAMS. And in order that there may be no cause to complain of the broader purpose, because they are contributing, we do the work ourselves. Certainly, I take it, there will be no complaint on their part. The real object of the building is the occupancy of it, and that will be for the American Red Cross.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Yet the Senator from Mississippi can not escape the conclusion—

Mr. WILLIAMS. And our women are in it as well as everybody else's.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. And yet the Senator from Mississippi can not escape the conclusion that if we adopt his amendment we refuse to contribute \$400,000 to assist the Loyal Legion in erecting the building which they have proposed to build.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. We amend so as to contribute \$400,000 for a commemoration national—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I want to vote \$400,000 of the money of the United States to join with the Loyal Legion in making this memorial that they want. Then I want to join the Senator from Mississippi to vote \$700,000 for the memorial which he wants.

I am not just now willing to substitute the one for the other, because I think there is merit in the proposition presented by the committee.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not believe there is a Senator in the Chamber who has less of sectional feeling than I have. It never occurred to me that a man comes from either the North or the South, so far as any feeling harking back to the past is concerned. I have quite as much respect for the women of the South as I have for the women of the North; but this proposition originated with the members of the Loyal Legion. They present the proposition to us. The bill is drafted and presented with the knowledge that it is a plan which they have proposed. If Senators on that side feel that this is a matter that would cast any reflection upon the women of the South, I would rather defeat the whole proposition—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator himself feel—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Let me finish my sentence. I would rather defeat the whole proposition than to treat the Loyal Legion, whose plan this is, in a way that would seem to me to be most discourteous. I hope we have not reached the time when this Government can not propose to honor the men and their mothers and wives and daughters who made the Government possible without having attached to it a proposition to divest it of its patriotic intent. I shall feel obliged, under the circumstances, to vote against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator think there is anything in my amendment that would keep the Loyal Legion from building anything they wanted to commemorate anything they wanted? The only thing is that while this begins with the Loyal Legion, it ends with us. We say we are willing to do what you want done and more, and we say to the Loyal Legion we are willing not to take a dollar from you, provided you are willing to make the application of money to the commemoration of the women of all the United States, who prayed and suffered during the war between the States. The money that is in the Treasury is put there as much by Mississippi, Louisiana, and South Carolina as it is by Michigan and Massachusetts. We are not now two separate groups of disunited States.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I realize that quite as well as the Senator from Mississippi does.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then why take the public money to commemorate solely the heroism of the women of one side?

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator from Mississippi is opposed to that, that is another proposition, but to change, revamp, reconstruct this proposition that was brought up is the thing we object to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we are the legislative body, not the Loyal Legion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I realize that.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not so very overly sensitive about whether we have the word "loyal" in the law or not; I would rather it was not. Therefore, I will vote to strike it out. The word "loyal" as used merely indicates and is intended to indicate in its application here a class of people who fought upon one side of that great civil strife. I do not care much about that. I am opposed to this whole proposition, whether you are going to appropriate the money to commemorate the sacrifices of the loyal women or the women of the United States, the women of the North alone or the women of the North and South together.

Mr. President, on Eighteenth Street, I believe it is, near the Speedway, there is a very beautiful structure erected there by the Daughters of the Revolution, the descendants of the men who fought to establish our independence in the struggle of more than a century ago. If we are to erect a building at public expense to commemorate the devotion and sacrifices of the mothers, wives, and daughters of the soldiers who wore the blue in that stupendous struggle of half a century ago between the States, or if we are going further and erect a memorial building commemorative of the loyalty in a broader sense, the devotion and the sacrifices of the mothers, wives, and daughters of the South and North alike, then why not go on along this line and erect a memorial building to commemorate the sacrifices, the loyalty, and the devotion of the mothers, the wives, and daughters of the soldiers who marched into Mexico and bore our banners across the wastes and won by their swords an empire and gave it to the United States? And we may go on and erect another one in commemoration of the sacrifices of the women in the Spanish-American War.

I think, Mr. President, that buildings of this kind ought to be constructed by contributions made by those patriotically interested, as was done in the construction of the memorial building owned by the Daughters of the American Revolution now standing in this city. I do not believe that the money collected by taxation from the people is well expended in the construc-

tion of establishments of this character. It is, I will not say a useless waste, but it is a useless and extravagant expenditure of money, and it ought not to be put in this bill. For one I intend to vote against the proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that we pass over this paragraph and go on with the balance of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LODGE. It is not too late to pass the amendment over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think we had better settle this question now and not have any more agitation about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. So do I.

Mr. BRISTOW. It would not do any good to discuss it for weeks and weeks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAYNTER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON], and withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER], who is absent from the Chamber. He would doubtless vote "yea," if he were present, and I would vote "nay." Under the circumstances I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In the absence of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], with whom I have a general pair, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and let my vote stand.

Mr. PERCY. I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER], and vote "yea."

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. In his absence I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. OVERMAN] is absent, and is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS]. My colleague is absent on account of his physical condition. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB], and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire again to refer to the enforced absence of my colleague [Mr. BACON]. He was very much interested in this matter, and had he been present he would have voted "yea."

Mr. CULBERSON. I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON], and vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Ashurst	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shively
Bankhead	Gore	Myers	Simmons
Bourne	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.
Bradley	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Johnston, Ala.	Penrose	Smith, Md.
Catron	Jones	Percy	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Kavanaugh	Pittman	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Polindexter	Swanson
Crawford	Lea	Pomerene	Thomas
Culbertson	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Williams

NAYS—24.

Brady	Clapp	Gallinger	Root
Brandegee	Clark, Wyo.	Jackson	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Cummins	Kenyon	Smoot
Bristow	Curtis	Lodge	Sutherland
Burnham	Dillingham	McLean	Townsend
Burton	Fall	Page	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—31.

Bacon	Foster	Nelson	Stephenson
Borah	Gamble	Newlands	Thornton
Brown	Gardner	Oliver	Tillman
Chilton	Gronna	Overman	Warren
Crane	Guggenheim	Paynter	Watson
Cullom	La Follette	Perkins	Webb
Dixon	Lippitt	Reed	Works
du Pont	McCumber	Richardson	

So Mr. WILLIAMS's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In keeping with what I announced, I now move to strike out, on page 53, in line 25, the word "of," after "\$700,000," and on page 54, after the word "contribute," to insert a period and strike out the balance of line 1 and all of lines 2, 3, 4, and 5.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In explanation I will state that it merely strikes out the amount of money to be contributed by the Loyal Legion and makes the entire expense of the total, \$700,000, fall upon the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it seems to me that the section must be so completely rewritten that we might pass it over now and go on with the balance of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BRISTOW. I would rather dispose of it now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. STONE. I ask for the yeas and nays on agreeing to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one word. Of course this will require later on some other amendments. I have marked them all, and will get the whole thing in accord with this amendment. There is no use passing it over at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 53, line 25, strike out the word "of," before the word "which," and on page 54, line 1, strike out, beginning with the numerals "\$400,000," the remainder of the paragraph, so that if amended it will read:

And shall cost, with the site, not less than \$700,000, which sum the United States shall contribute.

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

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I think we ought to have the yeas and nays, and I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to say a word. It is clear to me that it would be an exceedingly great mistake to establish a precedent of this kind. It would be a wrong expenditure of the public money. Certainly this proposition would not have been in this bill—is not that a fact?—except because the Loyal Legion of New York raised by subscription \$300,000 to construct a memorial building commemorative of the sufferings of the women of the Northern States during the war of 1861-1865. Those splendid women of the North have organized their societies, scattered broadcast throughout the States in which they live, and have the beautiful patriotic wish to erect a building commemorative of the devotion of themselves and of their mothers during the period of that great struggle between the States. They had a right to do that. Any movement by them in that direction should command our highest respect. So likewise would the women of the South if they care to do so—and I am not sure that that has not been attempted in some sections of the South—to raise money by subscription to commemorate the suffering, the patriotism, the loyalty of the women of that section.

Mr. President, when we go outside of those individual or concerted efforts to use the public funds of the Nation to construct edifices of this character it does not for one moment appeal to me. There is no more reason why we should take money to construct a building of this kind than that we should construct one, as I have already said, commemorative of the suffering of the women whose lives were identified with other great struggles in which the United States was engaged. I think the whole proposition embraced in this provision should be eliminated. I intend to vote against this kind of an appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I do not believe that a people's life is entirely an immaterial thing. I think that it is as noble of a nation to commemorate the heroism and constancy of its dead as it is of a son to erect a monument upon his father's grave, and I do not consider either a waste of money.

What constitutes a nation is neither its wealth nor its area; it is its traditions, its ideals. It is the soul politic and not the body politic that makes the nation and constitutes the greatness of a government.

I will be glad to see a monument erected to the heroic women of the North and of the South, and I hope it will be such a beautiful building that it may go down in all history as a commemoration equal in beauty and chastity to that which was erected by the great Mohammedan Sultan to his deceased wife, so that it shall contain at one and the same time a beauty of thought, a beauty of life, and a beauty of architecture. There is nothing in this that will prevent somebody at some time or the National Government at some time erecting a monument to commemorate the heroism of its various other heroes whom the Senator has mentioned.

To say that a nation shall never commemorate in granite and in marble and in noble architecture the heroism of the forefathers of the nation is to say that the nation shall shrivel up and become a mere material thing, without soul and without sentiment and without poetry, that makes soul and sentiment.

Some people say that sentiment is rot, unworthy of governmental notice. It is the only thing in the world that is not rot. That is rot which can decay and go back to the earth. The form of the strongest man, of the most beautiful woman, of the sweetest and healthiest-looking child, stocks and bonds, and the rest of it, but there is just one thing that never dies, and that is an ideal, a sentiment, a noble purpose transplanted from one human breast into another, to go traveling down the ages for all time. It is much better to spend money to commemorate the greatness of the heroes who have made a country than it is to spend money to improve present material welfare. So far as that is concerned, I do not agree with the Senator from Missouri.

Now, then, one more word in explanation of the amendment which I have offered and of the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. The Senator from Georgia says there are other parts of the bill that ought to be amended in order to be in keeping with this. Mr. President, I read just below the following:

The money hereby authorized shall not be paid for any site nor toward the construction of any memorial unless the site and the plan for the proposed building shall have been approved by a commission consisting of the Secretary of War of the United States, a representative of the Commandery of the State of New York of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, and a representative of the American Red Cross.

To show the spirit which actuates me, at any rate, in making the motion that I have made, I want to leave, as a member of that commission, the representative of the Order of the Loyal Legion of the State of New York, and let these plans be submitted to him as well as to the other two commissioners. A Senator upon the other side of the vote a second or two ago—I do not mean upon the other side of the Chamber—said to me that this amendment of mine defeated the purpose of the Loyal Legion of New York. I do not believe it does; I do not think that meanly of them. I do not believe that they will think that their purpose in commemorating the heroism and the sacrifice of their women has been defeated because, at the same time, we are commemorating the heroism and sacrifices of our women, equally noble and equally brave and equally American—remember that. But if it should be so, then I would leave the commissioner there, so that he might fail to approve it, if he chose, and let the thing go by the board. I challenge that test of it. I therefore shall not move to strike out the representative of the Commandery of the Loyal Legion merely to keep the provision in harmony, because I want to illustrate to the Order of the Loyal Legion that it was meant by me, at any rate, and by all of us, when we cast the vote a moment ago, for the purpose of accomplishing their purpose, to leave their representative upon the board, to pass not only upon the plans and the expenditure of the money and all that, but also upon our purpose. I think too highly of them to hesitate one moment in my own thought as to what their conclusion shall be.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I want to say a word, and a word only, with reference to this matter. I think the discussion we have already had is unfortunate. I think the motion which was carried to strike out the word "loyal" from this bill was unfortunate.

This scheme originated, as I understand, with the Commandery of the Loyal Legion. It is their proposition, not ours. They propose to contribute \$300,000 to erect a monument to the loyal women of the Civil War, and the Government was asked to contribute \$400,000 to that same purpose. Now, we can either accept their proposition or we can let it alone. It seems to me that it is little less than an affront to the members of this legion to take their proposition and turn it into something entirely different from that which they themselves originally

conceived and desired. I shall therefore vote against this proposition, as I voted against the other proposition. Either we ought to put this amendment through as it is presented and accept this proposition of the Loyal Legion, or we ought to let it alone.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I voted against the first amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I shall vote against the other amendment which he proposes to offer to perfect his original amendment.

Sometimes, Mr. President, in discussing a question of this kind, possibly a Senator may be excused for referring to personal matters. I am a son of the South. My mother was the wife of a Confederate soldier. My wife is a member of the organization known as the Daughters of the Confederacy. If the proposition of the Senator from Mississippi were to erect a monument costing five times the amount proposed to be expended under this amendment to the memory of those women in the South, I would vote most cheerfully for it. If it came as an original proposition to erect a monument of this character under the terms of his proposed amendment, I would most cheerfully vote for it; but that is not the case, sir. This proposition comes from the women of the Loyal Legion, whom I respect, as I know the Senator from Mississippi does, just as I respect the Daughters of the Confederacy in the South. It originated with those loyal women in the North, and they have come here with a concrete proposition embraced in this amendment proposed by the committee, and I think, sir, that it is an injustice to adopt an amendment which absolutely does entirely away with this proposition.

If the Senator from Mississippi chooses to offer here a separate amendment or a provision for an appropriation to erect a monument, as I have said, to the memory of my mother and the other women of the South who underwent the hardships of four years' warfare carried to their own doors, I will vote with him most cheerfully, and I am satisfied that the Members on this side of the Senate will join me in such an effort; but, sir—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FALL. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator permit me to ask him two questions in one?

Mr. FALL. Certainly; half a dozen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the first place, does the Senator think that it would be nice of me or of anyone to offer a proposition here, out of the money in the Treasury of the United States, which is paid by all the people, to erect a monument simply to the women of one section of the country? And, in the second place, I want to ask the Senator if he does not remember that at the beginning of this Congress, under a recommendation of the Secretary of War and under a unanimous report of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, I tried to get a small appropriation to complete a monument commemorative of the services of the Confederate navy as a part of the mapping of the Vicksburg Park, and could not even get the yeas and nays upon it?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, first, in answer to the second question asked me by the Senator from Mississippi, I have to say that I do not remember such effort upon his part, because, unfortunately, I was not here to assist him in demanding the yeas and nays, nor in giving him my vote for the proposition which he says he submitted.

In the second place, Mr. President, as a son of a Confederate, and I believe as loyal a man as can be found in this Hall now, I think that this is not the proper peace monument to erect between the North and the South, if that is the purpose of the Senator from Mississippi. I think the time has come when we should hear nothing about the war between the North and the South; but I do not think that the time has yet come—and I hope to God that it never will come—when it will be considered treacherous or traitorous to this great United States to wipe from our statute books or to cast out from our vocabulary the word "loyalty."

Mr. President, these loyal women of the North have inaugurated this proposition. It is theirs. The Senator from Mississippi says he does—and I know that he does—respect them. Then, if he is willing to vote away the money of the United States Treasury at all, why not assist them, and if, as he says, he wants to erect a great monument of a similar character to all the women of the United States, I will vote for it; and if he wants to erect a monument to the memory of those women of the Confederacy and of their daughters who now constitute the organization known as the Daughters of the Confederacy, I will vote for it; but, Mr. President, I will never vote to strike

out the word "loyal" from this bill, and I will not vote for the proposition advanced by the Senator from Mississippi; and I am just as loyal to the memory of my mother and of my other relatives in the South who are filling graves that were dug for them during the war—I am just as loyal to their memory and to the memory of those good women of the South as is the Senator from Mississippi or any other man from the South or from the North.

Mr. President, this is not, to my judgment, the proper kind of legislation; it is not the proper place to put an amendment of the character sought to be injected into this bill by the Senator from Mississippi; and, if his amendments are adopted, I shall vote against the amendment as amended and I shall vote against the bill on its passage, although it contains appropriations for my State.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I wish to say a single word.

I voted against the proposal to strike out the word "loyal," notwithstanding the fact that as an original proposition I should be quite willing to vote for an appropriation to commemorate all the women of the Civil War, because I fear it would be regarded by the originators of this proposal as a practical rejection of their proposal. The amendment of which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] gave notice, and which he now proposes, is to take upon the United States the burden of paying for the Red Cross building as a memorial to all the women of the Civil War. I regret that the original proposal of the military order of the Loyal Legion was rejected, as it was rejected, by the vote which the Senate has taken. But this other proposition, I think, is one which may well commend itself to us, and I intend to vote for it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I regret very much that this debate has arisen at all. I think it is always unfortunate to have debates of this character. My objection to this change is, first, that we are treating the offer of the Loyal Legion and the plan which they propose, which we have embodied in a bill and passed, with what seems to me very scant courtesy. Moreover, I do not like the point that was selected to strike the word "loyal" from the bill. If it is stricken from one place, it might as well be stricken from before the word "legion." I am not quite prepared to vote for that. I am not quite prepared yet to accept the proposition that the Government of the United States is never to erect a monument to the memory of the people who fought for the United States. For that reason I can not give my vote to the amendment as amended, or to the bill, if it contains the amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, it seems to me we are committing, or may commit, a very grave mistake. The Senator from Mississippi knows that I at least have no sectional prejudice. He will remember that I was one of the few Senators who favored, and sincerely favored, the proposal to erect in the military park at Vicksburg a monument to commemorate the courage of the Confederate navy. I have no objection whatever to the erection of monuments to memorialize courage and valor anywhere. I have very great objection, however, to the proposition that is made here.

Let us see just in what position it leaves the Senate of the United States. The Loyal Legion of New York came to Congress and made the proposition that it would contribute \$300,000 toward the erection of this structure if Congress would add a contribution of its own. That proposition was embodied in a bill. It was referred to the Committee on the Library. The committee considered it and reported it favorably. It reported it in the exact phrase that is found in this bill. The Senate, upon consideration, passed the bill and accepted the proposition of the Loyal Legion of New York. Our acceptance is now before the House of Representatives in the form of a solemn enactment passed here.

Under those circumstances, for us to emasculate this provision, to repudiate what we have already done, it seems to me is a mockery. It is more than an affront to the Loyal Legion of the United States. It is a mortal insult to every soldier concerned in the proposition made to us.

I am perfectly willing, as I said before, to erect monuments to virtue and valor and courage and suffering and hardship; and I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that it is the highest duty of any Government to perpetuate these honorable, patriotic, unselfish sentiments in marble and in bronze or in any other appropriate way. But in view of the history of this proposition, made as it was, received as it was, and accepted as it was—and I agree it ought not to be in this bill at all; it ought to have remained an independent proposition, but having been embodied in the bill now to take it and mutilate it and destroy it—to me it is incredible that the Senate of the United States can be induced to do any such thing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia and Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield, and to whom?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to ask the Senator just one question. Then, is not the best thing for us to do to leave the bill in the House and lay on the table section 13 of this bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. As an original proposition, inasmuch as it was made the subject of an independent bill and inasmuch as it has passed the Senate, I do not think it ever should have found its way into a public buildings bill. I agree to that. But, if it is to remain in the bill, I do not want it to be treated in the way in which it will be treated if it is changed in the manner suggested by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My suggestion to the Senator from Iowa was that the solution of the problem is to lay this section on the table—to strike it out, leave the bill in the House as it is, and go on with the balance of this bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. As far as I am concerned, I voted against the former amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi. I shall vote against this amendment, and I shall vote against the section itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Georgia at all. I think a beautiful thing to do is to erect this building in commemoration of the heroism and the sacrifices of American women during the war between the States.

The Senator from Massachusetts said a moment ago that he hoped the time would never come when we would cease to erect monuments to those who fought for the United States. So do I. But the Senator from Massachusetts must not believe that the North during the Civil War formed the entire United States. We were as much a part of the United States as you. You were fighting on one side and we were fighting upon another. In both the ante bellum and the post bellum significance of the term we were and we now are a part of the United States.

The Senator from Iowa used some rather severe language without intending it. Evidently, from his very expression, he did not intend it. He said that amending this bill was an insult to the Loyal Legion. It neither is nor can it be an insult to any man who proposes to commemorate the sacrifices and the heroism of his wife, mother, or grandmother if I ask that a part of the money that belongs to me and is contributed by me shall be also used at the same time to commemorate the sacrifices and heroism and nobility and constancy of my mother and my grandmother.

I do not believe the commandery of the Loyal Legion will regard this as an insult. I think more highly of them than to believe it, and I do not believe the Senator from Iowa, when he comes to measure his words, will consider it an insult to them.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I used my words with great care, and I do not retract or modify any phrase that I used. But I do think the Senator from Mississippi must have misunderstood in a degree what I said.

It would not be an insult to the Loyal Legion, composed of the officers of the Civil War and their eldest sons, I believe, to erect a monument to the women of the whole country or the women of the South. That would not be an insult to any man. But after having taken the proposition or offer of the Loyal Legion, and after having considered it, and after having adopted it in the Senate, then to repudiate it, to change it in the manner in which we have proposed to do here and in the manner in which we have already done in part, would be, in my opinion, most offensive to the men who made the proposition, simply because we have entirely changed our attitude toward it without any apparent reason. We accepted it once, for good reason, I suppose, and now we turn it back upon these men. Why do we turn it back upon them? Why do we forsake the attitude that we assumed a few days ago?

If the Senator from Mississippi can answer that, he may be able to satisfy what I believe will be the aggrieved sentiment of the Loyal Legion of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not know how it happened that the bill was not called to the attention of the Members of the Senate generally when it passed. I suppose it was presented in the usual routine way, without much study, consideration, or thought, and passed, as bills of that sort generally do. I can only speak for myself; I did not know that the bill had passed at all.

We are repudiating nothing here. So far as I am concerned, if I know myself—no man does know himself; but I try to know myself, and come as near it as most men—I have not a feeling in my heart, I have not a thought in my mind, that could wound or hurt anybody who fought or who is descended from anybody who fought in the war between the States upon the other side. Neither an appeal to a quasi patriotism nor any

amount of fallacy or sophistry nor any amount of excitement can defeat the statement that all there is in it is this: I am merely insisting that if it is proposed that money contributed by all the people of all the States shall be used to commemorate the heroism, the sacrifice, the love, the devotion, and the constancy of the women who lived during the Civil War, the women of the South shall not be expressly left off the inscription upon the monument.

As far as the amendment that I am now offering is concerned it merely assumes the entire cost of the project and makes the United States Government pay it. I hope it will pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, but not because of any intended affront to an organization of any class of people in the country. I did it because I believed the item had no place in a bill of this sort, to pay for which the Government of the United States is to contribute the money, either in whole or in part.

I agree also with the sentiments of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] and shall therefore vote against the amendment that is now the subject of consideration. I cordially concur with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] in that this is a measure foreign to the purpose of this bill, and has and should have no place in it.

I am convinced from the most interesting discussion we have had up to this time, Mr. President, and from the expressions which have fallen from the lips of Senators here and from the viewpoint of the clear atmosphere and golden sunlight of a State which had its birth since the Rebellion, that the time has not yet come for the building of such a monument as is designed by the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

But, Mr. President, there are some other considerations which impel me to vote against this amendment and which bring me to a practical discussion of some of the features of this bill. We have been fighting over the War of the Rebellion this evening to some extent; at least we have gone a good ways back from the present time. What we are concerned in now, however, is how the money of the people, raised by taxation and paid by labor, is to be expended by their chosen servants. The Government of the United States is the richest Government in the world. However, its wealth comes to it through the exercise of its power of taxation, and every dollar in its Treasury is paid to it by the people of the country. We exercise our right of taxation for the purpose of raising revenue to meet the public expenditures, and as these expenditures are provident and economical, so will taxation be minimized and reduced.

I want, therefore, in connection with this question and with the bill itself to say something in behalf of the men and women who pay this money into the Treasury and who are quite as much, if not more, concerned about the manner in which it is to be expended as we are.

Now, this bill is called a public grounds and buildings bill. It is one of the great appropriation bills of Congress and is designed to cover the fiscal period beginning with next July. It had its origin, of course, in the House, and was there passed and sent to this body for consideration. As it came here it made provision for the expenditure of \$25,643,800. As it is reported out of committee in this body, the amount has been swelled by the enormous sum of \$19,930,000, making a total of \$45,573,800. This added sum includes appropriations for the benefit of the District of Columbia, one of which is involved in the pending amendment.

Our committee has added to it in this body, Mr. President, \$20,000,000. The bill, if it is to be passed in its present form, appropriates almost \$50,000,000, an enormous amount in the aggregate, and composed of items of which the subject of the amendment is one, and by no means the only one, which has no place properly in the measure and should never have been reported by the committee.

We have heard several earnest discussions about the sort of buildings that we ought to erect in the Capital of the United States, some favoring business structures, some monumental structures, and about which sentiment is divided. But this bill is both businesslike in its detail and monumental in its design. It is businesslike in that it comprises an aggregate of items distributed over the entire continent, and representing individual interests of Members desiring to secure appropriations which are necessary to or at least desired by their respective constituencies, and said to be demanded by the volume of the business transacted for the public in the places where the appropriations are to be expended in public buildings.

But in addition thereto, as the Senator from New York has so forcibly declared, items independent of these, 92 in number, are attached to the bill, representing communities and revenues to the Government from those communities, insignificant both in amount and population when contrasted with the large appropriations that are to be made for public buildings to be erected for them.

It is not surprising that with these large amendments providing expenditures for the District we should provoke discussions of this kind, because it is very evident that they could not pass upon their own merits, for which obvious reason they are ingrafted upon the bill to be enacted into law through the aid of combined and kindred items desired by other localities.

Now, this condition of affairs is the outgrowth of similar legislation running over a large period of time. It perhaps had its origin in the combination of a few items, the successes consequent upon the merging together of which have naturally been contagious and the example has grown from a precedent into a custom until to-day we are confronted by this measure, the largest bill of the sort, I think, that was ever submitted to the consideration of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, mention has been made of a measure carrying \$5,000,000, if I recollect the figures aright, designed for the completion or the building of a bridge connecting the District of Columbia with Arlington Heights. This is a measure which the Senate committee has attached to the bill in connection with that which I am discussing. It has no place here. It belongs properly to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and to that bill only. Yet it is made a part of this measure because, forsooth, by attaching it to the bill the interests which are represented here in connection with other items of the bill will be sufficiently strong to produce unity of action, meaning success to all of them. Appropriations are thus obtained which, standing upon their own merits, probably would not be enacted.

I made the statement the other day, and if it is incorrect I hope those who are better informed will not hesitate to interrupt me, that the total appropriations already passed by this body, together with those which we still have to consider, amount in the aggregate to eleven hundred and fifty millions of dollars; in other words, one billion one hundred and fifty millions, the largest appropriations ever made by any Congress for a fiscal year.

There are those in this Chamber, perhaps all of them, who are better informed about our sources of revenue, the amounts to be collected from these different sources, and the consequent estimates of the national income. I have not yet heard any discussion, Mr. President, on any of these measures, of the amount of money that the Government can absolutely depend upon to meet and discharge and defray these enormous expenditures. I am therefore without information upon this all-important subject. Surely our lack of accurate information upon this all-important subject should bid us pause; should require the making of reductions in this and all other revenue measures, except where the amount of the appropriation as reported is practically essential to good administration, to the end that a deficiency may not confront the next administration in the first year of its existence.

A Senator said upon this floor two or three years ago that if the Government were conducted in a businesslike manner \$300,000,000 a year could easily be saved; in other words, by the application of the ordinary principles of economy as practiced by business men to the national affairs that enormous sum could be annually saved to the people.

In the face of an expenditure like that contemplated by this and other bills, while this sum in itself is insignificant, we must remember, Mr. President, that it is the aggregate of insignificant or comparatively small amounts which constitute the enormous total which these various bills represent. It is perfectly easy to add an item here and an item there, small in their amounts, and to do it without very much concern; but when we consider that the revenues of some of the largest dividend-paying corporations in the country are derived from the people in nickels and dimes which are paid to them for public service, we can form a fair conception of the cumulative character of small sums to combine in an aggregate when received continuously through long periods of time. The national revenues, as I have said, come from the people. They come through taxation, and it is the taxpayers who are the real parties concerned in the appropriations which we make for the monuments which we build, the structures which we rear, and the bridges that we provide for.

I believe in liberal expenditures, Mr. President, and particularly when we have a plethoric Treasury, but we are going too fast and too far in measures of this sort, covering as they do such colossal sums of money.

There is one virtue about this bill, if virtue it may be termed. Like the rains from heaven, its bounty falls upon the just and upon the unjust. Every section of the United States participates more or less in moneys carried by the items in the bill. I am not arrogating to myself any superior virtue or integrity or conscientiousness about this matter, for my State is also a recipient of some of the amounts of money which are covered

by the bill. It has that virtue, without which many of the items would find no place here.

When the Senator from Mississippi said that it is not the wealth and the area of a nation but its traditions that are the important things—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. I want to say that he stated one side of a great truth; no nation can have traditions unless it also has area and possesses wealth.

Mr. KENYON. I was going to ask if the Senator thought it was a virtue that the blessings of this bill fall on all the country?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, it is not an unmixed evil. I am willing to say that. Perhaps I used too strong an expression in calling this feature of the bill a virtue. But it is a characteristic of the bill, without which many of these appropriations could not be enacted into law.

Mr. KENYON. Is not that the very viciousness of a bill of this character?

Mr. THOMAS. It is the reason why bills of this kind are presented and why they are passed practically without amendment.

I regret to say that, as far as my experience goes, there seems to be no healthy public sentiment throughout the country which condemns this practice, largely due to the fact, in all probability, that the desire to obtain the benefits in localities consequent upon these appropriations and their expenditure outweighs all other considerations, just as was said to be the case at one time with the tariff, a local issue based upon local considerations, and every Representative and every Senator spurred to a common end by the appeals, the demands, the requests, and the threats of his constituency founded upon what they deemed to be their peculiar and pressing interest.

Mr. President, I think I have said practically all that I care to say upon this subject. We can build monuments—and we ought to build them—to commemorate great deeds, great events, and great men. I want to see this Capital City the most beautiful city in the world. I fully agree that we should make it an ornament and a feature not only in our national policy but an outward expression of our national life for all time. Parallels have been drawn to-night between the architecture of this city and the monumental characteristics of Grecian and Roman structures. We might carry the parallel a little further and remind Senators that we are imitating those Republics not only in their architectural creations but in the prodigality of their expenditures. The extravagance of those early Republics became so great and so reckless in the end that to-day nothing remains of them except their literature, their traditions, and the ruins of their monumental structures.

I trust the time will never come when the same epitaph will be written to the memory of the American Republic; but, I believe, Mr. President, that the time has come, and that it came long ago, when economy must be the watchword of this Nation. The party to which I belong and which soon comes into control of national affairs has in its platforms ever since 1832 pledged itself to the economical administration of public affairs. If when it goes into power next week it will be confronted by appropriations amounting to more than \$1,150,000,000 covering its first fiscal year, imposed upon it by the votes of Democrats and Republicans alike, both of whom are consequently responsible and must be held to be so, then we can not practice what we have preached or perform our great traditional pledge to the public which had very much to do with the result last November.

I do not want to see the new administration or any administration in this country the first or any of the years that mark its course in power to be confronted with a deficiency, for the administration in power, whether it be to blame therefor or not, must always bear the consequences of depressed conditions. It may simply have inherited them from the administration which preceded; they may have resulted from causes over which Governments have no control whatsoever; but the inexorable logic of public opinion always points its finger to the administration in power and holds it responsible for the economic and commercial ills of the time.

I think, therefore, that Senators on this side of the Chamber should pause before voting to place these enormous appropriations upon the statute book, lest perhaps we be overwhelmed in financial embarrassment upon the very threshold of the new administration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I believe the Senate is ready to dispose of this section 13, together with the amendment, and I move to lay both the section and the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia moves to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The proposed section.

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

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is not debatable [Putting the question.] The ayes have it. The motion is agreed to and the amendment is laid on the table.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill. There are further committee amendments.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 56, in line 6, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$118,750" and insert "\$300,000," and in line 10, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "\$418,750" and insert "\$600,000," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 14. That so much of section 24 of the act of Congress approved May 30, 1908, as provides for the construction of buildings for a customhouse and other governmental offices, except United States courts and post office, and for a building for the United States appraisers' stores at Wilmington, N. C., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to require that upon the enlarged site of the present customhouse and warehouse in said city the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be constructed a suitable and commodious fireproof building for the accommodation of the customs service, the appraisers' stores, the United States courts and court officials, and such other governmental offices, exclusive of the post office, as can be properly and conveniently quartered in said building; and that the limit of cost fixed by said act of May 30, 1908, is hereby extended by the sum of \$300,000, and said act is hereby amended so as to fix the limit of cost for said new customhouse, appraisers' stores, and courthouse and enlargement of site thereof at not exceeding \$600,000; and that the unexpended balances of the appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section 24 of the public building act of May 30, 1908, are hereby made available for the construction of the said building for customhouse, appraisers' stores, and courthouse hereinbefore prescribed; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to enter into contracts for the construction of such building for customhouse, appraisers' stores, and courthouse at Wilmington, N. C., within the limit of cost hereinbefore fixed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill, and read section 17 as follows:

SEC. 17. That for the purpose of beginning the construction under the direction of a commission consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, and Ivory G. Kimball, representing the Grand Army of the Republic, of a memorial amphitheater, including a chapel, at the national cemetery at Arlington, Va., and in accordance with the plans of Carrere & Hastings, architects, of New York City, adopted by the commission heretofore appointed, there is hereby authorized the sum of \$250,000: *Provided*, That this authorization shall not be construed as fixing the limit of cost of said building at the sum herein named, but the building herein provided for shall be constructed so as to cost, complete, including heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, \$750,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move to amend that section by inserting, on page 57, line 23, after the name "Kimball," the words "and Charles W. Newton, representing the United Spanish War Veterans."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. So far as I am able to do so, Mr. President, I will accept that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would suggest that the word "and," should be stricken out before the name "Ivory G. Kimball."

Mr. POINDEXTER. I accept that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated as modified.

The SECRETARY. On page 57, line 23, before the name "Ivory G. Kimball," it is proposed to strike out the word "and," and after the name "Ivory G. Kimball," it is proposed to insert "and Charles W. Newton, representing the United Spanish War Veterans."

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I inquire should not the amendment come in after the word "Republic," in line 24?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It should.

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is correct. I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment as now modified will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 57, line 24, after the word "Republic," it is proposed to insert the words "and Charles W. Newton, representing the United Spanish War Veterans."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 58, line 13, after the words "*Provided further*," to strike out "That the said commission may, in its discretion, expend, of the sum hereby authorized, not more than \$75,000 for the purpose of constructing a mortuary chapel, in accordance with the plans of Carrere & Hastings referred to in this act, or to locate the same elsewhere in and upon the Arlington estate, in pursuance of any other plan which

may be approved by the commission for that purpose," and insert:

That the said commission may, in its discretion, locate said chapel elsewhere upon the Arlington estate, and in that event may expend of the sum hereby authorized not more than \$75,000 for the purpose of constructing said chapel.

That said commission is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract with Carrere & Hastings, architects, for their full professional services in connection with the construction of the memorial amphitheater, herein authorized, at the usual and customary professional charges for such services.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, just a word about this entire provision embodied in section 17. I am not expressing any dissent particularly to the amendment reported by the Senate committee, but rather with the entire proposition to appropriate \$750,000 to erect this memorial amphitheater at Arlington. Arlington is a national cemetery. We have numerous national cemeteries in the United States, and it may be it would be advisable, one at a time, to put amphitheatres in all of them. To erect such structures is in the nature of an appeal to the patriotism of the people and of the country. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] in his address a few moments ago emphasized the striking fact that already we have in this bill now pending a proposition to appropriate some \$45,000,000. I think we might well delay a work of this kind for a while. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars expended for the erection of a memorial amphitheater in one of our cemeteries means, as sure as fate, that we are to go on erecting like structures in all the multitude of national cemeteries scattered throughout the country, the great burying grounds where the patriotic dead are interred. If it is the purpose of Congress to enter upon that field of enterprise, which will result in an ultimate expenditure of probably twenty-five or thirty million dollars, why, then, if we do it deliberately, purposely, understandingly, all right. This is but the entering wedge, and I am inclined rather to appeal to Senators to halt, to consider whether we can not abridge the vast expenditures embodied in this bill and reflect most carefully whether we care to start in upon this road, leading, ultimately, to enormous public expenditures.

Mr. President, this memorial structure is proposed to be erected at Arlington, a cemetery adjacent to Washington, on an estate historic in more ways than one, and I am loath to interpose an objection when I am persuaded that it has the support of friends of mine in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, but I can not but question the wisdom of this appropriation. I shall vote against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I was addressing myself to a section which was pending before the Senate, as I understood.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair had reason to suppose that the Senator had concluded.

Mr. STONE. I had concluded; but I thought at least we might have a vote upon it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will put it to a vote if the Senator from Missouri so desires. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Will the Chair have the amendment stated?

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

The SECRETARY. On page 58, line 13, after the words "*Provided further*," it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "purpose," in line 20, and to insert:

That the said commission may, in its discretion, locate said chapel elsewhere upon the Arlington estate, and in that event may expend of the sum hereby authorized not more than \$75,000 for the purpose of constructing said chapel.

That said commission is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract with Carrere & Hastings, architects, for their full professional services in connection with the construction of the memorial amphitheater, herein authorized, at the usual and customary professional charges for such services.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the mere fact that an amendment is pending to a portion of this paragraph open the entire paragraph to amendment now? The amendment that I would suggest, if that were true, would be to change the sum and to limit the total expenditure to \$100,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it would not open up the entire paragraph. The question is upon the amendment which has just been read. [Putting the question.]

Mr. STONE. Is a motion to strike out the paragraph in order at this time? I am inclined to think not; but I would like to strike out the entire paragraph.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to explain to the Senate that this provision is simply an amendment to enable a chapel to be constructed at Arlington. If the amendment is adopted, the en-

tire provision can be afterwards struck out. There is, however, no chapel at Arlington. They can not bury people there. The committee simply propose to insert an amendment which will provide for a chapel at Arlington. When soldiers come here from a distance, there is no church, no chapel, there. That is all the amendment provides for.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. All I want is to let the chapel provision stand and to get rid of the remainder of the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 59, line 13, to change the number of the section from "14" to "19," and, in line 16, before the words "Las Vegas," to insert "East"; in line 24, before the word "herein," to strike out "post office" and insert "building"; and, on page 60, line 2, before the words "Las Vegas," to insert "East," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 19. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to purchase a site, or acquire it by condemnation or otherwise, on land at a convenient point between the incorporated city of East Las Vegas, N. Mex., and the incorporated town of Las Vegas, N. Mex., and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the post office, courthouse, and other governmental offices, the cost of said site and building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, not to exceed the sum of \$125,000, and the building herein provided for shall be used as a post office and courthouse and for other governmental purposes for both the incorporated city of East Las Vegas and the incorporated town of Las Vegas, notwithstanding the general law requiring the maintenance of a post office in each county seat, and the authorization of \$15,000 made for the purchase of a site in the town of Las Vegas is hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 7, to change the number of the section from "15" to "20," and, in line 18, after the word "services," to insert "without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 20. That a commission, consisting of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Patents, and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, be, and is hereby, created, which shall cause plans and estimates to be prepared for a building to accommodate the Patent Office of the United States, and report the estimated cost thereof to the Congress, provided that such plans and estimates be prepared under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. And for the preparation of such plans and estimates a sum not to exceed \$5,000 is hereby authorized to be expended for employment of technical and engineering services without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations in the Office of the Supervising Architect. That the foregoing authorization for the employment of technical and engineering services shall be in addition to and independent of the authorization and appropriations for personal services for the Office of the Supervising Architect otherwise made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator in charge of the bill. Why is the language "without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations" inserted in line 18?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, it is because this is a particularly large piece of work, and it is necessary to call in other architects. The employees in the Office of the Supervising Architect, who are under the civil-service rules, are not sufficiently expert to do the work, and they have to call in outside architects. It is the usual provision in such cases. It simply happened to be omitted in this particular case from this bill. The Senator will find the same language in other House provisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this section organizes a commission—consisting of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Patents, and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, be, and is hereby, created, which shall cause plans and estimates to be prepared for a building to accommodate the Patent Office of the United States, and report the estimated cost thereof to the Congress, provided that such plans and estimates be prepared under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. And for the preparation of such plans and estimates a sum not to exceed \$5,000 is hereby authorized to be expended for employment of technical and engineering services.

Then it provides that it shall be done "without regard to civil-service laws, rules, or regulations in the Office of the Supervising Architect." It seems to me that that is a confession that the civil-service system has broken down in the Office of the Supervising Architect. If this great bureau of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury has not within it people who are competent to plan a Patent Office for the United States Government, then it seems to me that we had better employ outside architects for everything. It seems to be a confession of failure upon the part of the Supervising Architect's Office, or, if not a confession upon their part, a confession upon the part of the Senate committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, such a provision has been found necessary in the erection of every large building. I will undertake to say that there has not been an important building erected in the city of Washington where it has not been found necessary to call in outside architects. The force in the office of the Supervising Architect is not sufficient to do all

of the work that is necessary. The Supervising Architect himself would be capable, but he is simply overwhelmed with other work, and whenever we undertake any of these large enterprises it has always been found necessary to call in outside architects. Of course, these outside architects are not in the civil service. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], whom I see in his seat, has been chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for many years, and I think he will bear out what I am saying about the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I was perfectly aware of the facts that have just been stated by the Senator from Utah, and that is the reason I asked the question. It seems that, whenever we have any really important architectural work to do, we must go outside of the office of the Supervising Architect. I find it very hard to believe that it is because of a lack of force sufficient to do the work. It seems to me rather that it is because of a lack of genius sufficient to do the work.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, to get the best results the Supervising Architect frequently submits the plans to competition among architects from all over the country. If he has to apply civil-service rules before those architects can enter the competition, it would be useless to endeavor to go about it in that way. The reason why it is desired to exempt architects from the civil-service rules, is in order to have competition among the leading architects, both in this country and in other countries.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds was, on page 61, line 17, after "\$800,000," to insert: "and payment therefor to be made out of the proceeds of the sale of the old site and building hereinafter provided for," so as to read:

SEC. 22. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a site for a suitable building and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office and other governmental offices in the city of Newark, in the State of New Jersey, the cost of said site not to exceed the sum of \$800,000 and payment therefor to be made out of the proceeds of the sale of the old site and building hereinafter provided for.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 18, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 23. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to select and acquire by purchase or otherwise a suitable site for a public building in Des Moines, Iowa, for the use of the courts of the United States and such other governmental purposes, except post-office purposes, as may be necessary or convenient, the site to cost not more than \$100,000; and he is further authorized and directed to cause to be erected upon said site a suitable building for the aforesaid purposes, the building to cost not more than \$250,000. To acquire the site and erect the building there is hereby authorized the sum of \$350,000.

When said site has been acquired and the building erected thereon the Secretary of the Treasury shall sell the lots and building thereon now owned by the United States situated at the northeast corner of West Court Avenue and West Fifth Street in the city of Des Moines, Iowa.

The said sale shall be made after notice published in at least three daily Des Moines newspapers once each day for not less than three weeks, upon bids received in pursuance of such notice and upon the terms deemed most advantageous to the United States.

Only that part of the money heretofore appropriated for the repair and modification of said building now in use as may be necessary to render the building fit for use by the district court and by other officers of the Government now using it, shall be expended, and the remainder shall be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 21, to strike out:

SEC. 18. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to prepare designs and estimates for a fireproof national archives building containing not less than 1,500,000 cubic feet of space, suitable for the orderly storage of records, documents, and other papers which have accumulated in the various executive departments and independent establishments, and in the files of the Senate and House of Representatives and offices of the White House, and are not needed for current use.

That the said designs and estimates shall be prepared with a view to the erection of the said building in the city of Washington, D. C., upon a lot of land large enough to contain ultimately a building embracing 4,000,000 cubic feet of space.

That the said designs and estimates shall make provision for a building capable of subsequent extension without impairing its architectural appearance from a capacity of 1,500,000 cubic feet to a capacity of 4,000,000 cubic feet.

That upon the completion of the said designs and estimates the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the minimum cost of such a building and the minimum cost of a suitable site thereof conveniently located in the District of Columbia.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 24. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to prepare designs and estimates for a fireproof national archives building of modern library-stack type of architecture, containing not less than 3,000,000 cubic feet of space, suitable for the orderly storage of records, documents, and other papers which have accumulated in the various departments, independent establishments, and executive offices and in the files of the Senate and House of Representatives and are not needed for current use.

That the said designs and estimates shall be prepared with a view to the erection of the said building in the city of Washington, D. C., upon a lot of land large enough to contain ultimately a building embracing 8,900,000 cubic feet of space.

That the said designs and estimates shall make provision for a building capable of subsequent extension, without impairing its architectural appearance, from a capacity of 3,000,000 cubic feet to a capacity of 8,900,000 cubic feet.

That before the said designs and estimates are completed inspection shall be made under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury of the best modern national archive buildings in Europe, and consultation shall be had with the best authorities in Europe on the construction and arrangement of archive buildings.

That the said designs and estimates shall provide for the construction of a building the total cost of which, including heating and ventilating apparatus, elevators, and approaches, complete, shall not exceed the sum of \$1,500,000.

That whenever the said designs and estimates have been approved by a commission consisting of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Interior, then the Secretary of the Treasury shall be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in his discretion, to purchase, or cause to be taken for public use, by condemnation or otherwise, as a site for said building, any piece of land of the size defined in this section the purchase of which shall be approved by the said commission.

That for the preparation of said designs and estimates the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be expended for employment of technical and engineering services in the office of the Supervising Architect.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that, as a rule, is very wise, provided it is so arranged that the architectural design will not be interfered with by the addition. I am very much in favor of a building in which to keep the archives of the Government, which shall be, I hope, the only really fireproof building in the world; and it will cost a good deal of money to make it really fireproof.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator will see on page 65, beginning in line 6, the language:

That the said designs and estimates shall be prepared with a view to the erection of the said building in the city of Washington, D. C., upon a lot of land large enough to contain ultimately a building embracing 8,900,000 cubic feet of space.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill if the committee carefully considered whether the sum of \$1,500,000 would be sufficient for this very important and very permanent purpose? There is contained in the bill an appropriation of a million and three-quarter dollars for an armory in the District of Columbia, and here comes along a proposition to construct a building which is to be thoroughly fireproof and which is to last the Republic 50 or 100 years, and we are appropriating a quarter of a million dollars less money for its erection than was thought necessary to build an armory.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. This is only the first part of the building. This does not authorize the expenditure of a million and five hundred thousand dollars. It simply provides for the making of plans, and authorizes an expenditure of \$5,000 for that purpose. The plans are to be for a building to cost \$1,500,000 now; but that is only the first part of the building. We may be able to add to it hereafter. That is in the future.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know what portion of the building is to be erected out of the \$1,500,000.

Mr. WARREN. Three million cubic feet out of the more than 8,900,000 cubic feet.

Mr. WILLIAMS. According to the language pointed out by the Senator from Utah, it is to be 3,000,000 cubic feet out of a total of 8,900,000 cubic feet.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I should be very much surprised, indeed, if an archives building worthy of the country, fireproof and containing sufficient room for the purposes of the Republic, could be erected for less than \$5,000,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will say to the Senator that this is a matter the committee very carefully investigated. We had experts before us, men who were well informed with reference to the character of buildings of this kind and the cost in this and in other countries, and the committee made the provision after very careful consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thank the committee for having held down the appropriation. I am sure it is enough.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 15, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 25. That for the purpose of preventing the pollution and obstruction of Rock Creek and of connecting Potomac Park with the Zoological Park and Rock Creek Park, and providing a new location for the United States Botanic Garden, a commission, to be composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Agriculture, is hereby authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such land and premises as are not now the property of the United States in the District of Columbia shown on the map on file in the office of the engineer commissioner of the District of Columbia, dated May 17, 1911, and lying on both sides of Rock Creek, including such portion of the creek bed as may be in private ownership, between the Zoological Park and Potomac Park, at a total cost not to exceed \$2,300,000, which sum is hereby authorized to be expended. That all lands now belonging to the United States or to the District of Columbia lying within the exterior boundaries of the land to be acquired by this act as shown and designated on said map

are hereby appropriated to and made a part of the parkway and new Botanic Garden site herein authorized to be acquired. That the commission shall set apart such portion as they may deem adequate of the land herein authorized to be acquired or included within said exterior boundaries for a new location for the United States Botanic Garden, and one-half of the cost of the remaining portion shall be reimbursed to the Treasury of the United States out of the revenues of the District of Columbia in eight equal annual installments, with interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum upon the deferred payments. That should the commission decide to institute condemnation proceedings in order to secure any or all of the land herein authorized to be acquired, such proceedings shall be in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, providing a site for the enlargement of the Government Printing Office. (U. S. Stat. L., vol. 26, chap. 837.)

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I make the point of order that this section—

Mr. LODGE. No point of order lies, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I withdraw it.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to ask a question about the amendment. This is a commission to be composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Agriculture. Does that mean the three present Secretaries or the incoming Secretaries?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Undoubtedly it would mean the incoming Secretaries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to know, because if the present Secretaries are to form the commission and then go out of office there might be a claim at some time in the future for services rendered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; it belongs to the office; it does not belong to the person. The office would succeed rather than the person in the office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; but sometimes, you know, when people take a position on a commission and they are described by their official titles, it might be that they would hold over.

Mr. WARREN. That is only when they are named.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 3, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 26. That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be constructed across the Potomac River, from the city of Washington to the Arlington Estate property in the State of Virginia, a memorial bridge, to be located, as nearly as the commission hereinafter constituted may determine to be best, on a line beginning at the intersection of Twenty-third Street with a line drawn from the center of the Capitol through the center of the Washington Monument, and running from this intersection at Twenty-third Street to the center of the Arlington Mansion; the said bridge to be constructed on a location and plan to be approved by a commission composed of the President, the Secretary of War, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives, and not to cost more than \$5,000,000. And the commission is authorized to expend so much as may be necessary for the purpose in securing and determining on a proper location and plan.

That in the discharge of its duties hereunder said commission is authorized to employ the services of such engineers, sculptors, architects, and others as it shall determine to be necessary, and to avail itself of the services or advice of the Commission of Fine Arts created by the act approved May 17, 1910.

That said commission shall annually submit to Congress an estimate of the amount of money necessary to be expended each year to carry on the work herein authorized.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I do not think that the condition of the Public Treasury and the urgent and legitimate demands now upon it warrant this expense at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There is no money appropriated by the amendment. It is simply an authorization. If the bridge is completed and the money expended in the next five years, it will be much more rapidly done than I contemplate will be the case.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Will not this authorization, if it be passed, be followed by a provision in an appropriation bill for the money contemplated by this expenditure?

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. There will be possibly a small sum, but most likely none at the present session of Congress. There might be a small appropriation in the deficiency bill, but it would properly belong in the sundry civil bill, and that bill has been reported to the Senate. In any event, not more than \$100,000 will be asked for, and hereafter such sums as the commission may each year report to Congress as being required. No one contemplates a material appropriation at this session, and it will be certainly five years, and probably much more than five years, before the amount is expended.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have already given expression to some views that I have regarding the wasteful tendency in our public expenditures. It is estimated that the total amount of all the

appropriations, embracing those which have been passed and those which will be passed in a day or two, will approximate a sum in excess of \$1,200,000,000. The revenue that may be reasonably anticipated will be insufficient to meet that amount. These total expenditures will surpass the total expenditures made by any Congress in all the history of the Government.

It is true we are making remarkable strides in this country. Each year we are adding a million and a half people to our population. The last 12 years of our history have contributed approximately 20 per cent of all the population of the United States at this time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

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

Mr. O'GORMAN. Certainly.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Do I understand the Senator to say that the bill carries a larger amount than has ever been carried by any bill?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I say that all the appropriation bills, of which this is one, altogether—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh!

Mr. O'GORMAN. I apprehend that no Member of this body will dispute the accuracy of my statement.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I misunderstood the Senator. I thought he was referring to this bill.

Mr. O'GORMAN. That is what I stated. A few days ago I called attention to some extravagant and, as I think, wasteful provisions of the river and harbor bill, which justified my vote in opposition to the bill at that time. The same tendency is manifested not only in this bill, but in all the bills before us.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator from New York will permit me, I will suggest to him that this bill carries approximately now \$45,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Authorizations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Authorizations. Of course none of it is appropriated. That represents the accumulation of three years. It is only \$15,000,000 a year. It is not an extravagant bill. It is no larger—

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have no doubt there are a good many excellent features in this bill, but, as I said earlier to-day, in my judgment there are certain provisions which are absolutely indefensible. There are certain towns in this country with a population scarcely in excess of 1,000 that have provisions made in this bill for the procuring of sites at a nominal expenditure of from \$5,000 to \$10,000, which if passed will be followed in the near future by provisions for structures amounting to \$50,000, \$60,000, and \$70,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There never has been a public building bill passed in Congress, I will undertake to say, that has not carried some items that everybody was not quite in favor of. The Senator will recognize the practical impossibility almost of avoiding some items of that character. But I undertake to say to the Senate that those items are very few in number.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I have great sympathy with the chairman of the committee. I want to pay him the tribute which I do in declaring that no member perhaps has ever labored more industriously and conscientiously in the handling of a difficult proposition than has the Senator from Utah. But notwithstanding all the services and the devotion and the attention he gave to this bill, aided as he was by the members of his committee, it is one of the most obnoxious bills that I think could be presented to the Senate.

I shall vote against the bill, whatever change may take place, on its final passage. I am now calling attention to what I conceive to be one of its objectionable features. It may be that at some time this country can afford to expend \$5,000,000 for bridging the Potomac River, but we can not do it now. One side of this chamber but recently came into power under a pledge to the people of this country that it would favor as far as possible the most rigid economy in public expenditures. It can not support the provisions of this bill without stultifying itself. It can not justify its conduct in securing the approval of the people of this country and then giving its support to a series of appropriation bills representing a larger figure than was ever before represented in a single session by similar legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I just want to say again to the Senator from New York that there is not one single dollar appropriated by this bill.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I understand the view of the Senator from Virginia. There is no single dollar appropriated by any provision in the bill at the present time. This bill does nothing more than authorize expenditures which in time must be followed by appropriations in another appropriation bill.

At this time, Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the committee be laid upon the table.

Mr. SWANSON. Before the Senator makes that motion—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York withhold the motion?

Mr. SWANSON. I ask the Senator to withhold the motion for a few moments.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York withholds the motion.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I want for a short time to present to the Senate the question of a memorial bridge. Ever since 1887 the Secretary of War and also President McKinley have urged Congress to connect its own property on the Potomac, known as the Potomac Flats, with its Arlington property across the Potomac.

Mr. O'GORMAN. May I ask the Senator when the recommendation was first made?

Mr. SWANSON. In 1887 or 1888.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Why has it never been acted on?

Mr. SWANSON. I will tell the Senator why, if the Senator from New York will content himself for a moment. If I had thought he would make a motion to lay the amendment on the table I would have asked to be recognized, but he made a speech against it and then submitted his motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is withheld.

Mr. SWANSON. The Government owns the Potomac Flats. It owns 1,200 acres of land known as Arlington. Ever since 1887 the Secretaries of War, following President McKinley, have urged Congress to connect its own property by a bridge across the Potomac. Of all the cities in the world at the Capital of the Nation the Potomac is less bridged than any capital in the world. There is scarcely a bridge across the Potomac where the people can cross from the south that has not on it either a railroad bridge or a street-car bridge that makes it impossible for the ordinary traffic.

There has been an impression that this proposition is entirely in the interest of Virginia. I wish to say that the people of Virginia are not interested in it to the extent that Washington is. The city of Washington has no adequate and proper crossing of the Potomac. In the little city in which I formerly lived, of 19,000 people, there are three bridges that bridge the river that brings the people there. There are two bridges that allow the people to come here and also a bridge permitting street cars to run over. Yet here stands the Capital of this Nation, where practically traffic and travel across the Potomac are excluded.

Now, Mr. President, I want to go further and consider this as a business proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to ask the Senator a question there.

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

Mr. SWANSON. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What did those bridges cost?

Mr. SWANSON. Those three bridges at Danville cost fifty or a hundred thousand dollars. It is just a small river. I guarantee that there is not a capital of a State in the Nation which borders on a river that has not a decent bridge crossing it. Here you find that it is hard to represent Washington in Congress. All appropriations for the District of Columbia are a proper subject for professional economists to assault. I say when a proposition is made to erect a structure like this it is denounced because there are no Senators here and no Members of the House to take care of it. They have no Senators to speak for them and no Representatives in Congress, and on these appropriations we hear the subject of economy preached because the people of the District have no power in Congress. If this was the capital of your State, sir, if it was Albany or if it was New York City, I guarantee that there would be a magnificent bridge.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. O'GORMAN. New York City has contributed many bridges costing from \$10,000,000 to \$45,000,000 and has borne the expense herself.

Mr. SWANSON. This is the Capital of the Nation. New York has spent \$20,000,000 with 5,000,000 people to build a bridge, yet this Capital of 95,000,000 people is too poor to have a decent bridge across the Potomac. The trouble is that the Senator from New York considers Washington as a local city. He thinks the people of Virginia, the people of Alexandria County, should build this bridge. Washington is the Capital of this Nation. All the trouble has come from the fact that some people will not recognize that this is the Capital of 95,000,000 people.

If I mistake not, the people of America have pride in Washington. If I mistake not, they desire to see it a beautiful and a grand Capital. If I mistake not, they are proud of Washington. Here is the Senator from New York, who boasts of what New York can do. New York is not as rich as the 95,000,000 people of this country. It is hard to get the Senator from New York to realize that New York is a city constituting part of the country, but here is the Capital of 95,000,000 people.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Does the junior Senator from Virginia think that there would be the same traffic over the Potomac bridge as that which crosses over one of the great arteries of trade in the metropolis of the Nation?

Mr. SWANSON. All I know is that traffic which wants to come and the people who want to come from the South to the Capital of the Nation have no facilities and no ability to do it.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Is there not a bridge every half mile to the west?

Mr. SWANSON. Nearly all the bridges have street cars or railways, and it is nearly impossible for the traffic and the travel to cross properly and conveniently.

Now let us take another proposition. Arlington has 1,200 acres of land. The Potomac Flats are owned by the Government. If it were owned by an individual, if it were owned by a city, they would connect it by a bridge. The Secretary of War says troops could not come from Fort Myer into Washington if any emergency should arise.

You have at Arlington the most princely park in the world in beauty, in size, and in magnificence. There lie buried all the heroes in the war of the South and the North. New York is not as rich as this Government, but if that park were to be entered I will guarantee that New York or any other city in the United States would have a decent and proper approach to it.

There is not a decent approach to the most magnificent and royal park that the world has ever seen, with all its heroes. Yet there is no decent way to get from Washington to it.

Further than that, the Secretary of War has recommended it; President McKinley recommended it—have recommended it as a good investment for the Government. Why? It will make available lands across the Potomac which can be used for public purposes, and will put to use at once more land and make it applicable for public purposes for buildings than the bridge will cost.

The trouble we have had is this: We came here and asked for a small bridge in 1907. That was five years ago. What were we met with? "Oh, no; we want no small bridge; we want a bridge of a magnificent superstructure, a magnificent memorial bridge equal to those crossing the Seine, the Thames, the Danube." We were told that we must wait until we get a magnificent bridge. We now ask for this. We are now told that no such bridge is needed and it is extravagant. Thus between those who desire a magnificent bridge and those who are unwilling to incur the expense of a magnificent superstructure we never get a bridge, and have been delayed for more than 20 years. I do not ask for any \$5,000,000. All I ask is that Washington shall be as decently treated as the capital of any city in this Nation, and that this great Government shall give to the people who live south access to the Capital.

If the Senator wants no memorial bridge to commemorate the valor of the North and South, no splendid structure built on the Potomac, put the amount you want there for an ordinary bridge and I will accept it. But we are held off every time. We are told, "Now is not a fortunate time."

This bill has passed the Senate three times without a dissenting vote. It has been debated, it has been discussed, and all we ask is to let the question be settled for once.

You have just consented to an appropriation of \$2,300,000 worth of property that can scarcely be available and scarcely be used without this bridge.

Whenever this question comes up the objection is made that the people of Virginia will get something from it; that it is a Virginia scheme; that it is a Virginia effort. I have never seen the proposition made here in which that does not come up. But last year we had a proposition to get the Government of the United States to do what? To build its own road through its own farms into Arlington estate, and the comment went around the Senate that it was a Virginia enterprise.

We have improved the roads on the other side of Arlington. We can not tax Government property in Alexandria County, and all we asked was that the Government should make roads through its own property good and passable.

You talk about economy. We desire to be economical. We believe the incoming President is economical. We believe he

will carry out the platform. We believe the present Speaker of the House of Representatives is economical and a good Democrat. We believe the chairmen of the committees that are made commissioners here are. We believe the incoming Secretary of War is. We leave it to them to determine absolutely every cent that shall be expended. We put a limit there, for we thought possibly the Senate would object to a bill without a limit.

I am willing to trust Woodrow Wilson; I am willing to trust the Speaker of the House of Representatives; I am willing to trust the incoming Secretary of War; I am willing to trust the two chairmen of the committees to deal with this matter economically, and we constitute them a commission to determine what kind of a bridge shall be built. If they want to build a bridge costing one million and a half dollars or less, it is all right with us. All we ask is for Congress at this time to settle this matter that has been delayed for more than 20 years. The people of the South who want to come into Washington have some rights. Are we to be held up here eternally?

It seems to me the idea to have there a magnificent memorial superstructure is right—commemorative of the reunion of the North and the South, to thus bridge the Potomac that once was the dividing line that marked the hope and valor of 11 States south of it, that marked the valor and purposes of other States north of it. We ask that what was once a hostile dividing line between hostile camps shall be bridged by a magnificent structure illustrative of a united country, indicative of the fact that the Potomac no longer divides two sections, but that this magnificent superstructure shall be a monument to the fraternal feeling that exists between the North and the South.

This has been delayed 20 years. That it might not be delayed 20 years longer between those who want a cheap bridge and those who want a magnificent superstructure—so as to eliminate that difference we constitute a commission the membership of which can not be impeached; the integrity, ability, and economy of which can not be questioned.

I hope the Senator from New York, when he finds that in this bill the State of New York gets \$5,000,000—possibly more than that—will consent that the Capital of this Nation of 95,000,000 people may have a bridge across the Potomac.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I am in substantial accord with the Senator from Virginia respecting his views generally, but in view of the extraordinary disbursements and expenditures provided for by the various appropriation bills now before Congress, as I view the situation it would be very unwise to add to the burdens of the people at this time an expenditure of \$5,000,000 for a bridge across the Potomac when there are two bridges at the present time half a mile from here.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator permit me? If you are ever going to build this bridge, if you are not simply trying to make a pretense of economy, why not let it since the amount authorized will be distributed over five years? The conditions of the Treasury are all right. There is ample money in the Treasury for this purpose. Vast sums of money are being deposited in national banks to-day. This money will not be spent for five years. It seems to me if there is any justice, if there is any pride in the city of Washington, if there is any desire to treat the people who live south of the Potomac with the fairness that the people of your State receive, and those who live in other sections than New York, and as the people surrounding any capital in this Nation receive, some conclusion should be reached in connection with this bridge and proceed to its construction. Now, what amount does the Senator think the Government would be able to spend?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I would suppose at this time that the Government could make no expenditure for that purpose.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator think possibly a million dollars could be taken from New York and put on this bridge?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Not at this time. I submit my motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York moves to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Before the Senator presses that—

Mr. LODGE. The motion is not debatable, Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York withdraw his motion for the purpose of hearing the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask some one who knows the facts in the case to state the maximum and minimum for which a respectable and decent bridge could be built across the Potomac at this point?

Mr. LODGE. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York to lay the amendment on the table. [Putting the question.] The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. BRIGGS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. Observing him to be absent, I transfer that pair to my colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PAYNTER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. PERCY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and, in his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. In his absence from the Senate I am permitted to transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], and, in his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER]. I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CLAPP (after having voted in the negative). Since announcing the transfer of my pair, I have learned that my colleague [Mr. NELSON] is paired with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. I therefore transfer my pair to the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Bankhead	Curtis	Lea	Shively
Bristow	Fall	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.
Bryan	Gore	Owen	Smith, Ga.
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Page	Smith, S. C.
Crawford	Kenyon	Pomerene	Thomas
Cummins	Kern	Sheppard	Townsend

NAYS—30.

Bourne	Dillingham	Newlands	Smoot
Brady	Fletcher	Penrose	Stone
Brandegee	Gallinger	Perkins	Sutherland
Briggs	Jackson	Pittman	Swanson
Burnham	Jones	Polindexter	Wetmore
Chamberlain	Lodge	Root	Williams
Clapp	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.	
Clark, Wyo.	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Mich.	

NOT VOTING—41.

Ashurst	Dixon	Lippitt	Simmons
Bacon	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Borah	Foster	McLean	Thornton
Bradley	Gamble	Myers	Tillman
Brown	Gardner	Nelson	Warren
Burton	Gronna	Oliver	Watson
Chilton	Guggenheim	Overman	Webb
Clarke, Ark.*	Hitchcock	Paynter	Works
Crane	Johnston, Ala.	Percy	
Culberson	Kavanaugh	Reed	
Cullom	La Follette	Richardson	

So the motion of Mr. O'GORMAN to lay the amendment on the table was rejected.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to ask whether at this point it would be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks it would be in order.

Mr. STONE. I make that motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

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

Mr. BRIGGS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. WATSON]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BROWN] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I again transfer my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS], and will let that announcement stand for any subsequent vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Again transferring my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], I vote "nay."

Mr. PERCY (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], with whom I am paired, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I again transfer my pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I again transfer my general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. GUGGENHEIM], which will permit the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER] and myself to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER]. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (after having voted in the negative). I understand the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB], if he were here, would vote "yea." I therefore transfer my vote to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON], and will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bankhead	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Bristow	Kern	Sheppard	Williams
Bryan	Lea	Shively	
Cummins	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	
Gore	Owen	Stone	

NAYS—40.

Bourne	Crawford	Lodge	Root
Bradley	Curtis	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Fall	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Briggs	Fletcher	Paynter	Smith, S. C.
Burnham	Gallinger	Penrose	Smoot
Catron	Hitchcock	Perkins	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jackson	Pittman	Swanson
Clapp	Johnson, Me.	Polindexter	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Pomerene	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—38.

Ashurst	Dixon	Lippitt	Simmons
Bacon	du Pont	McCumber	Stephenson
Borah	Foster	McLean	Thornton
Brown	Gamble	Myers	Tillman
Burton	Gardner	Nelson	Warren
Chilton	Gronna	Oliver	Watson
Clarke, Ark.	Guggenheim	Overman	Webb
Crane	Johnston, Ala.	Percy	Works
Culberson	Kavanaugh	Reed	
Cullom	La Follette	Richardson	

So Mr. STONE's motion was not agreed to.

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

Mr. GORE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma moves that the Senate adjourn. [Putting the question.] By the sound the noes seem to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair to the Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I again transfer my pair from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I make the same announcement as to the transfer of my pair and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce a pair between the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON].

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Bryan	Kern	Pomerene	Stone
Gore	Lea	Sheppard	Thomas
Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Shively	
Kenyon	Owen	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—45.

Bankhead	Crawford	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Bourne	Cummins	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Curtis	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Brady	Dillingham	Page	Smoot
Brandeggee	Fall	Paynter	Sutherland
Briggs	Fletcher	Penrose	Swanson
Bristow	Gallinger	Percy	Townsend
Burnham	Jackson	Perkins	Wetmore
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Williams
Chamberlain	Jones	Poinexter	
Clapp	Lodge	Root	
Clarke, Wyo.	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	

NOT VOTING—36.

Ashurst	Cullom	Kavanaugh	Richardson
Bacon	Dixon	La Follette	Simmons
Borah	du Pont	Lippitt	Stephenson
Brown	Foster	McCumber	Thornton
Burton	Gamble	McLean	Tillman
Chilton	Gardner	Nelson	Warren
Clarke, Ark.	Gronna	Oliver	Watson
Crane	Guggenheim	Overman	Webb
Culberson	Johnston, Ala.	Reed	Works

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to hear the pending amendment read. I did not understand that there was an amendment pending.

The SECRETARY. The amendment is, on page 68, to insert a new section, to be known as section 23.

Mr. OWEN. Is it in order to offer an amendment at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order to offer an amendment to the amendment, but not otherwise.

Mr. OWEN. Let the amendment be read.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. OWEN. I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the amendment of the committee, the following:

Provided, That any item in this bill returned to Congress disapproved by the President of the United States at any time within the first 10 days of the next regular session thereof shall be void unless reaffirmed by a majority vote of both Houses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and the further point of order that it could not be passed without changing the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will first decide the point of order.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I believe I had the floor in offering the amendment; and I have a right to address the Senate on the amendment without being taken off the floor by motions made by other Members.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order can be made at any time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think a point of order is always in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not debatable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The point of order can hardly be nullified.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was about to decide that the point of order was not well taken. The Senator from Colorado makes the point of no quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS and others. That is dilatory.

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

Ashurst	Crawford	Lodge	Shively
Bankhead	Cummins	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Bourne	Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.
Bradley	Dillingham	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Fall	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Fletcher	O'Gorman	Smoot
Briggs	Gallinger	Page	Stone
Bristow	Hitchcock	Paynter	Sutherland
Bryan	Jackson	Penrose	Swanson
Burnham	Johnson, Me.	Percy	Thomas
Catron	Jones	Perkins	Townsend
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Pittman	Warren
Clapp	Kern	Root	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Lea	Sheppard	Williams

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate adjourn, and upon that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered, and the motion was rejected.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I regard this as the most objectionable amendment submitted by the committee. Indeed, I regard it as the most objectionable feature of the entire bill, much of which, I think, is objectionable.

It is scarcely necessary for me to go over what has been mentioned this evening—the condition of the appropriation bills that have been, and are to be, passed by the present Congress. I have listened to the suggestion of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN], when he sought to explain to us that this was a harmless little measure carrying no appropriation; that there was no appropriation in it; that it simply provided that \$5,000,000 could be spent, and made it a part of the law, but left it to some other appropriation bill to actually carry the money.

If it is so harmless, if it is so ineffective, why the necessity of putting it upon this bill? Why not let it wait? Why keep it, in spite of the objection that exists, with this provision before the Senate? When we already have a bill away beyond a normal size, why add this \$5,000,000 to it?

We all understand that when you get through a provision of this kind the appropriation follows. It can be put on any bill upon the floor of the Senate. It is constantly knocking at the door, demanding the money, and pressing for the actual cash.

Mr. President, if this provision really passes, I think, if this is to be a memorial bridge, the provision should be amended, and it should be provided that a statue of each of the Senators from Virginia should be placed upon it, one at one end and one at the other.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. I would suggest that a statue to the Senator from Georgia be placed on the bridge, as neither of the Senators from Virginia deems himself sufficiently important to be so honored; but I am satisfied that the Senator from Georgia is sufficiently important.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should object very much to having my statue on such a bridge. I should not consider it a compliment. I would far rather have my statue erected in connection with an effort to prevent the bridge from being built.

Mr. President and Senators, we have two very fair bridges across from here, on which we can pass over the Potomac. The Senator from Virginia most eloquently plead for an opportunity for those south of Washington to get into Washington. I belong to the number of those south of Washington, and I have never found any trouble about crossing the Potomac. I have never heard any cry beyond Virginia for better facilities to cross the Potomac. Do not put it as a plea to let the people south of the Potomac get here, because nobody beyond Washington and Virginia ever asked for it. North Carolina has no representatives asking for it; South Carolina has none; Georgia has none; Alabama has none. Do not say it is to let the people south of the Potomac get here. The Senator from Virginia should speak for his own State alone, and say: "Build it, and spend this \$5,000,000 of all the people's money, to let the people of Virginia cross the Potomac."

Mr. President, if we had every building that we needed in Washington erected, if we had no special strain on the Treasury, I would not be opposed to a bridge of this character or of some character. But I am unalterably opposed to this bill if this provision goes on. I hope if this provision goes on it that the bill will be killed. I am not sure that it ought not to be killed anyhow. I rather think it ought. It is not hostility to the District of Columbia or the city of Washington on my part.

I sat quietly a few moments ago and saw the splendid appropriation of \$2,300,000 made for park purposes and never opened my lips against it. My view of that was this: I believe it desirable that the park back of the White House shall be connected with the park north of the city, and if it is to be done the land ought to be bought at once. It will be more and more difficult as the days roll by to purchase the additional land. Therefore if the two parks are to become one, if this splendid effort to beautify our National Capital is to take place, now is the proper time to make the purchase.

So, Mr. President, moved by some of the lofty patriotism possessed by the Senator from Virginia, feeling at least in part the noble sentiments which he so eloquently presented, I made no obstruction to that measure. There was a reason why, if it is to be done at all, it should be done now.

But, Mr. President, with reference to this bridge, there is absolutely no economy in putting it on the appropriation bill now. Five years hence it could be put upon the appropriation bill with no more expense than would be required now. We own the approaches on either side.

We have had the fact delightfully explained to us by the Senator from Virginia that we own 1,200 acres of land on the other side of the Potomac and it requires an expenditure of only \$5,000,000 to turn that land into a farm. I have no doubt it is worth a hundred dollars an acre, and I suppose if this bridge, costing \$5,000,000, is built it will still be worth a hundred dollars an acre, and the investment of \$5,000,000 would be a splendid business proposition in the interest of the National Government.

Mr. President, what excuse can we give for making a \$5,000,000 appropriation for something not now essential? I should perhaps hesitate to say that, for the Senator from Virginia says there is not a bridge across the Potomac that has not a street car track on it, and therefore we must have another. The street car tracks do not prevent us from driving our teams across or crossing with our automobiles. I have crossed both bridges, and I never found the street car tracks in the way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether the street cars do not facilitate access into the city by those like myself, who have no automobiles?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; the street car affords splendid facility for access to the city by a large majority of our citizens.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will the Senator from Georgia allow me to ask him a question?

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is now after 1 o'clock. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether or not it is his intention to prevent a vote upon this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not say that it is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I mean this evening.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I can not say that it is; no. I have not finished making the observations I want to make. I trust the Senator from Utah is not so impressed with the lack of force in what I am saying that he has supposed I did not seriously want what I was saying heard. If so, he has misunderstood my purpose in speaking.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I asked the question in the utmost good faith.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I answered it in that way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is perfectly apparent that some gentlemen on the other side have engaged in some dilatory methods, and I wanted to know, because I do not think it is fair to punish a lot of men by insisting upon remaining in session for an unreasonable length of time. If it is the intention of the Senator from Georgia or others upon that side of the Chamber to prevent a vote during the evening, I would not feel like insisting upon remaining here.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have answered the Senator so far as I am concerned. I have not in any sense made up my mind to seek to prevent a vote upon this amendment this evening.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That answers my question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Or this morning. Now, I do not mean to say if this amendment goes into the bill that I may not seek to prevent a vote for some time upon the bill itself. I have not made up my mind at all on that. I know I will vote against the bill with this amendment in it. I believe with this amendment in it the bill is doomed.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We might as well understand it, gentlemen. If this bill is loaded with \$5,000,000 of additional appropriation, I believe it is doomed, and I think it ought to be doomed. I should earnestly plead and pray all others on this side to earnestly plead with the Senate to kill the bill if it has this appropriation of \$5,000,000 on it. You have placed in the bill \$1,750,000 for an armory in the District. You have put into the bill an appropriation of \$2,300,000 for a park in the District.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator has announced his intention to perform the righteous work which has appealed to him of voting against the bill if this provision is in the bill. I should like to get the Senator's frame of mind as to what he would do if this item was stricken out of the bill. Would he then vote for it?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If this item is stricken out of the bill, if I should vote against it I would vote and certainly occupy no time.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That is a consideration to be taken account of.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I informed the Senator. I appreciated the situation, and I appreciate the situation of those who desire the balance of the items in the bill. I meant it to be understood by the Senator from Wyoming just as he understood it—that it would be a thing very much to be appreciated if you wish the bill to pass, because, of course, those who are opposed to this measure can stop it at this time in the session. We understand that perfectly. For that reason we do not feel that you should force on us a measure involving this appropriation of \$5,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I should like to have the Senator explain what he means by forcing on the bill an amendment that a majority of the Senate voted in favor of.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They have not voted on it.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. The Senate refused to lay the amendment on the table. That was a distinct expression of the Senate by a decisive majority in favor of the amendment. The only force I have seen is the filibuster of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am sorry the Senator from Virginia speaks in such vehement language. There is no filibuster by the Senator from Georgia; none is going on now. I am appealing to the Senate when they come to vote upon this provision to vote against it. I can not accept the view of the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me finish what I have to say. The Senator from Virginia proceeded with his eloquent speech, one of the best I have heard at any time on the floor of this body, and he in my opinion carried the Senate by that speech.

Mr. SWANSON. Will the Senator permit me to interrupt him for a minute?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Do I understand that the position of the Senator is that if a majority of the Senate think this amendment is just and right and proper legislation, and because he does not concur in it and his judgment is not in accord with this majority, he will prevent the bill from going to conference? Do I understand him as using that threat to the Senate? That is the substance of what the Senator has said. If that is true, speaking for myself as a Senator, and believing that a majority of the Senate should rule, if I did not favor the proposition, before I could be coerced into surrendering the judgment of the Senate to the judgment of an individual Senator I would stay here until the 4th day of March.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the vehemence of the Senator from Virginia will not help his cause. I do not yield to him now, because I did not interrupt him and he did not permit us to interrupt him when he had the floor. I desire now to occupy the floor myself.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I can not recall that the Senator from Georgia asked an interruption at my hands. I ask any Senator in this body to arise who asked for an interruption and I refused it. I can not recall it. Did the Senator from Georgia ask to interrupt my speech?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not; but the Senator—

Mr. SWANSON. Name the Senator who did.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let me finish. The Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] several times sought to attract the attention of the Chair and to interrupt the Senator, and the

Senator went on with his speech and the Senator from New York did not have the opportunity.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the Senator from New York is present. He is amply able to present his grievances to the Senate and he is amply able to take care of himself. If the Senator from Virginia has been guilty of any discourtesy to the Senator from New York he does not need the Senator from Georgia to be his champion. Each Senator here is the champion of his own rights and his own grievances. The Senator from New York is here, and if I made discourteous treatment of him I will make proper amends to him.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I did not suggest that the Senator's treatment was discourteous, and I do not understand when I say that I wish to proceed with my speech that I in any way act with discourtesy to the Senator from Virginia. If he thinks so, no matter how much I wish to proceed with my speech, I would stop immediately and yield to him.

Mr. SWANSON. My injection in this debate was that the Senator had left an impression that I had refused properly to yield in a courteous way to a Senator who wanted to interrupt me, which I deny.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I never for one moment suggested he did; and I do not mean certainly in any discourteous way to fail to yield to him; but if he feels so I regret it. I would be glad to yield and concede to him any moment the floor if I had it, without the slightest hesitation. I did not mean, and I think the Senator ought not to have felt, that I meant that his conduct was discourteous. I had said that his speech was eloquent; that his presentation was powerful; and it is my honest opinion that the speech of the Senator from Virginia defeated the motion to lay this amendment on the table. I believe it was the power and the eloquence with which he presented the case, scarcely answered at all, that carried the Senate off its feet and defeated the motion to lay the amendment on the table, which I believe otherwise would have carried. The Senator has utterly misunderstood me in supposing that I meant anything but compliment to the part he has taken in this matter.

I have not heard a more powerful or persuasive speech made by any Senator upon the floor of the Senate since I came here, and I do not think I have heard one that more likely changed votes than the speech of the Senator from Virginia. The reason why I do not consider that the motion to lay on the table was a final decision of this question by the Senate is because the Senator from Virginia had presented his side with such power, unanswered, that I think the other side was not properly in the minds of Senators.

What I desired to impress upon the Senate was the condition of the appropriation bills, what we have already done for this District, and the feeling of Senators that they must vote against this measure as a whole if this additional appropriation is put on. Senators who desire to vote for the balance of it are justified in feeling that you are loading it down when you are paying \$600,000 a year rent because of the lack of public buildings in the District, where you need them and need them now. Are they not justified in feeling you are loading this bill down when you put \$5,000,000 on for this bridge, which is in no sense a necessity? I only ask to plead with Senators not to put this burden on the bill, and cite again the fact that we sat by practically without resistance when the appropriation of \$2,300,000 was put on for the park.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a few minutes ago when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] made a motion to strike out everything after the enacting clause of this bill I voted for the motion. I voted for it because there are so many little things in it that did not seem to me to be straight and right and worthy of recognition in a public-building bill.

The provision which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] opposes is one of the very few things in this bill that are worthy of consideration. Under the memorial-bridge project there is a great national peace idea uniting the sections by a symbolism that shall be beautiful and full of meaning at the same time. It is the only high sentiment—the only prose poetry in the bill. If the only opposition to this bill were that provision, I should never have cast the vote which I cast a few moments ago.

Now, I want to say another thing, Mr. President, not so much connected with the public-buildings bill as with the general management of the Senate and concerning its rules. This is the only body in America, as far as I know, with unlimited debate and with power in the hands of a few people to retard, if not totally to put an end to, the tyranny of a majority against a minority. It is a most precious privilege. It ought to be guarded most carefully. But if the rules of the Senate are to be abused and if filibustering is to be resorted to upon ordinary routine business, the rules of the Senate will be brought into contempt and the Senate itself will be compelled to change its

rules, and there will be no abiding place in America where a minority, and especially a sectional minority, can protect itself against the brute force of a majority.

It is worse than useless, it is dangerous, to fool with fire except when fire must be conquered; when it must be fooled with. For half a dozen men to hold up a bill simply because they do not agree with the mere expediency of it; when there is no great public principle involved; no constitutional principle; no principle of human right; no principle of protection of the natural rights of man, will lead inevitably to frequent imitations, and, after a while, to an abolition of that which is now a hedge and a buttress, and ought to be left to be used as a buttress only upon great occasions; occasions when it is necessary to take an appeal from the legislative majority to the people themselves so as to give time to the people to think, as was done in the case of the force bill, and as has been done successfully several other times in our history.

As a representative of the minority section of this country, I do not want to see the rules of the Senate changed and therefore do not want to see them abused; I do not want to see them brought into disrepute. I do not want to see the time come when in behalf of public liberty or of sectional rights they might be appealed to and be found wanting; be found abolished by reason of abuse prior to that time.

I have voted to strike out everything in this bill after the enacting clause, and I shall vote against the bill, because, notwithstanding it has this good provision and notwithstanding it has some other excellent provisions there is, as it seems to me, that element of logrolling in it that I do not approve of. But I am not willing to beat it except upon a square vote in the Senate, and I do not think we ought to be kept here indefinitely without facing the merits of the issue by the use of rules—instrumentality—good and safe and right in itself, but whose very existence may be involved by fights of this description. Let us keep the precious right of the rules of the Senate for great occasions when great principles are involved, when great and serious public feeling in some manner affecting a section or a class or a sentiment is involved, when an appeal is sought to be taken from a temporary brutal majority in the legislature to the sober common sense of the people at home or in behalf of a majority outside of this Chamber against a discredited majority in it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, there are many items in this bill which I do not believe are justified, and I think that the whole system upon which we have been hitherto proceeding in dealing with public-building bills has a fundamental error in it. We have no appropriate or adequate safeguard against the estimates involving unnecessary expenditures. It is very easy to call upon the Supervising Architect to make a report as to what would be the cost of a building containing a certain number of square feet of floor space, and to assert to the Supervising Architect's Office that such and such a town or village needs a building of a certain amount of floor space. In many instances and in most instances no doubt the floor space is more accurately ascertained, but no sufficient check exists on these demands for floor space. In that kind of fashion there comes into the committees these quasi estimates, so that one town after another is provided for with buildings that are not really justified by the public service on a sound, economical public policy. Where a town is perfectly willing to give the rent of a building for a post office in order to get the trade belonging to the post office at some convenient corner of the vicinity, and it often happens that the citizens of a town will make up the rent, and practically give a building to the Government for its use in order to attract to some convenient point in the town the trade which centers around the post office, or the Government may easily rent a convenient and economical building already in the town for such purposes, which serves the purpose excellently well, sufficiently well. Yet by the process we have followed in preparing this bill and bills of like character heretofore, the Government is called on to put up a building that will cost \$75,000 or \$100,000, and thereafter fix it as a permanent charge upon the Federal Treasury for the care of that building, for maintaining its heating apparatus, for keeping it in repair, for janitor service, and for things of that kind, which make a permanent unnecessary charge upon the Government. In that way I think we have gone into unnecessary expenditures.

It was for that reason that I presented this proposed amendment. I presented it with a serious purpose, to provide a means for putting an end to this kind of thing in these public-building bills, where items are inserted that ought not to go in. I know perfectly well that Members of the Senate, as a rule, are in no better position than I am to ascertain what is the exact

public need with regard to various of these items. I therefore propose this amendment:

Provided, That any item in this bill returned to Congress disapproved by the President of the United States with his objections at any time within the first 10 days of the next regular session thereof shall be void unless reaffirmed by a majority vote of both Houses.

The suggestion was made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the provision is "unconstitutional." I shall only take a brief moment to show that it is not unconstitutional. The general provision of the Constitution with regard to the exercise of the veto power by the President, of course, allows him, whether we will or whether we will not, to return a bill which passes both Houses with his disapproval, or veto, giving his objections, within a certain time. Thereupon that bill is vetoed, and is not the law unless it shall then be passed by a two-thirds vote of both Houses, in which event his veto is overruled; but we have a right to impose a condition in the law itself which becomes a legal condition with regard to any item in the bill when the President shall have approved the act. The constitutional provision provides that—

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated—

And so forth.

But this provision which I offer as an amendment to the proposed act becomes the law with the President's approval; and when he approves it, he makes this bill the law. It becomes the law of the land, and, being the law, it requires him, as a legal executive duty imposed by act of Congress, to do certain things; that is, to scrutinize the items in this bill and further advise Congress. It is clearly within the legislative power of Congress to require him to return any item of this bill, which, upon closer scrutiny, he may think deserves further consideration by Congress. My amendment proposes by act of Congress to make such item void unless it is reaffirmed by a majority vote of both Houses. It is not the same thing as a constitutional veto of the bill itself. It is a conditional provision in the law which becomes the law and justifies the President under a special act in returning to us any item, with his objection, for further legislative consideration. This is a wise public policy. That will cure the vice of a bill like this, which is being passed with many questionable items because of the individual interests of various Members of either House of Congress and the spirit of mutual conciliation, moved by local, but not by the higher national, interests.

That is the difficulty with this kind of a bill. Men do not feel absolutely free to object to a bill, because they have on the inside of the bill various items for their own State which are affected by the bill, and in that way this kind of a bill gets a number of votes it would not get upon its merit. I think the time has come in this Republic when we should not have bills put through that should be tainted in any degree with a suspicion that they are going through for the purpose of serving the special local interest only of Senators or of Members of the House. When I say "special local interests," of course I only mean in a localized sense; that is to say, that a Senator may be unduly influenced by his anxiety to serve some particular town in his own State whose lively citizens put undue political pressure on him.

There are towns in my State affected by this bill which I think are thoroughly justified in asking what has been estimated for them on the ground of their great postal receipts, on the ground of the volume of business, and on the ground of economy from a standpoint of rental charges, and I am prepared to defend any item in the bill for my State which I have offered; but at the same time I myself am interested and influenced in the way I have described, and have a strong inducement to favor this bill in order to favor the towns that I am friendly to and interested in, but I do think that the executive branch of the Government ought to have the right to put the microscope upon these items and, as a matter of law, should be required to return them to Congress, and unless Congress reaffirms them by a majority vote after consideration of the further Executive report, such items ought to go out of the bill. That is the reason why I have offered this amendment. I believe it would really strengthen this bill. I would be willing to support this bill with whatever items are in it with the opportunity in the Executive to review it and further advise Congress as to those items which might prove to be unsound. I am satisfied that there are a large number of items in this bill that ought not to be in it. My proposed amendment would cure that defect, and I would be willing to support the bill with this amendment.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. CLAPP. Does not the Senator fail to distinguish between a condition over which the Executive would have no control and of the existence of which a proclamation of the President would be proof, and dependent upon which a law might go into effect or not, and the mere leaving it to the will of the Executive? I can readily understand that we might, if we took the time and care, devise a bill prescribing certain conditions upon the happening of which certain results should follow, as in the maximum and minimum provision of the tariff law, but that is prescribing the effect with reference to a condition over which the Executive has no control. He simply makes a proclamation, which we declare is evidence of the existence of a condition. That is one thing, and no doubt within the power of Congress, for it has been tried many a time and has been sustained by the courts.

This is a proposition that prescribes no condition whatever. It does not make the bill depend upon the happening of any condition, but simply leaves it to the President himself to say at the end of a given time whether or not this bill should go into effect or whether before it becomes effective it should come back here and receive the affirmative vote of a majority of both Houses.

It does seem to me, with all due deference to the Senator, whose opinion I certainly hold in high esteem, that the Senator has failed to distinguish between those two cases—one where we prescribe that upon the happening of a condition a certain result shall follow and the other, the Senator's proposition, to leave it simply to the will of the Executive to say whether, outside of the Constitution, a provision of law shall become effective or whether it shall come back here and receive an affirmative vote.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I have answered the constitutional objection by pointing out that when this becomes a law by act of Congress and the approval of the President of the United States it is a statute by the action of the authorized authorities under the Constitution who are charged with the making of the law. It having become the law, then the law requires that items which are found by the Executive to have been injudiciously proposed may be returned and shall be returned to the Congress with further Executive advice, and the Congress then has the right by a majority vote to consider and overrule the objections suggested. No clause or phrase or word in the Constitution is inharmonious with the amendment I propose.

The constitutional veto does not inhibit it. It suggests its wisdom. The constitutions of New York, of Minnesota, of Oklahoma, and of other States provide that the executive shall have the power of veto as to individual items on appropriation bills which the legislative branch can not override except by two-thirds vote of both houses. My proposed amendment merely imposes a condition making possible the return for further legislative consideration items that seem unwise.

Mr. CLAPP. In a great many States, my own State among others, the constitution gives the executive the authority to veto any item in a bill. I think there ought to be in the Federal Constitution such a provision, but the trouble about this proposition is that it simply depends for its operation finally as to whether it shall remain a law or not, without further action of Congress, upon the action of somebody else outside of the legislative body.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator is mistaken. The items objected to are returned to Congress for legislative affirmation, not having been finally affirmed by this act, but only passed by Congress conditionally—that is, conditioned on a future affirmative act by Congress, if the Executive advise Congress that further legislative approval is necessary. I appeal to the constitution of the State of Minnesota as my justification for the policy.

Mr. CLAPP. For what?

Mr. OWEN. For my justification for the policy.

Mr. CLAPP. Nobody doubts the policy.

Mr. OWEN. Very well. The policy being conceded, the only thing remaining is the constitutionality of my proposal.

Mr. CLAPP. The way to meet that is by an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. OWEN. The Senator can not find anything in the Constitution forbidding it. I defy him to do so. If it is not forbidden by the Constitution, and he can show nothing in the Constitution which is inharmonious with my proposed amendment, he must concede Congress has the right to pass the law under the grant of all the legislative power of the United States to Congress.

Mr. CLAPP. The Senator does not have to find anything in the Constitution to forbid it. Congress can legislate. Legislating is one thing and leaving it to the will of an outsider—I do not care who he is, and it adds nothing to make him the

Executive—is another. Any condition which Congress can impose in a law, upon the happening of which a certain result will follow, may be left to the Executive, may be left to the Interstate Commerce Commission, may be left to anybody that Congress designates, but Congress prescribes the conditions upon which the result and the effect shall follow. This proposal would leave it entirely to the Executive.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. OWEN. I yield the floor to the Senator from Mississippi. I have already answered the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. The proviso proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma might be worshiped without violating the commandment against idolatry. It is not the "likeness of anything that is in heaven above or the earth beneath or in the water under the earth." It involves not only one amendment to the Constitution, but it involves three or four. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma reads:

Provided, That any item in this bill returned to Congress disapproved by the President of the United States with his objections at any time within the first 10 days of the next regular session thereof shall be void unless reaffirmed by a majority vote of both Houses.

The three particulars in which it differs from the Constitution are these:

The Constitution gives to the President of the United States the right to veto a bill. It does not use the word "veto," but it gives him a right to send it back "without his approval," which of course is the same thing as the language used here—"to return it to Congress disapproved."

The first amendment to the Constitution which the Senator is seeking to make by his simple provision upon a special appropriation bill is that the President shall be empowered to veto an item in a bill instead of a bill.

The Senator said he could find authority for that in the constitution of Minnesota. I do not know whether he could or not, but I do know that he could have found it in the constitution of the late Confederacy; and it was one of the very few amendments to the United States Constitution which the Confederate constitutional convention adopted which was unsound. The moment the legislative branch of a government surrenders the power to coerce the executive by putting riders upon appropriation bills in times of great emergency, and thereby depriving him of financial support—the minute the legislative branch surrenders the purse string, that moment liberty and popular government are in danger. It is a right which ought to be sparingly used, but which ought never to be surrendered. We have gained all our freedom by this very thing, and Great Britain has gained hers by this ability to coerce the King either to veto or to allow to pass an entire supply bill with all that Parliament chose to put upon it.

That is the first amendment to the Constitution, proposed in an amendment to a special appropriation bill offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, conveniently shirking the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote of both Houses.

What is the next one? The Constitution says that the President shall return a bill "within 10 days." The Senator wants him, after having vetoed an item, instead of a bill, to return it "within the first 10 days of the next regular session"—the next regular session.

Then, in the third place, the Constitution provides that if the vote of Congress shall be reaffirmed by a two-thirds vote of both branches, the bill shall become law notwithstanding the veto. The Senator, not satisfied with two changes to the Constitution, makes a third, and says that the item—

shall be void unless reaffirmed by a majority vote of both Houses.

The Senator read the provision of the Constitution, but he did not emphasize the right places in it:

Every bill—

Bill, not item—

which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States. If he approve, he shall sign it—

The bill—not an item—

but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal.

And so forth.

The Senator neglects that here. By the way, I was mistaken in my count; there is a fourth amendment to the Constitution, so glibly proffered. Under his amendment you need not enter the objections of the President to these items on the Journals at all and proceed to reconsider it.

If after such reconsideration two-thirds of that House shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other House, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of that House it shall become a law. But in all such cases the votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and nays—

All this constitutional provision the Senator from Oklahoma, in a light, five-minute speech, repeals. The Constitution further provides:

And the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House, respectively. If any bill—

Not any item—

shall not be returned by the President within 10 days (Sundays excepted)—

Not 10 days after the next regular session, as the Senator's repeal of the Constitution reads—

after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law.

But the truth is that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has taken the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] seriously, when the Senator from Oklahoma did not mean to be taken seriously. The truth is, there is hardly a better lawyer in this body than the Senator from Oklahoma, and there is not a man in this body who knows better than the Senator from Oklahoma does that except for mere purposes of delay it is useless to attempt to make four constitutional amendments in one night in the shape of one amendment to a special appropriation bill.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. OWEN. I merely wanted to say to the Senator from Mississippi, for the purpose of the RECORD, that the proposed amendment was offered very soberly, very seriously, and very deliberately, and will be insisted upon on other bills of like character from time to time, until the country realizes the importance of the proposed amendment.

I will answer the Senator on the constitutional aspects of the matter when he shall have concluded.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well. If the Senator can answer me he is even a better lawyer than I have thought him to be, even better than I have expressed myself so complementarily. He has even more ingenuity as a lawyer, as a man who can "split hairs 'twixt the Nor' and Nor'west side," better than I have thought him capable of, and I have thought him capable of almost any measure of ingenuity of that sort. If he can fix it so that the President can disapprove an item in an appropriation bill, and thereby keep it from becoming law, instead of having to disapprove the whole bill, and then if he can go further and override the veto of an item—itsself unconstitutional—by an equally unconstitutional majority vote instead of a constitutional two-thirds vote, and then if he can go yet further and give the President 10 days after the next regular session instead of the 10 days that the Constitution gives him after the bill reaches him, then I am willing to vote to put another item upon this public buildings bill—an item to erect a monument to the intellectual ingenuity of the Senator from Oklahoma.

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

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the difficulty with the Senator from Mississippi is that he does not seem to be able to discriminate between the requirement of the Constitution relating to the veto and an act of Congress. There is a great difference between the constitutional provision relating to the veto and an act of Congress making a conditional appropriation. I will invite the Senator, when he reads the RECORD to-morrow, to scrutinize carefully his own language and see whether or not he is quite content with it.

This is a proposed provision of law which I offer. When it becomes the law by act of Congress and the approval of the President, the general constitutional provision relating to the veto has nothing to do with it. Therefore the brilliant witticisms of the Senator from Mississippi are quite irrelevant and, I might say, immaterial and void. The difficulty with the Senator from Mississippi is that he does not discriminate between the Constitution providing a rule with regard to the veto and a law of Congress making a conditional appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it a law of Congress making a conditional appropriation, or is it a law of Congress regulating the rules under which the President shall disapprove items in an appropriation bill? The Constitution regulates the manner in which the President shall disapprove legislative acts.

Mr. OWEN. The Constitution gives the President certain broad powers without regard to an act of Congress, but the acts of Congress, being the acts of the lawmaking body, with the approval of the President, prescribe a rule of conduct for the President, which is a legal provision and binding under the Constitution. The Senator from Mississippi can not put his hand upon a single provision in the Constitution which forbids this act of Congress prescribing the conduct of the President.

It is not necessary for me to argue the matter any further. It is so plain as to require no further argument.

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

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. What amendment is it, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the amendment relating to the memorial bridge.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to offer an amendment, which I hope will solve the difficulties between us. I suggest that we strike out the provision appropriating \$5,000,000 for this bridge and insert instead \$1,500,000.

Mr. SWANSON. I accept that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 20, page 68, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,500,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, to come in after line 6, on page 69, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say to the Senator that that amendment is not now in order, the Senate having agreed to act first upon the committee amendments. They are not as yet concluded. The Senator will be recognized after the committee amendments are acted upon.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was, on page 69, line 7, to change the number of the section from "19" to "27."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 15, to change the number of section from "20" to "28."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 7, to change the number of the section from "21" to "29."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 20, before the word "free," to insert "in perpetuity," and in line 25, after the word "expense," to insert "In case of failure of the city of Pittsburgh to do any and all things necessary to proper fulfillment of this provision, the reservoir, pipe lines, and so much of the land adjacent thereto on the part of the reservation which is to be transferred to the said city as may be needed for rights of way shall revert to the United States," so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That before the above-described transfer by the Secretary of War to the city of Pittsburgh shall become effective, and as an express further consideration for said transfer, and for the surrender by the United States of a perpetual water supply now obtained from a reservoir located on the lands so to be transferred, the city of Pittsburgh, through its proper officers, shall covenant and agree, at its own expense, and within a reasonable time, to tap, within that part of the Pittsburgh supply depot and reservation between Butler Street and the Allegheny River retained by the United States, the 42-inch water main belonging to the said city which now crosses the said reservation under a revocable license, and thereafter to furnish, in perpetuity free of charge to the United States, all the water needed for all purposes upon the said reservation, and shall also agree to keep its own water main, pipes, hydrants, and other necessary appurtenances now located or hereafter to be located upon the same in good condition and repair at its own expense. In case of failure of the city of Pittsburgh to do any and all things necessary to proper fulfillment of this provision, the reservoir, pipe lines, and so much of the land adjacent thereto on the part of the reservation which is to be transferred to the said city as may be needed for rights of way shall revert to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 6, to change the number of the section from "22" to "30," and in line 10, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 30. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, additional ground adjoining the present site of the post office, customhouse, and courthouse at Utica, N. Y., at a cost not to exceed \$40,000, and that for the purpose of beginning the enlargement, extension, remodeling, repairing, or improvement upon the present site and the enlarged site herein provided for of said post office, customhouse, and courthouse and other governmental offices in said building, the sum of \$180,000 is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That this authorization shall not be construed as fixing the limit of cost of said enlargement, extension, remodeling, repairing, or improvement at the sum hereby named, but the enlargement hereby provided for shall be constructed or planned so as to cost, complete, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, not exceeding \$365,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 23, to change the number of the section from "23" to "31."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 18, to change the number of the section from "24" to "32," and in line 20, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$150,000," so as to read:

SEC. 32. That the limit of cost for the construction of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md., is hereby increased by the sum of \$150,000 and such further sum as may be realized from the sale of the site heretofore acquired for said immigration station.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation to limit the cost for the construction of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md., on page 78, line 21, after the word "deed," to insert "and to deposit the proceeds derived from such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt," so as to read:

And the Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized and directed to sell, in such manner and upon such terms as he may deem for the best interests of the United States, the site heretofore acquired for said immigration station in the city of Baltimore, Md.; and to convey the last-mentioned land to such purchaser by the usual quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds derived from such sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 78, line 24, to change the number of the section from "25" to "33," and on page 79, line 11, after the word "apparatus," to insert "and approaches," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 33. That for the purpose of beginning the enlargement, extension, remodeling, repairing, rebuilding, or improvement, upon the present site, of the United States post office and courthouse at Kansas City, Mo., so as to provide additional and necessary accommodations for the said post office, United States courts, and other governmental offices in said building, the sum of \$150,000 is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That this authorization shall not be construed as fixing the limit of cost of said enlargement, extension, remodeling, repairing, or improvement at the sum hereby named, but the enlargement hereby provided for shall be constructed or planned so as to cost, complete, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, not exceeding \$500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 17, to change the number of the section from "26" to "34."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, after line 21, to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 35. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to convey, by quitclaim deed, the building formerly used for post-office purposes and now known as the "Old Exchange," in the city of Charleston, S. C., to the Order of Daughters of the American Revolution in and of the State of South Carolina, to be held by it as a historical memorial in trust for such use, care, and occupation thereof by the Rebecca Motte Chapter of said order, resident in the city of Charleston, State aforesaid, as the said chapter shall in its judgment deem to best subserve the preservation of said colonial building and promote the honorable and patriotic purpose for which the grant is requested.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 10, to change the number of the section from "27" to "36," and in the same line, after "36," to strike out:

SEC. 36. That section 30 of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., p. 696), authorizing the enlargement of the site for the new post office, courthouse, and customhouse at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be, and the same is hereby, amended in so far as to provide that, in addition to the limit of cost fixed for such enlargement of site by said act, the unexpended balance of the original appropriation for site shall be available for the acquisition of said additional land, together with the further sum of \$75,000, which is hereby authorized to be expended from the amount heretofore authorized for the construction of said building, and the limit of cost for such additional land is hereby increased accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 24, to change the number of the section from "28" to "37."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 15, to change the number of the section from "29" to "38."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, line 7, to change the number of the section from "30" to "39."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. OWEN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following:

Provided, That any item in this bill returned to Congress disapproved by the President of the United States with his objections, at any time within the first 10 days of the next regular session thereof, shall be void unless reaffirmed by a majority vote of both Houses.

Mr. OWEN. I do not wish to detain the Senate by discussing this matter any further. I have already explained it. The veto of the President of the United States, of course, might be exercised against this whole bill in the way provided by the Constitution; but if he approves this bill it will be a part of the law prescribing his executive duties. It is plainly constitutional. I ask for the yeas and nays upon this amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are one or two amendments I desire to offer. On page 21, after the word "otherwise," I move to insert the word "of."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On page 261, after line 10, I move to insert:

The proceeds of such sale to be held in the Treasury and used, together with such further sum as may hereafter be appropriated, for the purchase of another site for a post-office building in said city of Pittsburgh.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will insert a comma after the numerals.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In the section numbered 32 I move to strike out all down to and including the word "follows," on page 77, line 1, and to insert in lieu thereof:

That the limit of cost of the purchase of a site and the erection of an immigration station at Baltimore, Md., heretofore fixed at \$130,000, be, and the same is hereby, increased to \$280,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building or buildings in said city of Baltimore, Md., the cost of such building or buildings and site, including filling in for pier, grading, approaches, sea wall, incidental dredging, etc., but excluding furniture and furnishings, not to exceed the sum of \$280,000;

That the piece of ground forming a part of the land acquired by the United States about the year 1836 as an addition to the grounds of Fort McHenry in the State of Maryland, which is described as follows.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It does not increase the appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That is what I wanted to ask before the announcement was made.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. On page 11, after line 22, I move to insert:

That the provision of the act of Congress approved June 30, 1906, fixing the limit of cost for the appraisers' stores building at Boston, Mass., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to fix the limit of cost at \$1,250,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Is that an increase?

Mr. LODGE. It is. I will explain it to the Senator. I received a notification from the Secretary of the Treasury only on February 20. Otherwise I should have brought it to the attention of the committee. It was after the bill had been reported. The Secretary of the Treasury wrote me—and I will print his letter in the RECORD—that the amount appropriated for this appraisers' stores building was \$900,000. The site cost \$444,000, and with the balance, \$455,000, it is impossible to construct the building.

He says that in accordance with his estimate the building will be constructed as designed, including elevators and mechanical equipment and reserving an adequate amount for unforeseen contingencies, if the limit of cost is increased to \$350,000. The Treasury Department advised \$550,000, but I have asked for \$350,000. I will add that it would bring the whole thing to a standstill. We are now paying \$45,000 rent for an appraisers' stores building, and we would have to pay the interest on the land, which will lie idle, for nothing can be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury be printed in the RECORD.

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

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 20, 1913.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: Referring to the proposed appraisers' stores building at Boston, Mass., I have the honor to advise you that the act of Congress of June 30, 1906, limited the cost of site and building to \$900,000, all of which has now been appropriated. The total amount expended on account of site is \$444,052.88, leaving a balance of \$455,947.12 available for the construction of the building.

Under date of December 22, 1910, this department opened proposals for the construction, except elevators and mechanical equipment, of an eight-story and basement building, of 14,000 square feet ground area, but inasmuch as the lowest bid was \$589,000 it was impossible to award a contract.

It is estimated that the building can be constructed as designed, including elevators and mechanical equipment, and reserving an adequate amount for unforeseen contingencies, by an increase in the limit of cost of \$350,000. If the limit of cost was increased \$550,000 it would be possible to add 2 more stories to the building, making 10 stories in all.

Respectfully,
FRANKLIN MACVEAGH, Secretary.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On page 58, beginning in line 2, I move to insert so that the same will read:

In accordance with the plans to be approved by said commission, the total cost not to exceed the sum of \$250,000.

The effect of that amendment would be to make the cost of the auditorium at Arlington \$250,000 instead of \$750,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A bill appropriating \$750,000 for that purpose has passed the Senate and it has passed the House. Both committees have considered it fully. The plans were pre-

pared under an act of Congress by a commission appointed two or three years ago. Their plans have been very carefully drawn, the details and everything. I have them upon my desk. It would necessitate a rearrangement of the whole matter.

It is impossible to construct a building that would be at all adequate and suitable for the sum of money mentioned by the Senator from Georgia. It is absolutely necessary if this building is to be made at all appropriate that the amount inserted by the House, \$750,000, should be retained. I therefore hope that the amendment will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I offer an amendment as an additional section.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the bill as an additional section the following:

SEC. —. That a commission composed of two Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, shall, with the aid of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and of the Commission of Arts and of a member of the Engineer Corps of the Army, to be appointed by the President, present to Congress a connected scheme, involving annual appropriations for the construction and completion of public buildings heretofore authorized within a reasonable time, and shall frame a standard or standards by which the size and cost of public buildings shall, as far as practicable, be determined, and shall report as to the adaptability in size, accommodations, and cost of buildings hitherto authorized to the requirements of the communities in which they are to be located, and also whether the existing appropriations should be increased or diminished to meet such requirements, and that the sum of \$5,000 is hereby appropriated for the expenses of such inquiry.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I may add, Mr. President, that I understand in some cases there are authorizations for the construction of public buildings as much as 4 or 5 years old, where the construction has not been commenced, and that in many cases the requirements have changed, either diminishing or increasing.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would suggest that this amendment be put upon the bill and be made the basis of a more complete provision by the committee of conference.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I see no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 26, after line 10, insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to contract for the erection and completion of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office and other Government offices, on a site already acquired in the town of Middletown, State of Connecticut, the cost of said building, including said vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, not to exceed the sum of \$140,000.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I wish to say very briefly, in explanation of the amendment, that the Representative in Congress from that district in Connecticut had an understanding with the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in the House of Representatives that that appropriation should go on for that city. He was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and was called to the Isthmus of Panama on his official duties. While he was gone the committee, for some reason which I do not know, did not insert the provision in the bill, and when the Representative from the district returned from the Isthmus of Panama the bill had not only been reported from the committee, but passed by the House without this provision in it.

The people in the town concerned—Middletown, which I know very well—immediately got in communication with me about it, and I at once went to the chairman of the Senate committee, hoping to have it inserted by the committee here. But the committee of the Senate had closed the bill and reported it to the Senate, and I was unable to get any relief at all.

I want to say that the city of Middletown is the county seat of Middlesex County. It is one of the oldest cities in the State of Connecticut. It has a population of 30,000. It has 61 manufacturing industries, a steam railroad, two large State institutions. It is the seat of the Wesleyan University and of the Berkley University school. It is an enterprising and growing city. In view of the situation, both in the House and Senate, which I have outlined, I hope the chairman of the committee will see his way not to oppose this amendment, if the Senate desires to put it on the bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I dislike very much to oppose any amendment that is suggested, but if the bill is opened to amendment of that character I can assure the Senate that we shall add some two or three million dollars to the bill. I have had a number of Senators suggest to me that they desire

to offer amendments. I feel obliged to object to the amendment so far as I can, and I express the hope that it will not be adopted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I can state that it was the intention of the committee to embody this proposition in the bill in the House, and it was omitted purely through some inadvertence.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator who was at the time the chairman of the committee corroborates me in stating it was the intention of the House Committee to put this item on the bill. It clearly is a case where, through inadvertence or some other reason with which I am not acquainted, justice was not done, and these people are deprived of the building which they otherwise would have had. Their Representative in Congress, or somebody else, is held responsible for the mistake. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POMERENE. On page 43, line 11, I move to strike out "\$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 43, line 11, in the item for Napoleon, Ohio, strike out "\$7,500," and in lieu insert "\$10,000."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PENROSE. I offer an amendment to increase the limit of cost. On page 8, after line 4, I move to insert:

United States post office at York, Pa., \$15,000.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWNSEND. On page 24, after line 18, I move to insert:

United States post office at Boyne City, Mich., \$85,000.

Mr. President, briefly this is an item for a public building at Boyne City, Mich., which has receipts of something over \$10,000. I introduced a bill providing for this building, but somewhat late in the consideration of the public buildings bill by the committee, and yet it was in time if some unfortunate delays had not occurred and for which I was not responsible. The bill was referred to the department under the name of the junior Senator for Pennsylvania as its author, and I could not find it in that department when trying to speed its consideration there. I am sure the committee would have included this item in its report if it had been presented before the report was agreed to, for it is a most worthy case, and, besides, the Government has already appropriated \$10,000 for a site in Boyne City, and good business judgment would seem to require the completion of a project already begun. I hope that the Senate's apparent decision to keep out all amendments providing for buildings not included in the committee report will be waived in this instance.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator state what is the size of the city and the amount of its postal receipts?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Its total receipts are something over \$10,000, and its population is something over 6,000. It is a growing city and is clearly entitled to this appropriation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, of course, there could be suggested here amendments of this character for a good many million dollars in towns where the population and the post-office receipts would warrant the erection of a building. The committee had before it bills and amendments amounting to some \$50,000,000. Of course, we could not permit any such amount to go into this bill, and we exercised our best judgment. The sums in the bill allowed to the various States amount to something over \$8,000,000. I think we ought not to add anything more to this bill, particularly for the construction of new buildings. I hope that the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I should not have asked for it at this time, certainly, recognizing the duty and responsibility of the committee, if there had not been a site there already. I am urging it now because I feel that there was neglect about it for which I was not entirely responsible, because I felt very certain that the bill would be printed correctly. Had the name been properly printed and the report been here in time there would have been no question about it.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking out "\$20,000," in line 20, page 4, and substituting "\$30,000" for it. I will briefly give my reasons for it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. On what page?

Mr. WILLIAMS. On page 4:

United States post office at Laurel, Miss., \$20,000.

I want \$30,000.

The estimates from the architect's office were \$80,000 if a brick and limestone facing building were erected; \$90,000 if freestone or Georgia or other marble were used in the erection of the building.

The appropriation already made is \$60,000. This bill carries an increase of \$20,000, making \$80,000. I want it to carry an increase of \$30,000, which would make \$90,000, and would accord with the estimate if freestone, Georgia, or other marble were used. The receipts of the office are \$22,326.33.

The population of the city at the last census was something over 8,000, but I have written information from the postmaster of the city to the effect that the last year's school attendance and post-office patronage figures show 12,000, which is an increase since the estimate was made 18 months ago of nearly 50 per cent. The town of Laurel, unlike some of the other towns that were spoken of to-night, is not "growing by leaps and bounds," but it is growing by leaping plumb over all bounds. The rental for a post office now paid at the place is \$405.50 a year. I ask for an increase of \$10,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POINDEXTER. On page 74, line 21, after the words "all the water needed for all purposes," I move to insert "of good quality for said purposes."

This is a matter in which I have no personal interest, but it was called to my attention by the War Department. In the provision in this bill for the supply of water from the city of Pittsburgh, from land which the Government has exchanged for land belonging to the city, there is no provision as to the quality of the water, some of which is for drinking purposes. I offer the amendment to cover that defect.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. On page 45, I move to add, after line 2:

United States post office at Georgetown, Tex., \$5,000.

Mr. President, this amendment was intended to be offered by my colleague from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. He was compelled to leave the Chamber and asked me to present it for him. He is the ranking Democratic member of the committee, and was under the impression that the item had been embodied in the bill. He discovered after the bill was printed that it had been omitted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. On page 46, at the end of section 5, I move to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That no contract authorized by any section of this act for the erection of post-office buildings or for the purchase of sites for such buildings shall be entered into, nor shall any public moneys be expended for such purpose until the receipts of such post office for which any such building or site is intended shall amount to more than \$10,000 per annum.

Mr. President, this amendment, in accordance with a rule that has been observed in the House of Representatives for many years, provides that no public building shall be given to any town or city until the postal receipts amount to \$10,000. The effect of this amendment will be to eliminate a number of towns and cities from consideration here, that are unworthy of consideration. I hope the amendment will prevail, and I should like to have a ye-and-nay vote on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment, on which the Senator from Indiana demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment, if adopted, would be to exclude from the benefits of this bill public buildings which are intended for post-office purposes primarily, but which would be used by the United States, in at least some portions of the country, for other governmental purposes, such as for public-land offices and for homes for the forestry reserve force.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. And for courthouses.

Mr. FALL. And for courthouses for holding court; and it would absolutely exclude them from the provisions of this bill.

Mr. KERN. This amendment only refers to buildings that are to be used as post offices.

Mr. FALL. Exclusively?

Mr. KERN. Exclusively for post offices.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator will put in the word "exclusively" —

Mr. KERN. I do not think it necessary. It refers to post-office receipts, post-office buildings, and post-office sites. It is not intended to refer to anything else. I am entirely willing to word it to convey that idea.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again read.

The Secretary again read the amendment proposed by Mr. KERN.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suggest to the Senator from Indiana that he ought to insert the word "exclusively" in his amendment.

Mr. KERN. I am entirely willing to do so and to add to the provision that it is intended to apply only to buildings and sites used exclusively for post-office purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator does he wish to include all of the sites where \$5,000 might buy a site?

Mr. KERN. Unquestionably.

Mr. WARREN. Which two years hence it might take \$10,000 to buy.

Mr. KERN. Whenever we buy the site we are expected to erect a building. The purpose is to stop this raid in so far as it applies to these small towns.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that in the growing towns—it takes, of course, all of these matters from four to five years after the site is bought—the faster the town grows the faster the price of land advances. It would make it very expensive in some cases to wait until the time when the land was needed, while it might be very cheaply bought if taken in advance.

Mr. KERN. Then, that is an argument against the proposition. SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend by striking out the period at the end of section 5, on page 46, inserting a colon, and adding the following:

Provided, That no contract authorized by any section of this act for the erection of buildings to be used exclusively as post offices or for the purchase of sites for such buildings shall be entered into, nor shall any public moneys be expended for such purpose, until the receipts of such post office for which any such building or site is intended shall amount to more than \$10,000 per annum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I offer an amendment, to come in on page 21, line 8, to increase the appropriation there from \$100,000 to \$150,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 21, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$100,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$150,000," so as to read:

United States post office at Roseburg, Oreg., \$150,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in reference to the proposed amendment, I desire to say that at Roseburg they have a land office, and they are compelled to occupy separate buildings from the post office. The weather bureau is there, and a number of the foresters are situated there, and all of them occupy different buildings, at quite a considerable expense. I understand the estimate that was made by the Government for this building exceeded \$100,000, but the House kept the amount appropriated down to \$100,000. The Government owns the site; and it seems to me it would be a matter of economy to make the appropriation \$150,000. The receipts of the office at this time are something over \$18,000 per annum. The town has a population of something like 5,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. One hundred thousand dollars is a pretty good appropriation for a town of that size, I suggest to the Senator.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If that is to be the criterion of appropriations here, it would apply to many appropriations found in this bill, because there are a great many buildings that have been appropriated for in amounts in excess of \$150,000 where the towns do not have as much as \$18,000 of postal receipts, and I doubt very much if in many cases they have as much as \$10,000. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways. Here a site has been obtained, the Government has made the estimates, and the other House has placed the appropriation in this bill at less than the estimates which were made. We have not asked very much from the committee, and I trust this will be granted.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I have a good case here. I greatly desire a public building for the city of Calumet. It would serve nearly 50,000 people. The post-office receipts are between \$30,000 and \$40,000 annually. It serves numerous mining towns, including Red Jacket and Laurium, in the vicinity of Calumet. Calumet has no adequate post office. It has recently gone slightly Democratic, and this should invite assistance from the other side of the Chamber who seem so critical of this bill, and that is the worst thing I can say about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then it does not need any post office.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; I insist we want a public building at Calumet, and we ought to have it. I propose this amendment, and I hope it will be unanimously voted into the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Does the Senator from Michigan guarantee that Calumet will stay Democratic if it gets this new post office?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, that will depend upon the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Ohio and his associates. The intelligent people of Calumet are appreciative as well as discriminating, and I would strongly advise my friends upon the other side to rally to their support. Mr. President, I desire the following letter read, showing the importance of this community.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CALUMET, MICH., February 21, 1913.

HON. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your telegram of the 19th instant, I wish to call your attention to a few of the reasons why Calumet needs a Federal building, viz:

The post-office quarters at Calumet, Mich., are inadequate. No larger, suitable quarters are available.

The present post office serves a population of 25,000.

Incoming and outgoing mails are handled in a single room 24 by 32 feet in dimensions.

Part of this room is used for a lobby.

In the remainder of this small room provision must be found for 11 regular carriers, 1 parcel-post carrier, and 5 clerks. They are so closely crowded that their efficiency is impaired.

The growing parcel-post business is helping to create confusion caused by lack of room.

Twelve mails are received daily. There are nine dispatches of mails, of which four are "R. P. O.'s," made each day.

The Calumet postal receipts are \$30,000 annually. The money-order business is approximately \$250,000 annually.

From a business standpoint a Federal building in Calumet would be a good investment, for it could be made to serve a much larger population, cutting out part of the expense of several outlying post offices, including Laurium, Osceola, and Kearsarge.

The mines tributary to Calumet produce annually 150,000,000 pounds of copper, valued in the present market at from \$22,000,000 to \$25,000,000. Expenditures for wages and other local expenses amount to between \$12,000,000 and \$15,000,000 per year. The mining industries employ from 11,500 to 12,000 men, supporting a population of over 35,000 people.

Only part of the Calumet district is served by the present Calumet post office. With a building of adequate size the entire population of over 35,000 could be well taken care of and easily reached from one central office.

The Calumet territory, 1½ miles east and west by 2½ miles north and south, is one compact community, in the geographical center of which is Red Jacket village, where the Calumet post office is now located. It also includes Calumet and Hecla mining location, Laurium village, Centennial mining location, Centennial Heights, Kearsarge, and Wolverine mining locations, Tamarack mining location, Osceola mining location, Tamarack Junior and Florida location.

The populations of these locations are as follows:

Red Jacket village	4,211
Laurium village	8,537
Calumet Township, including Calumet and Hecla mining location, Centennial, Centennial Heights, Tamarack Junior, Kearsarge, Wolverine, and Florida location (not including Red Jacket and Laurium villages)	20,097
Osceola location	1,200
Tamarack location	1,500

Postmaster Charles J. Wickstrom, of Calumet, says regarding the need of a new Federal building:

"The post-office quarters at Calumet, Mich., have been entirely inadequate for a long time and are becoming more so since the establishment of the parcel post service, which is constantly growing. The department now has the dimensions of the room and all information pertaining to the post office. They were submitted about two years ago.

"We are making 9 dispatches each day, of which there are 4 R. P. O.'s, and we are receiving 12 mails daily. On account of the large territory that has to be covered by carriers, we have 11 carriers, whose efficiency is impaired by crowding, as may be judged by the dimensions of the room in which they work, which are on file.

"Our postal receipts are \$30,000 per annum and our money-order business is approximately \$250,000 per annum."

Calumet is a permanent community. Its mines, which have been operating for almost half a century, show no signs of exhausting the mineral deposits, and new developments and new mine openings made in recent years insure the community of a glorious future.

The bank deposits within the territory above described on February 4, 1913, were over \$7,800,000.

Senator, if it is your desire to have a petition generally signed by the people of the community, arrangements can be made to have it done immediately, and we are certain that it will be very largely signed, as our people are very much interested and are thoroughly wrought up about this matter.

Respectfully,

F. H. SCHUMAKER,
Mayor Red Jacket, Calumet, Mich.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 4, on page 30, it is proposed to insert: United States post office at Calumet, Mich., \$200,000.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the Senate, I think, has not entirely lost its sense of proportion and fitness in the perfection of this bill. I now move that we authorize the purchase of a site at Calumet, Mich., for a public building, and ask \$25,000 for that purpose. Surely this will not be denied.

Mr. BRISTOW. Make it \$10,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I will make it \$20,000, Mr. President, if Senators will now come to my support.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Under the heading of "Sites for post offices," it is proposed to insert:

For post office at Calumet, Mich., \$20,000.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 12, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

For one additional mail lift and one combination freight and passenger elevator, and for additions to mail apparatus and other improvements at the new city post office, St. Louis, Mo., to be immediately available, \$47,550.

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

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, has the Senator had an estimate for that item?

Mr. STONE. I was about to state that I had when some Senator said that the amendment had been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the amendment.

Mr. STONE. I thought it had been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator was mistaken.

Mr. STONE. I will agree not to make a speech if it is agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, some time ago my colleague [Mr. NELSON] proposed an amendment to this bill, which he had printed and referred to the committee. He was unable to remain here this evening, and asked me to present it. I realize that the hour is late, but I trust that that will not interfere with the Senate giving the amendment due consideration. I send it to the desk to be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

That the Court of Claims of the United States shall, upon petition and motion duly made by the Secretary of the Interior or the National Automatic Fire Alarm Co., of Washington, D. C., the contractor, under contract with the said Secretary of the Interior duly authorized by Congress, bearing date of December 17, 1903, to install and place in the various buildings of the Government Hospital for the Insane an automatic thermostatic fire-alarm system, the same having been placed therein under said contract by said company, and a temporary receiver duly appointed by said court with the tacit consent of said department to complete the construction thereof, after first having given notice of such motion to the parties in interest, inquire into, hear, and forthwith determine the following issues of law and fact now pending and unsettled between the said parties to said contract in order that said system may at once be put into operation for the protection of said buildings and the inmates therein confined against fire—full jurisdiction being hereby conferred upon said court to carry into effect the provisions herein contained:

First. Whether or not the said contract of December 17, 1903, above referred to, has been performed according to its terms and requirements by the said contractor or by the said receiver, and whether or not, in law and in fact, the work required and done under said contract by said contractor and by said receiver has been or should be accepted by the United States as properly and fully performed; and if not, what further obligation, if any, rests upon the contractor in connection therewith and the cost of discharging the same.

Second. Whether or not the United States under and by virtue of the terms of said contract of December 17, 1903, became and is the absolute owner of said system as installed and placed and of the right to use and operate the said system and the patent rights therein to enter without further right of compensation to the contractor or to any other person claiming adversely, and also what their respective rights are under said contract and the value thereof to the United States of such as are not now owned by it.

The said Court of Claims shall, after considering and determining the questions submitted, report and certify the findings and opinions to Congress at the earliest practicable date; and shall also certify the amount of court costs incurred solely by reason of the proceedings had hereunder.

That the said Court of Claims is hereby given full power and authority to call upon the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia for such information and papers as it shall deem necessary to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I am very familiar with that proposed amendment. It evidently does not belong on this bill.

Mr. CLAPP. Was it not through inadvertence that it was omitted from the bill?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; it does not belong in the bill at all.

Mr. CLAPP. It relates to a claim growing out of the construction of a public building.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. But this is a bill authorizing public buildings, sites, and matters of that kind.

Mr. CLAPP. But before we authorize the construction of new buildings we ought to pay for those we have already erected.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is simply providing for a method of settling a dispute between the Government and some individual.

Mr. CLAPP. It grows out of a building.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; but it does not belong on this bill any more than if it grew out of something else, and I make the point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On what ground?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is not germane and it is a private claim.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Neither of those points would lie. This not being a general appropriation bill, the question as to whether an amendment is germane or not does not apply; nor is there any inhibition against a private claim being attached to any bill except a general appropriation bill. Hence, the point of order is overruled. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OWEN. On page 76, lines 11 and 12, I move to strike out the words:

And no person now in the employ of the Supervising Architect's Office shall be eligible to such employment.

The bill as it is drawn would prevent any architect who might possibly be employed in the Supervising Architect's Office from being eligible to serve in these positions, which are being created for the purpose of designing and standardizing public buildings. I think the provision limits the authority of the Government to employ men who might be entirely fit and who are already in the Government service and familiar with Government buildings.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, this is a House provision for the employment of men at salaries of from \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year, as I recall, under the Supervising Architect. I think no employees in that office now are paid more than \$2,000. Am I correct in that, I will ask the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is probably the maximum.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The maximum is \$2,000.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Something like that; not over \$2,500.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. They are men who are evidently not sufficiently expert to be employed in such positions. The Supervising Architect himself agrees that this amendment is proper. These architects have got to be selected from outside of the office, and we simply want to prevent any man who is not qualified to fill that position from being selected. I think it is a very wise provision and that it ought to remain in the bill.

Mr. OWEN. It does not seem right to exclude the possibility of advancement of men who are already in the Federal service.

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

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not do that. We have two very large and important appropriation bills ready for to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Very well.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I inquire if the bill is now in the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has not yet been reported to the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I have waited patiently until these various good amendments have been passed upon by the Senate, and I now present one that is most meritorious.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$1,250,000," so as to read:

United States post office at Seattle, Wash., \$1,250,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am satisfied that when the Members of the Senate understand the necessity for this amendment they will adopt it, because they want only provisions of merit, in the interest of the Government, in this bill.

The situation at Seattle is as follows:

We had a population of about 70,000 when provision was made for the public building we now have. It has become wholly inadequate, just as we thought it would at the time it was provided for. We had a population at the time of the census of 1910 of 237,000 instead of the 70,000 people when our building was given. The Government necessities have increased accordingly. Our post-office receipts in 1902 were \$233,000. Now they are over \$1,000,000. We have a site that was purchased at a cost, I think, of one hundred and sixty-odd thousand dollars. The present post office is away up in the town, far away

from the railway station. The site we have purchased is near the railway station. It is estimated that we will save the Government about \$100,000 every year in the transportation of the mails that come into Seattle when we get the post office on the new site near the station. That is because there is a large amount of foreign mail, oriental mail and Alaskan mail, that comes into Seattle that has to be carried from the station up to the present post office, sorted, distributed, and then carried back to the station. This would all be avoided if the post office should be located at the new place. Cars of mail could be run into the new building, prepared for transmission, and sent out, and the cost of taking it uptown and back, as now, would be saved.

Then we need quarters for Government offices now without quarters—for the Bureau of Investigation, the Internal-Revenue Bureau, the Customs Service, the Steamboat-Inspection Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the Pension Office, the Forest Service, the Weather Bureau, Army departments, and several other offices for which the Government has to rent quarters in private buildings.

It now costs about \$100,000 a year to take the foreign and Alaskan mail and the mail for the southern part of the city to the present post office and bring it back. This would all be saved. We are now paying nearly \$20,000 a year in rent. By making this appropriation now we will save almost the increase in six or seven years. Refuse it and these extra expenses will continue to increase.

Upon this showing it seems to me we ought to adopt this amendment. Three hundred thousand dollars will not build a suitable building there. It simply means that the \$300,000 will lie idle until we get another public buildings bill, when it must be increased. This will be two or three or more years; and this annual expenditure to which I have referred will go on. The department estimates that the cost of the building, simply for post-office purposes, would be \$750,000, and that the cost of erecting a suitable building for all the Government offices for which we need quarters would be \$1,250,000. I am reading from the department letter.

We already have our site, in which we have invested nearly \$200,000. If Congress does not increase this appropriation, it will simply rest until we get another public-buildings bill to increase the appropriation, and meanwhile we will pay out possibly \$100,000 a year that we can save by the early construction of this building. So it seems to me it is a matter of economy, and for the benefit of the Government, to make a sufficient appropriation now to erect the building required by the needs of the Government. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary be authorized to correct the section numbers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] suggests that the joint committee of the Senate and House, consisting of two Members of each body, which was to make a certain investigation, should be increased by adding to it the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Attorney General, for whose departments most of the buildings will be constructed. I have consulted with the chairman of the committee, and he has no objection to adding those names. I will ask unanimous consent that their names may be added to this provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator reserves that amendment, then, and moves to amend it as he has stated. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I move to amend by inserting, after section 12, section 13 in the original form in which it was reported by the committee. That is the provision for the Red Cross building.

I think, Mr. President, that when the Military Order of the Loyal Legion and the Red Cross come with a proposal of this kind, and with half of the money raised themselves to carry out the project, they are entitled to a vote of the Senate upon their proposal. I ask that the Senate give that vote. If the Senator is unwilling to agree to the proposal, well and good; but I think there ought to be a vote.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, when this matter was up a while ago I was one of those who voted to strike out the word "loyal." I did not understand the history of the proposed legislation at that time; that is, I did not understand that the initiative had been taken by this legion and its proposal to raise \$300,000. To my mind, it was a beautiful conception for the Government to assume the entire obligation and to pay for this building and to turn it over to the noblest

possible work that can be engaged in by human beings—that carried on by the Red Cross Society. It seemed to me to be a beautiful conception that it should be dedicated to the women and their sacrifices; and I was glad and enjoyed and was in sympathy with every word said in that respect and voted that way.

But later I learned what I did not fully appreciate then—that the initiative in this matter comes from the Loyal Legion and its proposal to contribute \$300,000, and that its initiative has resulted in this proposal. That really puts a different phase upon the situation with reference to this proposal.

I should like to see the provision go in as it once before passed the Senate, I understand. On that account my vote will be different than it was before.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, having stepped into the cloakroom for a moment to take a smoke, I was very much surprised when I came out to find that a motion had been made to strike out this entire provision. The Senate had passed upon it; the Senate had amended it; the Senate's amendment had lent it a broader and a more national meaning than that with which it came from the committee, and I felt almost outraged by the idea that the entire provision had been stricken out on a viva voce vote, without an opportunity for me to call for the yeas and nays. I would rather this provision were passed in the shape in which it was originally presented to the Senate than not passed at all.

I do not think it is right; I do not think it is fair; I think it is exceedingly sectional and unfair, just because some organization upon one side or the other has taken the initiative in a matter of this sort, to appropriate the public money collected from the people of the Southern as well as the Northern States to celebrate and commemorate the heroism and the constancy of the women of some of the States of the United States, while expressly leaving out the women of the other States of the United States.

What the Senate did was done upon my motion. What the Senate did was right, and ought to have been done. The fact that somebody "initiated" the original proposition has nothing to do with it. You know as well as I do that if a league of Confederate veterans or a society of Confederate women had come here contributing \$300,000 and asking you to appropriate the other \$400,000 you would not have done it. You would have refused to do it upon the ground that it was sectional.

I repeat what I said earlier in the evening—that this Union no more belongs to the North than it does to the South. It no more belonged to the North before the war than it did to the South. It no more belonged to the North after the war than it did to the South. So far as the phrase "United States" is concerned, it meant nothing during the four years of war between the States. There were then temporarily a couple of congeries or groups of formerly united and subsequently reunited States, temporarily disunited; and the only advantage that you had of us was that a majority of the States were on your side. The United States is just as much my heritage and my present enjoyment as it is yours.

I shall move to substitute for the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] the provision as it was adopted by the Senate. If that motion to substitute shall fail, I shall then vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, because I am not willing to put myself in the attitude of not paying due tribute to noble and heroic women anywhere simply because I can not include all the noble and heroic women of the Union. But I do say that if you pass it in that form you are narrow, you are sectional, you are selfish, and you had better quit talking about "bridging the bloody chasm" and "a reunited Nation" and "the whole country being together again." You thereby confess that it is all lip service.

You were no more the "United States" for four years than we were. Neither of us was. We were the disunited States, warring with one another in a most unfortunate war. But I want to make the announcement that if my substitute shall fail I would rather pay tribute to the women of the North during that war than to refuse to pay tribute to any of the noble women at all.

I move, Mr. President, that the provision as it passed the Senate be substituted for the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I want to say just one word in explanation of my vote. I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], not understanding the facts of the case. I am similarly situated with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD].

I want to say that I come from a State which, while it remained in the Union, was very much divided in sentiment during the war. No man in this great country of ours respects more the heroism of the women of the South who were friends of the Confederacy than I, and no man will vote more readily

to erect a monument in honor of those women. I think, however, that the matter should not be included in this bill.

This idea of honoring the loyal women of the United States was conceived by the Military Order of the Loyal Legion, of New York. They proposed to give and have given for that purpose \$300,000, and they ask the Congress of the United States to give \$400,000 for the purpose of completing the memorial. I think it would not be treating them with the proper respect to strike out the word "loyal" in this bill, and to take from them the credit to which they are entitled.

I am one of those who long ago came to the conclusion that the war was over. There is no bitterness in my heart. There never was. I believe we should forget all the asperities and troubles of the past, and that as one people we should hold in grateful remembrance all the glory of that trying period on both sides of the great conflict which made all men free and which preserved every star on the Nation's flag.

I make this explanation, and I want to say to my friend from Mississippi that if he should introduce a bill of the character he described awhile ago I will not be one of those who will vote against his measure, but will support it with my heart and vote, and I shall pray and hope that that bill may be passed.

Let us forget sectionalism. The way to forget it is not by striking from this bill under the circumstances the word "loyal." "Loyal" is not a disreputable word. "Loyal" is an honorable word. To be loyal to your country, to be loyal to the North, to be loyal to the South, to be loyal to your principles, to be loyal to your friendships, is the highest mark of patriotism and the most exalted mark of personal honor.

Mr. President, I gave that vote under a mistake, but I do not want to be misunderstood as to my position. I have tried to make it clear. I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before the Senator from Kentucky takes his seat I should like to ask him a question. Do you think that the Loyal Legion would feel hurt or could feel hurt—

Mr. BRADLEY. I do not know that they would be hurt, but I do think—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wait a minute.

Mr. BRADLEY. I do think that they would have the right to be offended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you think they would be hurt or could be hurt in their feelings or would have the right to feel hurt, either one of the three, if the Congress of the American Nation said to them, "Keep your \$300,000; devote it to whatever purposes you please; devote it to another monument elsewhere to these very people, if you wish, or to needy Union veterans. We will build a monument, a beautiful memorial structure in keeping with your idea, to the heroic women of the entire United States, not merely a part of the United States. You can keep the money; you can devote it to another monument here or elsewhere. Congress will grant you the site for that, as Congress always does." Do you think they would have any right to feel hurt if we said that to them?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I think, under the circumstances, to change this amendment as it was offered would be to say to these men of the Loyal Legion, "It is true that you have conceived this beautiful and patriotic idea, but we propose in the Senate of the United States not to praise you, but to blame you, for what you have done. We scorn your assistance. However honorable may be your motives, we ignore them, we put them behind us, and we propose to erect this monument without any help from you." I think it would be an insult to that organization.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator says that we would say to the Loyal Legion, "It is true you have conceived this idea." I think he might have gone further and said, "It is equally true that we have conceived a much more beautiful idea, a much broader idea, a much more national idea, and a much more American idea. If, as you gentlemen pretend, you love your brethren of the South and the bloody chasm has been bridged; if you mean that; if it is not mere lip service; you will be glad to have the heroism and constancy and devotion of the southern women celebrated with your own, and the more especially because you will have \$300,000 left in your treasury to celebrate, according to your own ideas, upon private monuments here and there, anything that you choose, including a special monument to your own special women."

The Senator says he "wants to forget." I do not want to forget, because I have no reason to forget. If I knew personally the man who shot my father upon the battlefield I would feel no personal antagonism against him. He was doing his duty as he understood it; and my father would have shot him if the chances had been different.

But the right way to "forget" differences is not to emphasize differences. This vote, which by a single word cuts off

the commemoration of the heroism and devotion and nobility of the women of one-third of the Union, is not the way to "forget" the differences. It is the way to emphasize them.

The gentleman speaks of "insulting" the Loyal Legion. This idea of an insult will be construed by many a good woman in the South as an insult to her, and she will have much more reason to think it and say it than the Senator had to say that it was an insult to the Loyal Legion.

We are either one people or we are not. If we are step-children in the American Union, let us know it. If we constituted before the war and after the war a part of the United States, as I firmly believe we did, and if we did constitute during the war a part of the disunited States, as no man with common sense can deny, then you have the power, but you have no right, to use the common Treasury of all the people—contributed by us as well as by you—for the purpose of emphasizing an old, sanguinary, fratricidal strife that ought to be buried in an ocean of forgetfulness.

But I move now, Mr. President, to substitute for the amendment for the motion made by the Senator from New York the provisions of the bill as they passed the Senate amended to-night. I repeat that if that amendment shall fail I shall then vote for the motion of the Senator from New York, for I no more sympathize with narrow sectionalism on this side of the Chamber than on that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi moves to amend the amendment as follows.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Mississippi allow the amendment to be stated?

Mr. PERCY. Certainly.

The SECRETARY. Amend the first paragraph of section 13 as offered by the Senator from New York, as follows: Instead of the words proposed by the Senator from New York insert:

That the acquisition by the commission hereinafter mentioned of a site and the erection thereon of a memorial building in the District of Columbia to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the women of the United States during the Civil War is hereby authorized. The said building shall be monumental in design and character, and shall be used as the permanent headquarters of the American Red Cross, and shall cost, with the site, no less than \$700,000, which sum the United States shall contribute.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, without desiring to prolong this discussion at all, I only want to say that I can not agree with the view so forcibly presented by my colleague [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I believe that we either ought to accept or reject the offer of the Loyal Legion just exactly as it was made, and not mutilate it or pervert it from the purpose for which it was made.

Feeling that way, I shall vote against the substitute, and I shall then vote against the motion of the Senator from New York.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, could we not leave out the words "during the Civil War" and leave it preferably to read "the loyal women of the United States"?

What does this provide for? It provides for the permanent headquarters of one of the greatest organizations in the United States, composed of the women of this country without regard to section—the women south of the Potomac as well as the women north of the Potomac.

Would it be pleasant, I desire to ask Senators on the other side, to make the permanent headquarters of the Red Cross a building erected even by money raised in the States of Virginia and North Carolina and dedicated to the loyal women of the South during the Civil War? Would not that be unpleasant to the members of the Red Cross descended from the loyal daughters of the North during the Civil War?

Is it not an unhappy thought to take the Red Cross and connect it permanently with a building dedicated to the honor of the women of one part of the country? I would not ask the Senators on the other side to vote to put the Red Cross in a building dedicated exclusively to the memory of the women of the South. I do not think it right for them to ask that this association shall be placed in a building dedicated to the memory of the women of the one part of our country, because the association is composed of members descended from the women of all parts of our country.

I do not wish to vote to strike out the word "loyal," because I would regret to be put in the position of not being gratified to pay every tribute to the loyal women of the North. But, I think, the plan of the proposed building unhappy. If it was simply to dedicate something here to the loyal women of the North it would be all right, but to put into that building a great organization that has members from all sections and fasten upon it the stamp of disapproval of the women of a part of the country, I think such action inexcusable.

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

Mr. STONE. Let the question be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be stated again.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of so much of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York as is contained in the first paragraph of section 13, insert the following as that paragraph:

That the acquisition by the commission hereinafter mentioned of a site and the erection thereon of a memorial building in the District of Columbia to commemorate the services and sacrifices of the loyal women of the United States during the Civil War is hereby authorized. The said building shall be monumental in design and character and shall be used as the permanent headquarters of the American Red Cross, and shall cost, with the site, not less than \$700,000, which sum the United States shall contribute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon that substitute I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if his amendment proposes the elimination entirely of the proposed contribution by the Loyal Legion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I want it to go into the RECORD, because this question is so important I want to make the statement that if we are going to accept this gift from the Loyal Legion the word "loyal" should attach to it. If we are not going to accept it, then I think it should be to all the women. I do not believe that the Red Cross should be mixed up in a question that would involve sectional ideas. If it could be divorced from that I might not oppose it, but I must vote against the idea of getting a great universal organization of mercy mixed up in this way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It will only create a feeling in a section on account of the sectional idea. With that explanation of my vote the roll may be called, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Southern women are members of the Red Cross.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The roll will be called on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER], and I withhold my vote.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Again I announce the transfer of my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE], and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on the last vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I again announce my general pair and a transfer to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). Making the same announcement I have heretofore made in reference to the transfer of my pair, I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I transfer my general pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I really desired to refrain from voting, but as it may be necessary to make a quorum, I will vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—22.

Bankhead	Kern	Polindexter	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lea	Sheppard	Stone
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Shively	Swanson
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gore	Newlands	Smith, Ga.	
Jones	Pittman	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—28.

Bradley	Crawford	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.
Brady	Cummins	Page	Smoot
Brawdegee	Dillingham	Paynter	Sutherland
Bristow	Fall	Penrose	Thomas
Burnham	Gallinger	Percy	Townsend
Clapp	Kenyon	Perkins	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Root	Wetmore

NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Catron	Dixon	Hitchcock
Bacon	Chilton	du Pont	Jackson
Borah	Clarke, Ark.	Foster	Johnson, Me.
Bourne	Crane	Gamble	Johnston, Ala.
Briggs	Culbertson	Gardner	Kavanaugh
Brown	Cullom	Gronna	La Follette
Burton	Curtis	Guggenheim	Lippitt

McCumber	Overman	Simmons	Webb
McLean	Owen	Stephenson	Works
Myers	Pomerene	Thornton	
Nelson	Reed	Tillman	
Oliver	Richardson	Watson	

So Mr. WILLIAMS's amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is now on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR].

Mr. GORE. I only wish to say one word. The Red Cross is an international emblem and is an international organization. It ought not to be sectionalized, and it can not be sectionalized without jeopardizing its future and jeopardizing its efficiency. The Congress of the United States ought not to do anything which might jeopardize the interests of this humane and beneficent organization. The Loyal Legion has a right to commemorate the achievements of its soldiers and of its section, but it has no right to kidnap the Red Cross. We ought not here to-night to do anything which might set a wedge that would split this organization which has dispensed and which will dispense its blessings the world around. I hope that Senators will consent to strike from this amendment the language relating to the Red Cross and let the Loyal Legion, with devotion and patriotism, commemorate the achievements of the Union Army; let them celebrate the preservation of the Union; but let them not and let us not become accomplices in the performance of any deed which might impair an organization which is consecrated to humanity and to the noblest sentiments that actuate the heart of man. I therefore move to strike from this amendment the clause relating to the Red Cross.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to add just one word to what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] has said. I do not know what the effect of the adoption of this provision and the attempt to identify the Red Cross with one of the sections of the American Union may or may not be; I do not know what its effect upon southern women will be. I can only state that, if I were a southern woman, I would not remain a member of the Red Cross after it thus became a sectional association. I do not even know whether or not to-morrow, when I feel cooler about this matter than I do to-night, I would repeat that language, but that is the way I feel right now.

It seems to me that this is an unprovoked discrimination between the women of the sections of this country. I should have no objection, of course, to granting a site and voting aid for a monument to be erected by anybody in commemoration of American heroism on either side, although I remember that when I tried it upon the Senate in the name of the other side, I received the votes of the Senator from Iowa, of the Senator from Minnesota, and about three more north of the line, and that when I tried to get the yeas and nays I did not find a sufficient number to give them to me.

I am not complaining; but I do think the rule ought to work both ways, or not at all; and I do think that the motion made by the Senator from Oklahoma ought to be adopted. I see no reason why the Red Cross should be stigmatized—labeled—as a sectional organization. I am, I believe, one of the members of its board of directors, or whatever it may be called, but I do not see why you should take an organization, which is one of grace and mercy and sweetness, and try to make it yours any more than ours. I should feel that I was persona non grata in it. Every good deed that it does upon the battle field it does by the aid of southern women. Southern women are members of it; southern women go with the ambulances and with the nursing corps, and yet you want to put them in the attitude of being shamed and denationalized.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STONE. It is now half past 3 o'clock, in the "wee sma' hours," and soon the sun will begin to glow in the east. I think we might as well stay on now, and I wish to ask the Chair whether at this point a motion would be in order that, as soon as this bill is concluded, we proceed with unobjectioned bills on the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At the conclusion of the bill the Chair will recognize the Senator to make that motion.

Mr. STONE. I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] moves to amend the amendment by striking out all reference to the Red Cross.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GORE. I remember the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] moved to table this section, together with the amendment, as I understand, proposed by the Senator from Missis-

issippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I should like to know if this entire proposition is not on the table now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was laid on the table as in Committee of the Whole, but the amendment can be renewed in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR]. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. GORE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Renewing the announcement of the transfer of my pair made on the last vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. PERCY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON] and transfer it to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 30, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Bradley	Cummins	Page	Smoot
Brady	Dillingham	Paynter	Sutherland
Brandegee	Fall	Penrose	Townsend
Bristow	Gallinger	Perkins	Warren
Burnham	Kenyon	Pittman	Wetmore
Clapp	Lodge	Poindexter	Williams
Clark, Wyo.	Martine, N. J.	Root	
Crawford	Newlands	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—20.

Bankhead	Jones *	Percy	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Kern	Sheppard	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Lea	Shively	Stone
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Swanson
Gore	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	Thomas

NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Reed
Bacon	Curtis	Kavanaugh	Richardson
Borah	Dixon	La Follette	Simmons
Bourne	du Pont	Lippitt	Stephenson
Briggs	Foster	McCumber	Thornton
Brown	Gamble	McLean	Tillman
Burton	Gardner	Myers	Watson
Catron	Gronna	Nelson	Webb
Chilton	Guggenheim	Oliver	Works
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Overman	
Crane	Jackson	Owen	
Culberson	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	

So Mr. Roor's amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I desire to say in a word that I voted to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill when it was supposed that \$5,000,000 would be voted for the bridge across the Potomac River and before the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] was adopted. After the reduction of the amount to be available for that bridge and after the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana, I had determined to vote for this bill. I do not intend to do so now, but will not take up the time

of the Senate to explain why, beyond saying that it is simply because section 13 has been added to the bill.

Mr. BRISTOW. I desire to state that I had intended to vote against the bill but because of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], which takes from the bill the very objectionable features which it contained, I now expect to vote for it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I desire to say that it had been my purpose all along to vote for this bill, and this is all I have had to say on the subject; but in view of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR], which has been adopted by the Senate, I shall vote against the bill. I think it a most unfortunate thing to have brought a proposition of that kind into a measure of this character at this time, or even to have brought it here at all. It seems to me a great impertinence on the part of any organization in this country to come to the Congress of the United States and ask that the money of all the people of this country shall go to celebrate the fruits and the sacrifices of only a part of the people whom they name and whom they seek to distinguish and to set apart and specify as the only people worthy of commemoration.

I say not only that, but if that organization desire to build monuments or otherwise to commemorate people, let them proceed to do it in their own way and after their own manner; but I say it is not proper that they should come here and ask Congress to vote hundreds of thousands of dollars to help them carry on a work of sectionalism and of discrimination. I consider that the involving of that great philanthropic organization—the Red Cross—in a scheme or plan of that kind is unfair to it, and is a proposition which the Senate ought to reject, and which the Congress of the United States ought not for one moment to countenance.

Therefore I shall vote against the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when his name was called.) I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GARDNER], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. PERCY (when his name was called). I again transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). Again announcing the transfer of my pair, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (when his name was called). I again announce the transfer of my pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WEBB], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Under the same arrangement of transfer of pairs, I vote "yea."

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 35, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—35.

Bradley	Cummins	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Brady	Dillingham	Page	Smith, Mich.
Brandegee	Fall	Paynter	Smoot
Bristow	Gallinger	Penrose	Sutherland
Burnham	Jones	Perkins	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lea	Pittman	Townsend
Clapp	Lodge	Poindexter	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Martin, Va.	Root	Wetmore
Crawford	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	

NAYS—15.

Bankhead	Kenyon	Sheppard	Stone
Bryan	Kern	Shively	Thomas
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Gore	Percy	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—45.

Ashurst	Cullom	Johnston, Ala.	Reed
Bacon	Curtis	Kavanaugh	Richardson
Borah	Dixon	La Follette	Simmons
Bourne	du Pont	Lippitt	Stephenson
Briggs	Foster	McCumber	Thornton
Brown	Gamble	McLean	Tillman
Burton	Gardner	Myers	Watson
Catron	Gronna	Nelson	Webb
Chilton	Guggenheim	Oliver	Works
Clarke, Ark.	Hitchcock	Overman	
Crane	Jackson	Owen	
Culberson	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	

So the bill was passed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I move that we meet to-morrow at 12 o'clock instead of 10 o'clock.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That can not be done.
Mr. WARREN. A motion to amend a motion to adjourn can not be entertained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Utah, that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m., Thursday, February 27) the Senate adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, February 27, 1913.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 26, 1913.

CONSUL GENERAL.

James A. Smith, of Vermont, now consul general at Genoa, to be consul general of the United States of America at Calcutta, India.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. George M. Dunn, judge advocate, to be judge advocate with the rank of colonel, from February 20, 1913, vice Col. Harvey C. Carbaugh, retired from active service February 19, 1913.

Maj. Lewis E. Goodier, judge advocate, to be judge advocate with the rank of lieutenant colonel, from February 20, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. George M. Dunn, promoted.

Capt. Samuel T. Ansell, Infantry, unassigned, acting judge advocate, to be judge advocate, with rank of major from February 20, 1913, vice Maj. Lewis E. Goodier, promoted.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Edwin B. Babbitt, Ordnance Department, to be colonel from February 20, 1913, vice Col. Charles H. Clark, retired from active service February 19, 1913.

Maj. John W. Joyes, Ordnance Department, to be lieutenant colonel from February 20, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Edwin B. Babbitt, promoted.

CAVALRY ARM.

First Lieut. Frank T. McNarney, Twelfth Cavalry, to be captain from February 22, 1913, vice Capt. Philip W. Corbusier, Eighth Cavalry, detailed in the Quartermaster Corps on that date.

Second Lieut. George L. Converse, jr., Fourteenth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from February 22, 1913, vice First Lieut. Frank T. McNarney, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Cyril Arthur Winton Dawson, of Washington, to be second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from January 3, 1913.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Wythe M. Parks, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1913, with the officer next below him.

Capt. Frank H. Bailey, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1913, with the officer next below him.

Macdonough C. Merriman, a citizen of New York, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 21st day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Second Lieut. Joseph C. Fegan to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Charles P. Lynch, a citizen of Texas, to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy from the 19th day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Commander William H. G. Bullard to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1912, to fill a vacancy.

Commander Joseph W. Oman to be a captain in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander Percy N. Olmsted to be a commander in the Navy from the 16th day of January, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Commander John R. Brady to be a commander in the Navy from the 12th day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. Bayard T. Bulmer to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 16th day of January, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Richard R. Mann to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William C. I. Stiles to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 12th day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Aubrey W. Fitch to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 13th day of February, 1913, to fill a vacancy.

The following-named ensigns to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy from the 21st day of February, 1913, to fill vacancies:

Henry G. Taylor and

Gaylord Church.

Gunnery Joseph H. Aigner and Clarence D. Holland to be chief gunners in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1913, upon the completion of six years' service as gunners.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

James H. Bolton, of Iowa, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Sioux City, in the State of Iowa. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

John S. Johnson to be postmaster at Brantley, Ala. Office became presidential January 1, 1912.

Spencer J. McMorris to be postmaster at Wetumpka, Ala., in place of Spencer J. McMorris. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1912.

COLORADO.

George C. Reiley to be postmaster at Ordway, Colo., in place of Milton E. Bashor, resigned.

CONNECTICUT.

S. Augustus Coffey to be postmaster at Plainfield, Conn. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

FLORIDA.

Samuel J. Giles to be postmaster at Carrabelle, Fla., in place of Samuel J. Giles. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Charles N. Hildreth, jr., to be postmaster at Liveoak, Fla., in place of Charles N. Hildreth, jr. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

James A. Zipperer to be postmaster at Madison, Fla., in place of James A. Zipperer. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1913.

GEORGIA.

Mary A. Hale to be postmaster at Smithville, Ga. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Isaac T. Sellers to be postmaster at Cornelia, Ga., in place of Isaac T. Sellers. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

KANSAS.

Edwin J. Bookwalter to be postmaster at Halstead, Kans., in place of Edwin J. Bookwalter. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1913.

Gertrude Stevens to be postmaster at Goodland, Kans., in place of Gertrude Stevens. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

LOUISIANA.

Valry G. Ledoux to be postmaster at Lake Arthur, La., in place of Robert B. Johnson, resigned.

MARYLAND.

Leslie W. Gaver to be postmaster at Middletown, Md., in place of Leslie W. Gaver. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John W. Baldwin to be postmaster at North Wilbraham, Mass. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

MICHIGAN.

Charles H. Baird to be postmaster at Holly, Mich., in place of Charles H. Baird. Incumbent's commission expired April 24, 1912.

MISSISSIPPI.

Frank M. Elliott to be postmaster at Okolona, Miss., in place of Irene F. Elliott, deceased.

MISSOURI.

Willard A. Seymour to be postmaster at Sturgeon, Mo., in place of Willard A. Seymour. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1913.

MONTANA.

Edward B. Newhall to be postmaster at Big Sandy, Mont. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

NEBRASKA.

Anna Austin to be postmaster at Deshler, Nebr. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

NEW YORK.

Albert A. Boynton to be postmaster at Elizabethtown, N. Y., in place of Harry H. Nichols, deceased.

Peter Dahl to be postmaster at Tonawanda, N. Y., in place of Peter Dahl. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

John C. Jubin to be postmaster at Lake Placid Club, N. Y., in place of John C. Jubin. Incumbent's commission expired February 9, 1913.

Frantz Murray to be postmaster at Dolgeville, N. Y., in place of Frantz Murray. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1913.

James D. Read to be postmaster at Eden, N. Y. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Hiro J. Settle to be postmaster at Ballston Spa, N. Y., in place of Hiro J. Settle. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1913.

OHIO.

Zora Bennett to be postmaster at Middle Point, Ohio. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

Emma Jones to be postmaster at Shadyside, Ohio. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Theodore Totten to be postmaster at Findlay, Ohio, in place of Theodore Totten. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1913.

OKLAHOMA.

Benjamin G. Baker to be postmaster at Chattanooga, Okla., in place of Benjamin G. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1913.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry G. Moyer to be postmaster at Perkasié, Pa., in place of Henry G. Moyer. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

John W. Zerbe to be postmaster at Shamokin, Pa., in place of John W. Zerbe. Incumbent's commission expires March 1, 1913.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Allen T. Collins to be postmaster at Conway, S. C., in place of Allen T. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

John L. Dew to be postmaster at Latta, S. C., in place of John L. Dew. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1912.

J. E. Folger to be postmaster at Easley, S. C., in place of Alonzo T. Folger, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Gregory Smithberger to be postmaster at Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of Hiram A. Mason, resigned.

TEXAS.

Harry H. Cooper to be postmaster at Nacogdoches, Tex., in place of Harry H. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

Charles F. Darnall to be postmaster at Llano, Tex., in place of Charles F. Darnall. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Frank G. Goodridge to be postmaster at Robstown, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

Eve Wright Kennedy to be postmaster at Kirbyville, Tex., in place of Jasper C. Williamson, resigned.

Le Roy P. Loomis to be postmaster at Slaton, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1912.

Frederick Loudon to be postmaster at Fredericksburg, Tex., in place of Frederick Loudon. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Charles Real to be postmaster at Kerrville, Tex., in place of Charles Real. Incumbent's commission expired January 27, 1913.

William Reese to be postmaster at Floresville, Tex., in place of William Reese. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

Rudolph L. Reuser to be postmaster at Runge, Tex., in place of Rudolph L. Reuser. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1912.

VIRGINIA.

James Carter to be postmaster at Chatham, Va., in place of James Carter. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

Howard P. Dodge to be postmaster at Manassas, Va., in place of Howard P. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

John W. Gregg to be postmaster at Purcellville, Va., in place of John W. Gregg. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1913.

Harry A. Sager to be postmaster at Herndon, Va., in place of Harry A. Sager. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1912.

Bezer Snell to be postmaster at Brookneal, Va., in place of Bezer Snell. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1912.

WASHINGTON.

James R. O'Farrell to be postmaster at Orting, Wash., in place of James R. O'Farrell. Incumbent's commission expired February 11, 1913.

WISCONSIN.

Carrie E. MacLaughlin to be postmaster at Benton, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1913.

WITHDRAWALS.

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 26, 1913.

CONSULS GENERAL.

James A. Smith, of Vermont, to be consul general of the United States of America at Marseille, France.

Alphonse Gaulin, of Rhode Island, to be consul general of the United States of America at Calcutta, India.

POSTMASTERS.

MINNESOTA.

William Wichman to be postmaster at Morton, in the State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

Arthur W. Schmidt to be postmaster at Clayton, in the State of Missouri.

NEW YORK.

Gerow Van Wyck to be postmaster at Wallkill, in the State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Walter C. Brinson to be postmaster at Belhaven, in the State of North Carolina.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry B. Jacobs to be postmaster at White Haven, in the State of Pennsylvania.

TEXAS.

Henry Krabbenschmidt to be postmaster at Grand Prairie, in the State of Texas.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 26, 1913.

Irwin B. Laughlin to be secretary of the embassy at London, England.

INJUNCTION OF SECRECY REMOVED.

The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following:

An agreement signed on February 13, 1913, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States and the French Republic extending for a period of five years from February 27, 1913, the convention of arbitration of February 10, 1908, between the United States and the French Republic.

A convention between the United States and other powers, signed at Paris on January 17, 1913, modifying the International Sanitary Convention of December 3, 1903.

A treaty between the United States and Italy, signed on February 25, 1913, amending article 3 of the treaty of commerce and navigation of February 26, 1871, between the two countries.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 26, 1913.

The House met at 10.30 o'clock a. m.

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

Infinite spirit, Father almighty, maker of the heavens and the earth, we would pour out our hearts in love and gratitude for the faith which binds us to Thee. An inspiration in the struggle for existence, a potent factor in the civilization of the world, a shield against the temptations which assail, it purifies and ennobles, comforts and sustains us in sorrow, lights the dark valley.

Faith is the rainbow's form
Hung on the brow of heaven,
The glory of the passing storm,
The pledge of mercy given.

Increase and strengthen it in all our hearts that we may be true to Thee, to ourselves, and to our fellow men. In the spirit of Him who personified it in life and death. Amen.

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

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 28730) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the pension appropriation bill, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules, take from the Speaker's table the pension appropriation bill, with Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves to suspend the rules, take from the Speaker's table the pension appropriation bill, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second; and I also make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia demands a second and makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House. The motion was agreed to.