

By Mr. McHENRY: Petition of Grange No. 976, of Lincoln Falls, and Grange No. 128, of Orangeville, both in the State of Pennsylvania, for Senate bill 5842, relative to oleomargarine traffic; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of automobile drivers and manufacturers for House bill 5176, providing for Federal registration of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Illinois and Chicago Civil Service Reform Association, asking further extension of the civil-service law; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of business men of various cities and towns of the fourteenth congressional district of Illinois, protesting against the establishment of a local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MASSEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James I. Green; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for the relief of C. F. Rogers and Robert H. Massey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Melvin P. Long, Charles McVey, and Elijah W. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of business men of Newton, McPherson, Wichita, Rome, Mulvane, Iuka, Polwich, Hutchinson, Bentley, Oxford, Belle Plaine, Whitewater, Andale, Portland, Marquette, and Conway, all in the State of Kansas, against a local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HENRY W. PALMER: Petition of Joseph H. Glennon, of Pittston, Pa., for removal of duty on barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Oliver Ayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Walla Walla Trades and Labor Council, of Washington, regarding abandonment of Fort Walla Walla and disposal of the land; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Papers to accompany House bill increasing the pension of Emma H. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Calvin Hanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Memorial of Homer L. Boyle, suggesting methods of protecting the United States against loss of innumerable lives and vast amounts of money and property; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of numerous citizens of Texas, against the proposed rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Jamestown Ministerial Alliance, for the Burkett-Sims bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mansfield, Cattaraugus County, Pomona, and Rose Valley Granges, all of the State of New York, favoring a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Gaston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of State Military Board of New Jersey for House bill 28436, providing for pay for the organized militia; to the Committee on Militia.

Also, petition of K. Kwirjian, of Princeton, N. J., for House bill 5176, for Federal registration of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. DWIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum. The House was dividing when the point of no quorum was made on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill indicated. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Therefore, under the rule, the Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members; the Clerk will call the roll on the pending question, and as many as favor the motion will, as their names are called, answer "yea;" as many as oppose the motion will answer "nay;" those present and not voting will answer "present."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 0, answered "present" 8, not voting 152, as follows:

YEAS—227.

Adair	Dwight	James	Padgett
Alexander, Mo.	Elvins	Jamieson	Page
Allen	Englebright	Johnson, S. C.	Palmer, A. M.
Austin	Esch	Keifer	Parker
Barclay	Estopinal	Kendall	Parsons
Barnard	Fassett	Kennedy, Iowa	Pearre
Bartlett, Ga.	Finley	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Peters
Bates	Fish	Kitchin	Plumley
Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Knowland	Pratt
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Kopp	Pray
Bennet, N. Y.	Floyd, Ark.	Klistermann	Prince
Bennett, Ky.	Fordney	Langham	Rainey
Bingham	Fornes	Latfa	Randell, Tex.
Boehne	Foster, Ill.	Lawrence	Rauch
Booher	Foster, Vt.	Lee	Richardson
Boriand	Fuller	Legare	Roberts
Boutell	Gallagher	Rodenroot	Rodenberg
Brantley	Gardner, Mich.	Lever	Rothermel
Burgess	Gardner, N. J.	Lindbergh	Rucker, Colo.
Burke, S. Dak.	Garner, Tex.	Livingston	Scott
Burleigh	Garrett	Loud	Shackelford
Butler	Gillett	Loudenslager	Sheffield
Byrd	Goldfogle	McCall	Sheppard
Byrns	Good	McCreary	Sherwood
Calder	Graff	McDermott	Sims
Campbell	Graham, Ill.	McHenry	Sisson
Candler	Grant	McKinney	Slamp
Cary	Greene	McLachlan, Cal.	Smith, Iowa
Cassidy	Gregg	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sperry
Clark, Fla.	Guernsey	Macon	Stafford
Clayton	Hamer	Madden	Steenerson
Cline	Hamilton	Maguire, Nebr.	Stephens, Tex.
Cole	Hamlin	Malby	Sulloway
Collier	Hammond	Mann	Sulzer
Conry	Hanna	Martin, Colo.	Swasey
Covington	Hardy	Martin, S. Dak.	Taney
Cox, Ind.	Harrison	Massey	Taylor, Colo.
Cox, Ohio	Haugen	Mays	Taylor, Ohio
Craig	Hay	Miller, Kans.	Thistlewood
Crumacker	Hayes	Miller, Minn.	Thomas, Ky.
Cullop	Heald	Mitchell	Thomas, N. C.
Currier	Heflin	Moon, Tenn.	Thomas, Ohio
Dalzell	Helm	Morehead	Tilson
Davis	Henry, Tex.	Morgan, Mo.	Tou Velle
Dawson	Hill	Morgan, Okla.	Turnbull
Dent	Hitchcock	Morrison	Underwood
Denver	Hobson	Moss	Washburn
Dickinson	Hollingsworth	Moxley	Watkins
Diekema	Houston	Murphy	Weeks
Dies	Howell, Utah	Needham	Wickliffe
Dixon, Ind.	Howland	Neison	Willey
Dodds	Hubbard, Iowa	Nicholls	Wilson, Pa.
Douglas	Hughes, Ga.	Norris	Wood, N. J.
Draper	Hughes, N. J.	Nye	Woods, Iowa
Driscoll, M. E.	Hull, Iowa	Olcott	Young, N. Y.
Dupre	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	
	Humphrey, Wash.	Olmsted	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—8.

Adamson	Goulden	Howell, N. J.	Robinson
Godwin	Hardwick	Payne	Saunders

NOT VOTING—152.

Aiken	Coudrey	Graham, Pa.	Law
Alexander, N. Y.	Cowles	Griest	Lindsay
Ames	Creager	Gronna	Lively
Anderson	Crow	Hamill	Lloyd
Andrus	Davidson	Havens	Longworth
Ansberry	Denby	Hawley	Lowden
Anthony	Dickson, Miss.	Henry, Conn.	Lundin
Ashbrook	Driscoll, D. A.	Higgins	McCredie
Barchfeld	Durey	Hinshaw	McGuire, Okla.
Barnhart	Edwards, Ga.	Howard	McKinlay, Cal.
Bartholdt	Edwards, Ky.	Hubbard, W. Va.	McKinley, Ill.
Bartlett, Nev.	Ellerbe	Huff	McMorran
Bowers	Ellis	Hughes, W. Va.	Madison
Bradley	Fairchild	Humphreys, Miss.	Maynard
Broussard	Ferris	Johnson, Ky.	Millington
Burke, Pa.	Focht	Johnson, Ohio	Mondell
Burleson	Foelker	Jones	Moon, Pa.
Burnett	Foss	Joyce	Moore, Pa.
Calderhead	Fowler	Kahn	Moore, Tex.
Cantrill	Gaines	Kelher	Morse
Capron	Gardner, Mass.	Kennedy, Ohio	Mudd
Carlin	Garner, Pa.	Kinkead, N. J.	Murdock
Carter	Gill, Md.	Knapp	O'Connell
Chapman	Gill, Mo.	Korby	Palmer, H. W.
Clark, Mo.	Gillespie	Kronmiller	Patterson
Cocks, N. Y.	Glass	Lafean	Pickett
Cooper, Pa.	Goebel	Lamb	Polindexter
Cooper, Wis.	Gordon	Langley	Pou

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, January 7, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.  
Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.  
LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 29360, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The question was put.

Pujo	Sherley	Spight	Vreeland
Ransdell, La.	Simmons	Stanley	Wallace
Reeder	Slayden	Sterling	Wanger
Reid	Small	Stevens, Minn.	Webb
Reynolds	Smith, Cal.	Sturgiss	Weisse
Rhinock	Smith, Mich.	Talbott	Wheeler
Riordan	Smith, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.	Willett
Rucker, Mo.	Snapp	Tener	Wilson, Ill.
Sabath	Southwick	Townsend	Woodyard
Sharp	Sparkman	Volstead	Young, Mich.

The following pairs were announced:

For this session:

Mr. WANGER with Mr. ADAMSON.

Mr. BRADLEY with Mr. GOULDEN.

Mr. ANDRUS with Mr. RIORDAN.

Mr. AMES with Mr. AIKEN.

Until further notice:

Mr. CHAPMAN with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. CAPRON with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania with Mr. BARTLETT of Nevada.

Mr. BARCHFIELD with Mr. BARNHART.

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. ANSBERRY.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York with Mr. ANDERSON.

Mr. McMORRAN with Mr. PUJO.

Mr. CALDERHEAD with Mr. GORDON.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut with Mr. GODWIN.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. GLASS.

Mr. GRIEST with Mr. GILL of Missouri.

Mr. GOEBEL with Mr. GILL of Maryland.

Mr. ELLIS with Mr. ELLERBE.

Mr. DUREY with Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL.

Mr. DENBY with Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi.

Mr. DAVIDSON with Mr. CARTER.

Mr. COWLES with Mr. CARLIN.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio with Mr. WILLETT.

Mr. JOYCE with Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. KENNEDY of Ohio with Mr. JONES.

Mr. MCCREDIE with Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey.

Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. KELIHER.

Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. LLOYD.

Mr. LOWDEN with Mr. KORBLY.

Mr. MCKINLEY of Illinois with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MADISON with Mr. LEVELY.

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. MAYNARD.

Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania with Mr. MOORE of Texas.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. FAIRCHILD with Mr. POU.

Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. LAFEAN with Mr. SHARP.

Mr. MILLINGTON with Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. REYNOLDS with Mr. O'CONNELL.

Mr. COUDREY with Mr. SMITH of Texas.

Mr. LAW with Mr. SABATH.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. SMITH of Colorado with Mr. HAVENS.

Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. HARDWICK.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. PATTERSON.

Mr. SNAPP with Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana.

Mr. SOUTHWICK with Mr. REID.

Mr. STERLING with Mr. RHINOCK.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota with Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. TENER with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. VREELAND with Mr. SPARKMAN.

Mr. VOLSTEAD with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. STANLEY.

Mr. HIGGINS with Mr. TALBOTT.

Mr. HUFF with Mr. CANTRILL.

Mr. CREAGER with Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama.

Mr. MURDOCK with Mr. GILLESPIE.

Mr. KNAPP with Mr. SHERLEY.

Until Monday noon:

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. SMALL.

From December 10, 1910, to January 10, 1911:

Mr. GRONNA with Mr. FERRIS.

From December 20, 1910, until January 8, 1911:

Mr. BARTHOLDT with Mr. WEISSE.

From January 7 to January 9, noon:

Mr. PICKETT with Mr. ROBINSON.

Mr. PAYNE with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.

Mr. GAINES with Mr. RUCKER of Missouri.

From January 6 to January 7, inclusive:

Mr. HUBBARD of West Virginia with Mr. LAMB.

Balance of day:

Mr. YOUNG of Michigan with Mr. ASHBROOK.

The SPEAKER. On this question the yeas are 227; the nays are 0; present, 8; a quorum. The yeas have it. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. The House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CURRIER] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative appropriation bill (H. R. 29360), with Mr. CURRIER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose at its last sitting the pending question was on agreeing to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER]. If there be no objection, the Clerk will again report that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 122, lines 24 and 25, strike out "deputy commissioner, \$3,600," and insert in lieu thereof "two deputy commissioners, \$7,200."

The CHAIRMAN. On that question a division had been called for.

Mr. FULLER. I ask unanimous consent to change the form of the amendment to conform to a former appropriation bill, so that it shall read "first deputy commissioner, \$3,600; second deputy commissioner, \$3,600."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to withdraw his former amendment?

Mr. FULLER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to withdraw his former amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] now offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "deputy commissioner, \$3,600," and insert in lieu thereof "first deputy commissioner, \$3,600; second deputy commissioner, \$3,600."

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is precisely in accordance with former appropriation bills. In the present bill as reported there is an appropriation for only one of these deputy commissioners. There are two deputy commissioners provided for by the general law, a first deputy commissioner and a second deputy commissioner. The bill as reported provides for only one, without saying which one.

It seems to me it is not a good plan to dispense with the services of the Second Deputy Commissioner of Pensions. I have had considerable experience with that office, and I know how important that position is. During the month of December last, which had only 25 working days, in the office of the second deputy commissioner there were 970 cases examined and reported upon for Members of Congress and others. It is the most important office in the entire Bureau of Pensions, so far as getting necessary work done that Congressmen are called upon to look after in pension matters. Every gentleman in this House who has had business to transact in that office will agree with me. At the time that office was created there were only 441 employees in the Pension Bureau. There were then added 141 clerks and employees, making a total of 582. Additions have been made since then, so that now there are 1,222 employees, and there is ample work, so that the office of second deputy commissioner is important and necessary. So long as the law provides for that position, I think we ought to appropriate the salary, and not endeavor to legislate a faithful officer out of office by the simple process of failing to appropriate for his salary.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Invalid Pensions, by a unanimous report, have caused to be placed upon the calendar of this House a bill which we are going to pass and which will very largely increase the work of the Bureau of Pensions for the next year or two and make this office still more important than it has been in the past. I think there should be no objection whatever to this amendment and to the appropriation as provided for by it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FULLER. I will.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does this appropriation bill provide for doing away with the position which he refers to as the second deputy?

Mr. FULLER. It does not. It simply appropriates for one Deputy Commissioner of Pensions, without saying which one.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Has the gentleman any impression as to which one of the present deputies will be let out in case the bill is left in the form in which it was reported by the committee?

Mr. FULLER. Very naturally it would be the second deputy. That is all I know about it; I do not know how that matter will be determined.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Why does the gentleman say that very naturally it would be the second deputy? As I understand, the present law provides for two deputies.

Mr. FULLER. It does.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. My information is that the second deputy, if you call it that, has all that he can do at the present time.

Mr. FULLER. That is true.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And if the services of a deputy are to be dispensed with, it would be the first deputy rather than the second.

Mr. FULLER. My judgment is that neither should be dispensed with at this time.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The argument of the gentleman is both of these officials should be continued?

Mr. FULLER. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The argument of the gentleman would indicate that it was the second deputy that he is concerned about.

Mr. FULLER. Naturally, because I assume that he would be the one that would be dropped.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted. This illustrates the difficulty of economizing in any branch of the Government. The department and the Commissioner of Pensions assured us that one deputy commissioner could do all of the work that was required in the department.

Now, I have not a word to say against the official referred to by the gentleman from Illinois. He comes from the State of Illinois, and I do not criticize the gentleman from that State in his desire to keep him in office. But we can never economize, we can never cut down the force of the Government, if the friends of the person who is to be displaced are going to try and keep him there, when we are assured by the department that his services are no longer necessary. This is certainly that case.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the commissioner have the power to name either one of the deputies under the law?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly, and I do not know which he intends to drop or reappoint. I know nothing about the individuality in the case. I simply know the committee was assured by the Secretary and the commissioner that only one deputy was necessary. In accordance with that recommendation we have put in an appropriation for only one deputy, and I trust the amendment will not be adopted. The gentleman is unwilling that the person whom he considers so efficient—and I do not doubt his efficiency—should lose his place under the Government—a place which, I understand, is not at all necessary for his personal comfort and support. I think it would be very unfortunate if in that way the economy of the administration should be blocked.

Mr. FULLER. The gentleman says he knows nothing about the individuality of the case. Does not he assume that it would be the second deputy that would be dropped?

Mr. GILLETT. I have no understanding, except from the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not the elimination of one of these deputy commissioners will in any way interfere with the speedy conduct of the work in the bureau.

Mr. GILLETT. We are assured that it will not at all; that one deputy will adequately perform the duties of the office, and that the administration of the office will not at all suffer by dropping him.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the present appropriation reads:

For Commissioner of Pensions, \$5,000; first deputy commissioner, \$3,600; second deputy commissioner, \$3,600.

I have a great deal of business with that department, as I have a great many pensioners in my district. I have never found the second deputy commissioner when he was not immersed in business, and if that second deputy commissioner

was ever needed it seems to me he is still needed. I can not go into the statistics or details, but I have listened to the figures read by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER], and my experience in calling at that office entirely accords with the figures read by him. If the office was ever needed I do not understand why it is not still needed, and it seems to me that the amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois ought to prevail. I certainly hope that it will.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, before the holidays this question was considered by the committee and decided, but apparently nothing is ever decided in this House which purports to effect some economy in the public service. I doubt if I know either of the Deputy Commissioners of Pensions. It is immaterial who the particular individual may be who is affected by this reform. The committee has been assured that one deputy commissioner is unnecessary; that the public business can be transacted just as effectively without this official. In an attempt to reduce the expenditures of the Government and to effect some reform and economy the department recommends that one of these deputies be dropped. As soon as that state of affairs is presented to this House, gentlemen with no knowledge whatever of what has taken place in the committee, but knowing something of the efficient manner in which some individual has discharged the duties of an office when it was necessary, protest against any action which would ever separate him from the Government pay roll.

It is a notorious fact that this Government has a large number of officials upon the pay roll who are absolutely unnecessary—put there because of peculiar political conditions which have made it necessary, at one time or another, to take care of some good, faithful worker in the public weal. Now, a change is coming over things. Many of these faithful public servants will be compelled to retire to private life and to earn a living like the great majority of the people of the United States. Perhaps it may be that instead of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] being alarmed about some particular individual, he should be perfectly content with what is happening, because if the individual he has in mind is so efficient, I have no doubt that he is the individual who will be retained, and that the other deputy commissioner, about whom nothing has been said and who apparently has no friends whatever, will be the man whom the fates will decree must go out of the service. But at all events, so far as this side of the House is concerned, I should regret that anything be done by us which would in the slightest degree discourage this administration from dispensing with useless public officials. That work must be commenced very shortly, and if anything will accelerate the procession and will help do some of the important and necessary work that must be done, we should be grateful to the administration for what it will do.

Mr. Chairman, the statement has been emphasized that an official is unnecessary. This administration is not going to recommend that the services of any official be dispensed with who could be utilized in any way whatever, but it seems that the work of this office has got to such a point that it is utterly impossible to find anything for this official to do. We should accommodate the administration and dispense with the services of whoever may be unnecessary.

Mr. FULLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Certainly.

Mr. FULLER. Does it look as if the office were unnecessary when the figures show that there were handled and examined in that room the files in 970 cases during the last month, and reports made upon those cases from that room?

Mr. FITZGERALD. O, Mr. Chairman, that work is done by a \$1,200 clerk. The deputy commissioners have no more to do with it than I have. They are accommodating gentlemen, genial, pleasant, they treat Members of Congress with great courtesy, and they make some gentlemen feel as if they really were great men when they visit the office. Gentlemen could transact their business more speedily and with less waste of time if they did business with the man who actually does the work. The best way to promote efficiency in the service is to dispense with the services of those who are no longer necessary.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make an observation upon this subject. Since I have been a Member of the House I have heard Members contend that whenever the departments recommended either the increase of a salary or the employment of an additional clerk, the departments ought to know more about the matter than a Member upon the floor who had no personal knowledge of it whatever. They have contended that ever since I have been here, and now when this department is attempting to reorganize its force, so as to curtail expenses, and recommend that we dispense with an employee who is receiving a good round sum and for whom they have no further use, we

find Members contending that the department does not know what it is talking about.

If the argument that a department knows what it is talking about when it says that it needs an additional employee is correct, why, in the name of reason, is it not just as logical that a department should know what it wanted and needed when it said it had an official connected with its service whose services were no longer needed, and hence asks the Congress to retire that official to private life? I do not know either of these commissioners; I do not know personally a single employee in the Pension Bureau, and hence I can have no personal interest in it one way or the other. The only way I see is that we are charged with the duty of retrenchment if retrenchment can be made; we are charged with that duty by the people who send us here; and when we have an opportunity to do it without blocking the service, or materially interfering with it, we are only discharging a duty we owe to those who elected us when we curtail the expenses of the Government when such a thing can be done without hindering its proper administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced the yeas appeared to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. FULLER) there were—ayes 19, yeas 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional force of 45 special examiners for one year, at \$1,300 each, \$58,500, and no person so appointed shall be employed in the State from which he is appointed; and any of those now employed in the Pension Office or as special examiners may be reappointed if they be found to be qualified.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill what is the necessity for this addition of 45 special examiners for one year.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, somebody was talking to me at the moment, and I do not know to what section the gentleman refers.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The paragraph reads as follows:

For an additional force of 45 special examiners for one year, at \$1,300 each, \$58,500, and no person so appointed shall be employed in the State from which he is appointed, etc.

What is the necessity for this?

Mr. GILLETT. That is not anything new. What is new is a reduction. We have reduced the force 25 this year. It is gradually diminishing every year.

Mr. COX of Indiana. And later on the elimination will be complete.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It was 70 last year.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Education: Commissioner of Education, \$5,000; chief clerk, \$2,000; specialist in higher education, specialist in rural education, specialist in school hygiene, at \$3,000 each; editor, \$2,000; statistician, \$1,800; specialist in charge of land-grant college statistics, \$1,800; translator, \$1,800; collector and compiler of statistics, \$2,400; specialist in foreign educational systems, \$1,800; specialist in educational systems, \$1,800; 2 clerks of class 4; 3 clerks of class 3; 4 clerks of class 2; 8 clerks of class 1; 7 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 6 copyists; 2 copyists, at \$800 each; copyist, \$720; 2 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; messenger; assistant messenger; 3 laborers, at \$480 each; laborer, \$400; in all, \$72,800.

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas will be first recognized on the point of order.

Mr. MACON. I reserve the point of order against the language to be found in lines 11 and 12, "specialist in rural education, specialist in school hygiene, at \$3,000 each."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the entire paragraph.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not maintain that it is not subject to the point of order. The gentleman has reserved the point of order, and therefore I will explain to him the reasons the committee put in the two specialists to which he objects, one the specialist in rural education and the other in school hygiene. The Commissioner of Education satisfied a majority of the committee that to employ two men who knew thoroughly the subjects for which they were to be employed

would be a great advantage to the rural education and the school hygiene of the whole country. The purpose is to have two men who would keep abreast with all that was done in Europe and in this country in these directions, and then when a superintendent of any State or of any town or city in the country wanted to know what was being done and what were the best methods in rural education or in school hygiene, here would be a central authority to which they could appeal and find out. It seems to me it would be of great advantage to every State in the Union to have in Washington a central clearinghouse for such information as that, so that when such information was desired it could at once appeal here and obtain it. As it is now, different States are all the time making investigations along these lines, but there is no central place from which one State can find out what is being done in another State or abroad, and consequently the very best methods may be unknown to some States or counties or towns who are earnestly struggling to do the best they can along these lines, and it seems to me it is a very useful and valuable purpose.

Mr. PARSONS. Did not the State superintendent of public instruction in the State of Arkansas recommend a much larger appropriation than that which was recommended by the committee?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not remember that. It may be so.

Mr. PARSONS. I have it here, if the gentleman will allow me to read it.

Mr. GILLETT. I will yield the floor.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield to one question before he takes his seat?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I would like to ask whether this is not the first time that any attention has ever been paid to looking after the country schools, so far as education is concerned.

Mr. TAWNEY. Not at all. All of the appropriations of the Bureau of Education work along those lines.

Mr. GILLETT. I understood him to ask particularly as to rural education and school hygiene.

Mr. COX of Indiana. In the same item that was appropriated last year, was any part of it expended with a view of looking after the interests of the rural schools?

Mr. GILLETT. As I understand, in the past the general subject of education in the country at large has occupied them, and, I presume, under that some time has been devoted to the public schools, but they have not had any specialists in that particular line, and so it could not be studied as it could under this item.

Mr. COX of Indiana. This is the first time that a specialist has been assigned to this kind of work.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let me suggest to my colleague that we have specialists in higher education, and that money and time and attention has gone in that direction, and not for the country schools.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. The point of order of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] is made against the two additional specialists—one for rural education and one for school hygiene?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Personally I am in sympathy with the committee in recommending these two additional specialists. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not true that the committee, in providing for these two additional specialists, has materially reduced the estimates made for the support of the Bureau of Education.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes; 10 specialists were recommended, and the committee compromised upon two; and inasmuch as it was a compromise on behalf of the committee, I shall feel bound to stand by the compromise, although I will say individually I should have been glad to go further.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. The Bureau of Education asked for 10 specialists?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. And the committee compromised on two specialists?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. And I understand the gentleman to say it is against the two specialists—one on rural education and one on hygiene—the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] makes the point of order?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I think the scope of the Bureau of Education ought to be enlarged, not only by the addition of these two specialists for rural education and school

hygiene, but also it ought to be enlarged by additional specialists for other purposes.

Mr. GILLETT. I agree with the gentleman personally, but I feel bound by the decision of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I hope the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] will withdraw his point of order as to these two specialists, by all means. I think the committee has been quite economical on so important a matter as public education.

Mr. GILLETT. I hope that the gentleman will persuade him to do so.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I will try to do so. The president of the University of North Carolina has written me on this subject, as well as other prominent educators in my own State, and the people of the whole country are interested in the enlargement of the scope of the Bureau of Education when it can be consistently done within the authority of the Federal Government.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS], in the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], a question?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that these letters were written at the request of anybody, or written spontaneously? Did they all think of this at once?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I think they were spontaneous, due to the interest of the writers in public education.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not think that they were suggested by the Commissioner of Education in any way?

Mr. GILLETT. I would like to answer that. I think they were not suggested by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. MANN. Well, the National Education Association that has been working on this line.

Mr. GILLETT. I do not believe that the Commissioner of Education has done the slightest thing in instigating any popular movement upon this matter.

Mr. MANN. Evidently, then, he is not very strongly in favor of it.

Mr. GILLETT. On the contrary, he is.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, if I may be recognized in my own time, a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I notice that one of these two specialists is to be a specialist in school hygiene. Just what are supposed to be the functions of that office?

Mr. GILLETT. The construction of buildings, the observation of the children, in order that their health may be preserved and bettered. The gentleman, of course, knows that ventilation is one of the very important things for the health of children; that the open-air treatment is now receiving much attention. I do not know all the details on the several lines in which this specialist is to be engaged.

Mr. MANN. I assumed it was for the purpose of affecting the health of the children.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Covered with that question of hygiene is the water used at the schools and colleges of this country. We have hundreds and hundreds of pupils in the schools of the country that are suffering from typhoid fever on account of the bad quality of water supplied.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the President in his last annual message made this statement:

In my message of last year I recommended the creation of a bureau of health, in which should be embraced all those Government agencies outside of the War and Navy Departments which are now directed toward the preservation of public health or exercise functions germane to that subject.

We have pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a number of bills in reference to this matter. Yet in the face of this recommendation, apparently looking toward consolidating the health activities of the Government in one bureau or department, is a proposition to create another division, in another department of the Government, to consider health activities. The Public Health Service is now studying the subject with intelligence and with research; but here is a proposition to put in the office of the Commissioner of Education a health man, to advise in reference to the health of children everywhere, a duplication of work, instead of following the recommendations of the President, which were at considerable length in his message last year and reiterated this year, of consolidating in that way. The proposition is now made to divide the public-health responsibilities and activities of the Government, and add a division to study the same question already covered in other branches of the Government.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly. I always yield to my friend.

Mr. COX of Indiana. It is for the purpose of obtaining information which is very vital to me. I do not understand the theory or plan they propose to work by this recommendation. As to whether or not they propose to evolve some plan whereby the Federal Government and the authorities of various States will work in cooperation under the two heads provided for in this paragraph. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether this specialist is to be an architect, a doctor, a physician, or a surgeon, or whether he is to be a school-teacher or what he is to be. It is very evident that the purpose of this is to combine the wisdom of the architect, the physician, the school-teacher, and various other lines of wisdom in one person.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. He is to be a man of good common sense. That is all we want.

Mr. MANN. There are a lot of men of good common sense inside the schools of the country.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Well, not many of them.

Mr. MANN. Well, I hope there will not be any less from Georgia than there is in this House; but I know we lose one man of good common sense from that State. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman allow me to answer the gentleman from Indiana? I think it is intended in the first provision that there should be a man who is posted in what has been done and is being done along these lines, so that the very best results of experience will be at hand for those who wish it; so that the Federal Government should be a reservoir of knowledge of what is being done from which the various States could draw.

Mr. COX of Indiana. In other words, the Federal Government is to collect this data or information.

Mr. GILLETT. That is it.

Mr. COX of Indiana. And then distribute it out to and among the several States.

Mr. GILLETT. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I do not withdraw it.

Mr. PARSONS. I wish to be heard on the point of order, if the gentleman makes it.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order, if the gentleman wants to be heard.

Mr. PARSONS. But I wish to be heard on the point of order, if the gentleman from Illinois makes it.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, on the words on page 127—

Specialist in higher education, specialist in rural education, specialist in school hygiene, at \$3,000—

not being warranted by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PARSONS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. PARSONS. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to paragraph 3615, in volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents, page 410. That paragraph says:

A department being created for the declared purpose of investigation, an appropriation for the instrumentalities of such investigation was held to be within the rule. On February 14, 1901, the sundry civil appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the Clerk had read the following paragraph relating to the work of the Fish Commission:

"Employees at large: Two field-station superintendents, at \$1,800 each; 2 fish culturists, at \$900 each; 2 fish culturists, at \$900 each; 5 machinists, at \$960 each; 2 coxswains, at \$720 each; in all, \$13,560."

Mr. OLMSTED made a point of order that the appropriations proposed were not authorized by law, and the Chair held—

That they were in order. I will not read that part of it, but wish to call the attention of the Chair now to section 516 of the Revised Statutes, which is the section that establishes the Office of Education. It says:

There shall be in the Department of the Interior a bureau called the Office of Education, the purpose and duties of which shall be to collect statistics and facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and to diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

My point is, therefore, that these specialists are directly within the purview of the object of the Bureau of Education, and that section 3615 of Hinds' Precedents is authority for overruling the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the general authority which the gentleman from New York refers to might be a sufficient authority to warrant an appropriation of a certain sum of money for that purpose; but under the precedents, as I understand them, it is not sufficient to provide for a specific office, which is quite a different proposition. If the Commissioner of Education had the authority to make these investigations under the law, with a certain amount of money appropriated, this would be a limitation on his authority by prescribing through what officers he should make the investigation, and in that respect would be a change of existing law, or an appropriation for an office not warranted by law.

Mr. PARSONS. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in that section 3,615 specific offices were allowed for.

Mr. MANN. As I understand also, this is for an appropriation for the office of the Commissioner of Education in the District of Columbia. My recollection is that there is a statute which forbids an appropriation for an office at the seat of government unless it has been authorized by law. The Chair will remember that a few years ago this matter was very carefully examined and determined by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole at that time on this precise bill, the legislative bill. That was a case where the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] made points of order against the various items in the bill. The ruling was that where they were not authorized by law they were subject to a point of order, that although the statute might warrant an appropriation for certain purposes, it did not warrant the creation of the particular offices as proposed in the bill. In that case, as the Chair will recall, it became necessary for the House to adopt a special rule making these offices in this bill in order before the bill could be passed.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Will the Chair hear me for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear from the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that this paragraph provides for any additional offices. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] keeps repeating that, and refers to some former ruling of the Chair with reference to the creation of additional offices. This is simply enlarging the scope, authorized by the organic act, of the Bureau of Education, providing for additional agencies, but not providing for new offices.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman point out any provision authorizing the employment of these officers, except the general organic act?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. No, sir; the point I make is that the addition of these specialists for rural education and for hygiene simply adds additional agencies to the Bureau of Education greatly desired by all educators of the country. It is simply adding additional agencies to carry out the original purpose of the Bureau of Education, as stated in the hearings. The purpose of the bureau is the collection and diffusion of accurate information which will aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of an efficient school system. Now we are providing for additional force for carrying out the work contemplated in the organic act.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman if he has any authority for the claim that these particular officers are provided by any existing law?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I do not regard them as officers; I look upon them as agencies—

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman does not regard them as officers, what is a specialist of higher education? Does not that mean an official? What is a specialist, a man or a cow?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. He is an agency of the Bureau of Education for the purpose of carrying out the work of the Bureau of Education.

Mr. MANN. Is not this a salary, and does it not mean that an individual is to receive a salary as an officer of the Government? Is not that the meaning of this language? Would the department have the authority to expend the money except by paying it to an individual?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. The point I am making, as the gentleman understands, is that the original purpose of this bureau was to collect and diffuse accurate information. Now, in the course of time it has become apparent that additional agencies, additional specialists, are needed to collect the information on these two subjects, namely, rural education and school hygiene, and it is proposed by this bill to add these two specialists to the work contemplated originally by the Bureau of Education. It is simply enlarging the scope of the work of the bureau.

Mr. MANN. If that be true, and the gentleman from North Carolina and others thought that it needed not only one specialist, but a hundred thousand, in the different branches of the service, then it would be in order to offer an amendment to provide for a hundred thousand new officers, each by name.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. It would be within the power of Congress.

Mr. MANN. But would it be within the power under the rules, and not subject to a point of order? That is the question.

Mr. MACON. If the gentleman from Illinois will allow me, in reply to the gentleman from North Carolina, I will say that the President of the United States is simply an agency for carrying on the administration of the affairs of the Government. If the committee could do as is claimed by the gentleman from North Carolina, it could select several more Presidents as agencies of the Government, because they were thought to be necessary by some one in order to carry on the administration of the affairs of the Government.

Mr. MANN. The President of the United States is warranted by the Constitution, and not by mere act of Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Can not you make additional clerks in any department of the Government?

Mr. MACON. You can not create additional offices on an appropriation bill without their being subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. If the precedents cited by the gentleman from New York were to be followed, and had been generally followed, the Chair would be constrained to overrule the point of order; but the Chair does not understand that that ruling has been followed in subsequent rulings or was consistent with rulings made before that time.

On February 28, 1898, the gentleman from New York, Mr. PAYNE, being Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the sundry civil bill being under consideration, a section was reached making an appropriation of \$100,000 for the participation of the United States in the Paris Exposition. This section provided also for the appointment of a commissioner general and other officials, with specified duties and salaries; authorized certain heads of departments to prepare exhibits under certain conditions and regulations, and so forth.

A point of order was made that this was legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair ruled:

The Chair thinks the act of 1897 is sufficient foundation for an appropriation, but not for legislation. The Chair is unable to see wherein it authorizes the office of commissioner general or assistant commissioner, from the reading of the law by the gentleman from Illinois. The rule in regard to the continuation of public works simply authorizes an appropriation in the continuance of public works and not the appointment of officers. \* \* \* The rule would simply authorize an appropriation, but would not authorize legislation upon the subject in a general appropriation bill. There are in this paragraph several clauses which are distinctly new legislation, and if in a paragraph any clause or provision is out of order, the point of order against the whole paragraph must be sustained.

On February 25, 1909, when the sundry civil bill was under consideration, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Watson, being Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, ruled as follows:

The authorization of a Government establishment without legislation establishing offices and salaries does not authorize specific appropriations for such salaries, even although a lump sum might be appropriated to carry out the work.

The Chair thinks it is conceded that the language to which the point of order is directed does create new offices, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 128, by inserting after line 3 the following:

"To enable the Commissioner of Education to carry out the purpose and duties of the Bureau of Education, to collect statistics and facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and to diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems, and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country by the employment of specialists in higher education, school administration, education for housekeeping, school architecture, rural education, school hygiene, accounting and statistics, commercial education, secondary education, and a wider use of the school plant, together with clerks and other expenses necessary therefor, \$50,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PARSONS. I do. The amendment as now drawn in the first part of it recites the language of section 516 of the Revised Statutes. It does not establish any offices at all, but it enables the Commissioner of Education by the employment of

specialists to do the things that section 516 of the Statutes says the Bureau of Education shall do. No amount of any salary is fixed—simply a lump sum of \$50,000 is appropriated.

Mr. MANN. Eighty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. PARSONS. No; \$50,000. The estimate submitted by the Commissioner of Education provided for an appropriation of \$75,000, to include all these experts, and I have added in the specialist in higher education, as was provided for last year. That estimate of the commissioner, despite the general pruning of estimates made by the administration, was approved by the Secretary of the Interior, was approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, and was forwarded to Congress as an estimate of the administration. Presumably it had the indorsement of the President, because he had been trying to cut down, and despite his desire to cut down he allowed estimates to be made for all these specialists. The committee, however, included only the specialist in higher education which was in the bill last year, and then two of the 10 new ones. The two they included were the specialist in rural education and the specialist in school hygiene. The eight specialists they did not include were in school administration, industrial education, education for housekeeping, statistics and accounting, school architecture, commercial education, secondary education, and wider use of school plants. At present we have no specialists, no men in the employ of the Bureau of Education who are specialists on those subjects, nor has the Bureau of Education any money that it can use to secure the services of specialists in such matters.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. PARSONS. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Has the absence of such specialists interfered in any way with the educational progress of the country?

Mr. PARSONS. It has very seriously, and if the point of order is not overruled I will point it out, I believe, to the satisfaction of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Chairman, referring to the point of order, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to paragraph 3649, volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents, which, I think, in principle sustains this amendment as in order. That was a case under the agricultural appropriation bill. The headnote says:

Because of the requirements of law appropriations for investigations on subjects connected with agriculture are generally in order on an appropriation bill.

I will not read—

The CHAIRMAN. What is the number of the paragraph?

Mr. PARSONS. Thirty-six hundred and forty-nine, page 430. There are other specialists in this paragraph that we have appropriated for in the past that would not be in order unless they were authorized by the section of the Revised Statutes to which I have referred. They are to be found in lines 18 and 19, page 127—specialist in foreign educational system, specialist in educational systems. The latter refers to State educational systems.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PARSONS. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman think it is the part of wisdom and propriety on the part of the Federal Government to interfere with the educational affairs of the States, counties, and towns in any way?

Mr. PARSONS. Under the amendment which I propose the Federal Government will not interfere one iota.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Well, if it will not, what is the purpose of this amendment for the purpose of gathering data and statistics?

Mr. PARSONS. The purpose of this amendment is this: Suppose some people connected with the schools in the gentleman's own State of Indiana wish to get information on the subjects which are mentioned here and subjects for which specialists are to be employed, where are they going to secure such information?

Mr. COX of Indiana. Do it themselves.

Mr. PARSONS. Where will they find the information?

Mr. COX of Indiana. In the same way the Government does; go out and find it.

Mr. PARSONS. But the Government does not now go out and find it, and the people in the gentleman's own State have not the time or the money. Moreover, the general proposition is uneconomical on its face, because it would still require each one of the States to do for itself what the Federal Government can do once for all of the States.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Well, I take it that information can be gathered without sending men all over the United States to do it; certainly it could be obtained by correspondence.

Mr. PARSONS. It can not be done completely by correspondence—

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from New York will permit—

Mr. PARSONS. I have the floor.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will just permit me a moment, I will say that this work has heretofore been performed by the National Educational Association, an organization created by act of Congress. Now, as far as possible, it is the purpose to transfer the function of the National Educational Association to the Government of the United States.

Mr. PARSONS. With all due respect to what the gentleman from Minnesota says, anyone who has looked into this matter at all knows that it is impossible, with the limited amount at the disposal of the National Educational Association and the limited time that the members of that association have, in view of their other duties, that it should do the work that ought to be done—

Mr. TAWNEY. But, if the gentleman will permit me, I perhaps know more about the work of the National Educational Association than he does. The secretary of that association is a citizen of my home city and has served in that capacity for 20 or 25 years. I know that the association has had and has been conducting investigations along all of these lines.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Without any aid from the Federal Government?

Mr. TAWNEY. Without any aid from the Federal Government. They have a large fund. It is true their revenues during the past few years are not quite as large as formerly, but these investigations have been made, and that is the chief function of the National Educational Association. And I want to say another thing.

Mr. PARSONS. Will you please give me the name of the secretary? Is it Mr. Adee?

Mr. TAWNEY. It is not Mr. Adee. It is Dr. Irwin Shepard, of the city of Winona. I will say that he came to my office with the best of intentions and urged me to support this appropriation, and explained fully what the situation was and what the Educational Association has been doing in the past along these very lines; and I know, further, that there are eminent professors in some of our large colleges in the United States who have made investigations of these various subjects and have prepared papers, and of course if they can sell their information to the Government of the United States and then have it published in the form of a bulletin, it is to their advantage to have Congress make this appropriation.

Mr. PARSONS. Nobody knows that they prepared the information.

Mr. TAWNEY. I can cite one. In Pennsylvania College a gentleman there has, I doubt not, made a very valuable and important investigation.

Mr. PARSONS. On what?

Mr. TAWNEY. On the effects of light on the eyes of children in schools.

Mr. PARSONS. That would come under the data—

Mr. TAWNEY. That investigation was made by him during his services as a representative of a State institution.

Mr. PARSONS. The feature which the gentleman now refers to is a matter that comes under the head of school hygiene, which is one of the subjects for which the gentleman's committee voted an appropriation, but it covers but one of the many subjects that school hygiene has to deal with, and it does not cover any of the subjects or matters which these other nine specialists would have to deal with.

Now, I want to say that the National Educational Association wants this appropriation; the State superintendents of instruction want it; the city superintendents of instruction want it, and I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as an appendix to my remarks extracts from letters written by many of them and by college presidents, and so on, in behalf of an appropriation, not of \$50,000, as my amendment calls for, but of \$75,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to insert the matter to which he has referred in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair rules I would like to say a word.

Mr. PARSONS. On the point of order?

Mr. MANN. On anything that I please to discuss.

Mr. PARSONS. I wish to say something more on this subject, but it depends in a way upon what the decision on the point of order is.

Mr. MANN. I will reserve it for a moment in order that the gentleman may discuss what he wishes to discuss.

Mr. PARSONS. I have called attention to the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman wish to discuss its merits?

Mr. PARSONS. I do.

Mr. MANN. Then I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. PARSONS. I will be very glad if the gentleman will do so.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman must know what the ruling of the Chair will be.

Mr. PARSONS. I think I do, inasmuch as I have examined the precedents myself.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman does not want me to reserve it, I will not do so.

Mr. PARSONS. If the gentleman will reserve it, please—

Mr. MANN. I will reserve the point of order.

#### STATE SOVEREIGNTY OVER EDUCATION.

Mr. PARSONS. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the situation we have here. Under our form of government the control of the system of education is absolute with each State. That is a great advantage in some ways. It allows each State to follow out the lines that it thinks are best, and it gives us a great variety of experience. But the experience of one State ought to be available to another State, and to make it available to another State should be one of the functions and, under the Revised Statutes, in my opinion, is one of the functions of the Bureau of Education. All that this amendment that I have offered would accomplish would be to put at the disposal of educators the country over the experience that each State has and that each city has. And in this connection I will say that what led partly to this recommendation was that when educators the country over could not find out, and could not get information on these subjects from the Government or from their own States, they wrote to the great private educational foundations that have been made and asked them to furnish the information. But they did not have it. So many letters on these subjects were received that they called the matter to the attention of the Bureau of Education, and emphasized in that way the need of this information.

#### FOREIGN SYSTEMS.

Now, in all foreign countries the system of education is somewhat centralized. That has disadvantages, because there is no chance for variety of experience. It also has advantages, however, in that the poorest rural school has the advice of the most trained expert in the service of the country. Now, we, without burdening our school systems by making them too uniform, which is the complaint against some of the foreign systems, can render available to our different States this information by allowing the employment of specialists who will have special knowledge on these things.

#### OBJECT—CENTRAL BUREAU OF INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE.

The general object, then, of the employment of these specialists is to make the bureau a bureau of centralized information and assistance to the different States, cities, and school districts. That was the object of the establishment of the bureau, for section 516 of the Revised Statutes says:

Its purpose and duties shall be to collect statistics and facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories and to diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

Very comprehensive purposes and duties.

To enable the bureau to fulfill these functions, we have already authorized specialists in land-grant college statistics, foreign educational systems, and State educational systems, and last year we added one in higher education, which means colleges and universities. None of these specialists will lead to control by the Federal Government or to appropriation by the Federal Government. They simply mean that the Bureau of Education is by use of them better enabled to perform the work for which it was designed.

#### PRESENT WORK OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

What this bureau now does in addition to employing the specialists already allowed to it is to fulfill the other functions prescribed in section 516, supra, namely, "to collect statistics and facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories." It has no authority to compel the giving of these statistics and facts. Its reports, while useful, need not be strictly accurate, and I am told that the great educational foundations are unable to rely upon its statistics as a basis for justly rendering assistance to different institutions, but have to make independent investigations. The bureau does as well as it can, but with no means to investigate it can not be certain.

The statistics and facts which the bureau collects are published annually in the annual report of the Commissioner of

Education. That gives a general survey of the matters being attempted in the way of education throughout the country and a résumé of the meetings of the different educational associations. The bureau also publishes monographs on different educational subjects, but it does not render the real assistance or give advice when asked in regard to specific problems as it could if given the men and money.

#### RELATION OF STATE AND FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ON EDUCATION.

We are spending over \$500,000,000 a year in this country on education in the different States and Territories. The Federal Government, however, although since 1868 it has been its purpose to have a bureau which would collect statistics and diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of schools, school systems, and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country, has been contributing only one-sixtieth of 1 per cent of that amount. If the amendment that I have offered should be adopted, the Federal Government would still contribute less than one-fortieth of 1 per cent of the amount expended by the States and Territories. Such an expenditure by the Federal Government is necessary, however, in order to make as effective as possible the half billion of dollars expended by the States and Territories.

We engage in the work of providing specialists in agriculture. Why should we not do it for education? We seem to have a superstition about the benefits which the Federal Department of Agriculture can confer, but no intelligent comprehension of the benefits to education that the Federal Bureau of Education could confer.

I want to call the attention of the committee to what some of these things are for which specialists are suggested, to the conditions which exist, and to what is being done in regard to them in isolated sections of the country and to the need of specialists. The first is school administration. We are having a discussion now in the city of Washington as to the administration of the public schools.

#### SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION.

I was greatly surprised to learn that we really have not any intelligent common basis on which to compare school administration here with school administration in other cities. Other cities are making investigations themselves. New York is spending \$50,000 on an investigation; Baltimore is making an investigation; the city of Montclair, in New Jersey, is spending \$50 a day on an expert making an investigation. There are lots of things which people learn about their own locality which they theretofore could not understand. In one city they will find that five out of six children will leave before they finish a common-school education. In another they will find that five out of six stay. Why is there that difference? There is nobody who can indicate to the educators in one city why so many of their children leave and why so many stay in another city.

Public education is the largest, as well as the most important, business in America. In every other line of business we are discovering that the expert is able to save a considerable per cent of the gross expenditure and at the same time increase the quality of the output. The amount of money spent per child per year varies greatly in our several communities, but the efficiency of the work can not be gauged by the per capita expense. There are at present no available standards by which the efficiency of school administrations can be judged or their results compared. There is no common denominator or method of measuring results that can be applied to all. Such standards can be discovered, and the Federal Government is the one authority to discover them.

#### INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION.

Take the matter of industrial education. It is of prime importance that children learn how to make a living. The apprenticeship system has gone. Various cities and countries are taking large steps to meet this new condition. Definite information as to the value and effects of these various plans are nowhere available. The utter foolishness of undertaking work without first ascertaining the nature, cost, and results of such work done elsewhere needs no demonstration. The securing of such information is distinctly a Federal function. It is needed by each State, but not one has adequate facilities for securing it. The utility of each State conducting such investigations when it can be secured for all by the Federal Government is evident.

I am told that in Newton, Mass., nearly \$1,000,000 was expended in the erection of an industrial school, but after it had been completed it was found that there were not enough children to use it fully. Newton had not known how many of its children dropped out of school before reaching the grade from which they would enter the industrial school, and hence, to a certain extent, expended this money uselessly. The school was



later adapted to the instruction of older people. Pittsburg is erecting an industrial school, but it knows nothing from the results in other cities as to the success it is likely to have and the peculiar problems which it must be prepared to meet. Some cities are doing excellent work. Cincinnati has schools for training boys, who are working at regular trades, in the arithmetic, drawing, and specification reading of those trades, thus satisfying a want felt by foremen in the factories of Rochester, N. Y., who in answers to inquiries indicated that they were anxious to have boys able to "apply the mathematics they have learned in school to the actual problems which arise in shops." Menomonee, Wis., trains all its boys and girls, both in elementary schools and in high schools, in vocational studies; that is, in trades which they may later pursue. Lowell, Mass., has a school of the textile trades. But the result of the work in Lowell or the result of the work in Cincinnati or Menomonee or other places is not known in other cities. Such knowledge can be economically and effectively gained by giving to the Bureau of Education a specialist in industrial education who will be able to render the information available to all.

This subject was discussed by Hon. Andrew S. Draper, commissioner of education of the State of New York, in his annual report for 1908, in which he said:

Nothing in the common schools leads to a trade.

The situation was summed up by him thus:

The public-school system has had but little thought of craftsmanship, by which the greater part of the people must live, and upon which the moral and intellectual health of the people and the greatness of the Nation must depend; the work of the schools has led almost exclusively to mere culture and to professional and managing employments; the efficiency of the teachers has been measured by the number and training of the pupils they sent to the grade above, and thus the pupils have been led to think that the grade above was the goal of life; and the grade above has led to literature and the sciences and to professional and managing vocations. This has taken a great many into situations for which they were not adapted, and has overstocked the professions; has resulted in too many partial or complete failures, and is operating both to the industrial and intellectual disadvantage of the country.

He thus referred to, yet criticized, the French system:

France began the systematic training of handworkers long years ago, and the result is quickly apparent in the trades, industries, and arts of the French people. There are hundreds of trades schools in Paris and thousands throughout France. They are highly efficient; they turn out artists and craftsmen of the very first order; it is apparently very easy for France to make a most attractive exhibit in the international expositions. But it does seem as though the system is both arbitrary and narrow. It is so absolutely directed from the center, so oppressed with ministerial regulation, so oppressed with apprehension about a real democratic advance, that it develops mere craftsmen and artists, rather than free, all-round men and women.

And he thus briefly summarized the Prussian system:

Practically all of the children of Germany, boys and girls, rich and poor, high and low, up to about their fourteenth year, go to elementary schools, established, supported, and directed by the State. The teacher is a professional, the course exact, the attendance universal, and the expectations of the State are very completely realized. The idea does not yet prevail that girls should go beyond the secondary schools. At about 10 years of age the boys and their parents are expected to determine whether they will fit for a trade or a profession. If for a trade, they go at 14 either to a shop, as an apprentice, or to a trades school. If for a profession, they go to a "gymnasium," which is a school of two kinds, of which one is more literary and classical and one more scientific than the other, and the boy takes one or the other, according to the profession he has in mind.

How backward we are in comparison with Germany he indicated by reference to the German view of the subject:

#### WHAT THE GERMANS SAY OF US.

Germany sent an educational commission to the St. Louis Exposition in 1904 with instructions to study the school exhibits at the exposition and quietly investigate the educational system of this country, and then report with particular reference to the bearing of the educational systems of their country and ours upon German and American industry and trade. The commission pursued its work very quietly. It did not seek the limelight; it did not proclaim its route of march by the use of a military band; it circled the educational conventions; it did not have itself invited to dinners and make speeches at us; in some way it even escaped the alert and aggressive attentions of the press. The commission's report may be alike interesting to German and American readers, but it is not altogether satisfactory to American complacency.

It declared that America is abundant in resources, filled with energy, exceedingly quickwitted and resourceful; that a vigorous people is possessed of such mighty and largely undeveloped physical resources, and has such splendid advantage in coast lines and commercial situation, that undoubtedly it will have to be reckoned with in the trade and commerce of the somewhat distant future; but that the United States is so seriously handicapped with manifest disadvantages, of which Americans are unconscious, that no American industrial competition at any early day need be taken seriously by the German Nation. They said these disadvantages make a buoyant confidence without sufficient underpinning for it, a "feeling of complacent satisfaction with everything American," an expectation that, without much planning, and without much philosophical study, or concerted action, or definite plan, or cooperative efficiency, everything will come out all right whenever the need of it arises. They emphasized the entire absence of provision for public schools supplying systematic instruction in craftsmanship, and asserted that this lack is sufficient to overcome any natural advantage in resources or geographical situation. This commission was not constituted exclusively of teachers, but of teachers, merchants, manufacturers, economists, publicists, and con-

structionists. They were thinking much of German trade and they advised their people not to be disturbed about any American interference with it at an early day.

In his report Mr. Draper compared the exports of domestic manufactures from Germany and the United States in the same year, beginning with 1880. The exports of domestic manufactures from the United States in 1880 were \$102,000,000; from Germany, \$152,000,000. In 1906, the last year for which he has figures, our exports had increased to \$686,000,000. Germany's exports had increased to \$1,079,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PARSONS. Germany's exports had increased to \$1,079,000,000.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman tell us the date of that report?

Mr. PARSONS. His annual report for 1908.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I understand that the gentleman in reading from this report is intending to show the value of industrial education to the children of Germany and the value that it would be to the children of the United States if industrial education was extended to them. Is that it?

Mr. MANN. I suppose he is intending to show that under the tariff system the Federal Government ought to force industrial education upon the rural districts.

Mr. PARSONS. It does not show anything of that sort, but it shows that unless we can have available to the people in the different States the best advice in regard to industrial education we shall, comparatively speaking, be handicapped industrially.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does that German report purport to show the value of our exports at \$600,000,000?

Mr. PARSONS. Our exports of domestic manufacture.

Mr. TAWNEY. Not our aggregate exports.

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, no; our exports of domestic manufactures.

Some American cities have made efforts for industrial education, but what they have done is not available to others. The Commissioner of Education in his annual report usually calls attention to the new things that are being attempted, but there is no information which tells us the result of what has been attempted, and so some very unwise appropriations have been made. Sometimes very handsome industrial school buildings are erected, and then there are found to be no scholars to occupy them, for the reason, of which the people were ignorant themselves, that too many scholars drop out from the lower grades to be in school at the time when they would be eligible for industrial education, and some other use has to be made of the building.

Organized labor realizes our shortcomings. A special committee on industrial education was appointed by the American Federation of Labor, and it reported to the full convention which met at Toronto in November, 1909. The following is an abstract from the committee's report:

If the American workman is to maintain the high standard of efficiency, the boys and girls of the country must have an opportunity to acquire educated hands and brains such as may enable them to earn a living in a self-selected vocation, and acquire an intelligent understanding of the duties of good citizenship.

We favor the establishment of schools in connection with the public-school system, at which pupils between the ages of 14 and 16 may be taught the principles of the trades, not necessarily in separate buildings, but in separate schools adapted to this particular education, and by competent and trained teachers.

The course of instruction in such a school should be English, mathematics, physics, chemistry, elementary mechanics, and drawing; the shop instruction for particular trades, and for each trade represented, the drawing, mathematics, mechanics, physical and biological science applicable to the trade, the history of that trade, and a sound system of economics, including and emphasizing the philosophy of collective bargaining.

In order to keep such schools in close touch with the trades, there should be local advisory boards, including representatives of the industries, employers and organized labor.

The committee recommends that any technical education of the workers in trade and industry being a public necessity, it should not be a private but a public function, conducted by the public and the expense involved at public cost.

There is a strong reaction coming in general methods of education, and that growing feeling, which is gaining rapidly in strength, that the human element must be recognized, and can not be so disregarded as to make the future workers mere automatic machines.

Experience has shown that manual-training school teachers without actual trade experience do not and can not successfully solve this great problem, and that progress will necessarily be slow, as new teachers must be provided, a new set of textbooks will have to be written, and the subjects taught in a sympathetic and systematic manner.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman know any method by which children can be forced to attend school when their families need their services to maintain the household?

Mr. PARSONS. They are forced to attend school in most States, up to a certain age.

Mr. MADDEN. But after that age?

Mr. PARSONS. No, they can not be; but in Germany and France industrial education begins while the children are in the common schools. In the Philippines to-day the Filipino child has a better chance for industrial education than has an American child in an American school.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose that accounts for the greater efficiency of the Filipino over the American.

Mr. PARSONS. No, it does not; but it shows that we are giving the Filipino child, physically and mentally inferior to the American child as we believe him to be, a proportionately better chance for industrial education than our own children. Last year, according to the report of the secretary of public instruction of the Philippine Islands, of the 451,000 children that were in the schools there, 381,000 were receiving industrial education.

#### EDUCATION FOR HOUSEKEEPING.

The question of education for housekeeping is an important one. Anyone who studies the cost of living is impressed by the difference in the comfort of a family according to whether the housewife has a knowledge of housekeeping or not. Food is one of the large items in the family budget. Knowledge of how to purchase cheaply and how to cook well have been the means of enormous saving to the family income, as well as of better health and greater contentment for the family. Mrs. More, in her book, *Wage Earners' Budgets*, which is an intensive study of conditions in the Chelsea section of New York City, calls particular attention to this. Knowledge of housekeeping on the part of the wife is equivalent to many dollars of income.

The conditions in American homes have so changed that in a large fraction of them there is no longer any adequate opportunity for girls to learn the common duties of the housewife.

New methods of factory and shop production have also largely changed the nature of the problem itself. Our cities are already spending millions of dollars in teaching girls to sew and to cook. Whether this is wise or unwise, it is right and proper that impartial information on the subject should be available to those who desire it. It is not to be expected that successful and happy homes can be established and maintained by those who are ignorant on these topics. Either through the school or in some other way the problem must be met and the need answered.

Steps are being taken in various States and cities to give the children a better knowledge of housekeeping. Olympia, Wash., gives all its girls a thorough education in housekeeping. The new course of study in Nebraska provides that all the girls in the State shall be trained in housekeeping. In traveling through southern Utah this summer, many miles from a railroad, I was very much impressed by the excellence of the food that was obtained everywhere; whether 50 or 100 miles or more from the railroad, it was none the less always good. I was told that in those Mormon communities the girls were sent away to schools where the principal stress was laid upon housekeeping. It certainly brings splendid results. But here, again, what is done in one State is not known in others, and particularly the success or failure of the course is not known.

#### SCHOOL HYGIENE.

The matter of school hygiene is one of the items which was included by the Committee on Appropriations, but which went out on a point of order. With all due respect to the gentleman in charge of the bill, I do not think he explained exactly what the duties of that specialist would be. He would not be a physician, but he would be a man who had special knowledge of all these things.

Now, what are some of the facts? The records in New York, Philadelphia, and other cities show that children's diseases increase in number when schools are in session and fall off during vacations. This would indicate that schools breed disease, whereas one would think that children's diseases would be more numerous when the children were out of school and in the narrow streets of the great cities. Why is it that children's diseases increase during the school period, and what should be done to stop it? One-sixth of the children who drop out of school do so on account of sickness, according to the school records. New York City spends a quarter million of dollars a year in educating children who die of tuberculosis before reaching maturity. What can be done to guard school children against tuberculosis? Sixty-nine cities use vacuum cleaners in their schools. It is claimed that this reduces tuberculosis by reducing dust. Is this so? Findlay, Ohio, with a population of 18,000, has employed 13 dentists to care for children's

teeth, because it has found that children with decaying teeth take half a year longer to complete the school course than those with sound teeth, and it is cheaper to pay for the dentists than to pay for the extra schooling. Who knows these things and what the results of these different efforts are?

Four years ago there were 41 American cities having more or less complete systems of medical inspection of school children. To-day there are about 400 cities doing this work. At first medical inspection was largely for the detection of contagious diseases; to-day it is largely for the discovery of defects of vision, hearing, hypertrophied tonsils, adenoids, and other conditions which tend to prevent children from profiting by the instructions furnished by the State.

Tuberculosis is usually contracted during school years. This disease can be prevented, to a large extent, by better ventilation, cleanliness, and so forth. This is but one of the many questions relating to the health and vigor of school children. There is at present no clearing house with reference to the rapidly accumulating experience on this subject by which the experience of all may be rendered available to each.

There are at present 18,000,000 school children in America. They constitute the great sedentary indoor class of America, and suffer from all the disabilities which are well known to be associated with sedentary occupations.

It is estimated that we spend \$18,000,000 per year in city schools alone on the instruction of children who fail in their work. Much of this could be prevented by securing better hygienic conditions.

What this expert in school hygiene would do would be to prepare circulars and answer all inquiries that might come from any locality in regard to what that particular locality should best do.

#### STATISTICS AND ACCOUNTING.

Take the matter of statistics and accounting. Less than half of the children who attend school in our cities and towns ever finish the elementary course. Less than half of our future citizens are getting even a common-school education. The reason is that they spend so much time in the lower grades that they never reach the upper ones. This is a business problem, and its solution is to be found only through a study of the statistics and accounting of school systems. It is the problem of the relation of the raw material to the finished product, and the children who enter our schools are the raw materials; those who graduate are the finished product. A business concern that lost half of its goods in the process of handling them would fail. The solution in education lies in the application to it of business methods. Schoolmen are awake to the situation. What they now need and demand is guidance and information of the sort that a specialist in statistics and accounting could furnish.

The items given under school administration apply forcefully to statistics and accounting. One of the merits of our dual system of government is that each State has a chance to experiment for itself. There is one line, however, in which there should be enough uniformity to make accurate comparisons possible, and that is in the method of statistics and accounting. In definite quantitative terms we know little of what our schools are doing, and a large part of what we think we are doing is not so.

As I said before, we can not really compare the schools of Washington with other schools, and I will tell you some things that we do not know about the schools of Washington.

[The time of Mr. PARSONS having expired, by unanimous consent his time was extended five minutes.]

No one knows how many children entered school this year for the first time in Washington, and hence no one can tell how many of those who enter here graduate and how many fall by the wayside. The teachers here are agitating for more pay. No one knows just how their salaries compare with those in other cities. No one knows whether we spend less or more here for books and supplies than is spent in other cities. No one knows what proportion of Washington children reach the high school. No one knows what proportion of our school expenditures in Washington are used in carrying children who fail over the same work for the second, third, or fourth time. Most cities need help in revising their accounting and statistics as much as Washington does. Here the need of a specialist who can give advice and answer questions is easily discernible.

Other cities are in the same position, and if they want to thoroughly understand themselves they have no place to apply to and each one is put to separate expense. What a specialist would do would be gradually to get all the cities and States to adopt a uniform method of statistics and accounting, and then you could make some comparison.

## SCHOOL ARCHITECTURE.

In speaking of the matter of school architecture, I said to one of the gentlemen employed by the Russell Sage Foundation, who is supposed to know a great deal about these things: "Suppose a country school committee wants to build a new schoolhouse, could it send for plans and find out the best kind of a schoolhouse to build for the money?" The answer was, "No, except in two States—Maine and California." Our Bureau of Education here does send out and is sending out a revised copy of a circular on the subject, but that does not meet the many different problems that arise in different localities.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARSONS. Certainly.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Is it the gentleman's idea to get the Federal Government to educate the various cities up to a uniform standard as fixed by the Bureau of Education?

Mr. PARSONS. No; not at all, except to get the matter of statistics and accounting uniform. It would be of great value to every State and city if the methods of accounting were sufficiently uniform so that accurate comparisons could be made. Now they can not be made, as the gentleman will see if he looks at the figures in the report of the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. COX of Indiana. After the Government had gathered the statistics, would it be the idea of the gentleman that the Government recommend to the States and cities to conform to the standard?

Mr. PARSONS. Not at all; but the information would be there available for the different States and cities when they wanted it, and experience shows that they would want it. Here are requests innumerable from superintendents of public instruction in different cities.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. PARSONS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman refers to requests innumerable. There are, I suppose, a very large number of new schools being built; is it the gentleman's idea that any of these school officers might write to the Bureau of Education and get information in regard to the building of a schoolhouse?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes; take the matter of building a schoolhouse.

Mr. MANN. Take that as an illustration.

Mr. PARSONS. Some of the mistakes in regard to school architecture are pitiable. A year or so ago there was a great school disaster in Cleveland—what is known as the Collingwood disaster. The reason so many children were caught there was that the school building was put up without regard to what would be the A B C of information of any specialist in school architecture, and the result was that they could not open the doors to get the children out. The doors opened in instead of opening out, and the result was that a large number of children were caught in the room and could not be gotten out. Now, there are probably a great many schools where just the same situation exists.

Mr. MANN. Under the theory of the gentleman, what would be the proceeding? Would the directors or the trustees or the officers of the school district write for this information, or would the architect write for the school board? Which one gets the information?

[The time of Mr. PARSONS having again expired, by unanimous consent it was extended for five minutes.]

Mr. PARSONS. Either would get it.

Mr. MANN. Do the school officers decide the character of the school building as against the architect, overrule the local architect, or does the local architect determine? Is it the proposition to have the school officers say they know more about school architecture than the architect they have employed?

Mr. PARSONS. I presume that in the case I supposed they would ask the school architect to make a change if they noticed that he was putting on doors that opened inward instead of outward.

Mr. MANN. I suppose he would ask whether the windows ought to be opened one way or another.

Mr. PARSONS. Very likely.

Mr. MANN. And whether lead or iron weights ought to be used.

Mr. PARSONS. That may be.

Mr. MANN. Is it the proposition that we educate the school board so that they can keep the architect in hot water all the time?

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, I presume there are a great many schools in the country that are erected without the supervision of an architect at all, but they are simply constructed by carpenters in the localities, and I think that the general information which

the Bureau of Education would furnish would be peculiarly available in all such cases.

Mr. MANN. I do not know but that it would be a good thing, and I do not know that it would not, but I would like to ask the gentleman whether he thinks one individual up here would be able himself to acquire all of this great information and answer all of this correspondence and furnish all this information through his own lonely efforts.

Mr. PARSONS. I do not know that he could, but he will at least partially remedy a bad situation that exists at the present time.

Mr. MANN. Is it not the proposition, following out the gentleman's suggestion, that this is only an entering wedge for the creation of a very large expense through Federal activity as to education, and that if you follow out the idea which the gentleman has in mind it will require not the creation of 10 new offices, but of a thousand or more clerks and typewriters and all sorts of employees of the Government?

Mr. PARSONS. I disagree with the gentleman. I think there will always be an opposition in this country, and ought to be, to having a system of education the country over entirely uniform.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is familiar with the fact, of course, that we have in this House a Committee on Education, a very able committee, presided over by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE]. Has the gentleman from New York not introduced a bill to refer this matter to the legislative committee which has jurisdiction, where it can receive complete consideration?

Mr. PARSONS. No bill is necessary, in my opinion—

Mr. MANN. That is the question, whether it is or not; but has the gentleman introduced a bill on that subject?

Mr. PARSONS. No; and in my opinion such a bill is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman think that in organizing this great new bureau it ought to be organized after full consideration, and not merely by the creation now of one office, to the duties of which the gentleman will admit one officer could not attend?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield at this point?

Mr. PARSONS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. COX] about establishing new bureaus, and suggesting that the National Government is going to infringe upon the work now being done by the States in the matter of public education. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to what was said in the hearings on that point. The Commissioner of Education says—and that is my understanding of this situation—that it is not the purpose of these additional appropriations in any way to interfere with the work of the States in public education, nor is it the purpose to establish any new Federal relation whatsoever. The Commissioner of Education says simply that the purpose is to continue upon a larger and better plan the kind of assistance which has heretofore been rendered by the Federal Government to the States. He says furthermore:

I do not think that it leads to any novel type of Federal relation with the States.

It simply leads to an extension of the work which has always been carried on by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States by employing some additional specialists in the matter of rural education and school hygiene.

Mr. PARSONS. Exactly; to make available to the different States and cities the experience of the others.

About \$10,000,000 a year are spent in school heating and ventilating plants. These commonly send a stream of air around the sides of the room, leaving the air in the center unchanged. This is due to ignorance in school architecture. Nearly every school in the country has rooms in which gas is burned all day long to make it possible for the pupils to see. The prevailing bad eyesight of Americans is largely due to this cause.

Physicians tell us that a large part of the diseases of childhood result from wrong practice in the heating and ventilating of schoolhouses, and this is a problem in the construction of these buildings. From all over the country are arising demands for expert advice in this field. Again, schoolhouses are being used for new activities—for the teaching of manual work, carpentry, cooking, and the like. These new activities involve changes in construction that ordinary builders can not meet. The whole problem of how a community can build its schoolhouses so as to get the most for its money, and so that its children may best profit from the years they spend there, is not a

problem to be solved by untrained common sense; it is a problem for the specialist in this field. Recent studies show that millions of dollars are being spent in the erection of school buildings having beautiful exteriors, but totally unfit for use as schools because of the absence of expert advice in their planning.

#### COMMERCIAL EDUCATION.

Take, now, the matter of commercial education. Business men everywhere are complaining that public-school graduates are utterly incompetent to take up work in business offices. This is true whether the young people come from common schools, high schools, or colleges. It is so true that in every city are found numerous private "business colleges," in which the need is met by private individuals who use it for exploitation and do the work quickly, superficially, and at great expense to the pupils. Public schools are endeavoring to fill the want through commercial schools and courses. What is needed to make their efforts successful is a central source of information, through which they can learn which methods and types of schooling are successful and which are failures. A specialist connected with the Bureau of Education would meet this need.

#### SECONDARY EDUCATION.

Then there is the matter of secondary education, which is the technical name for education in high schools and academies. Formerly these schools were chiefly occupied in preparing boys to enter college. Now the high schools themselves have become the colleges of the people. There are enrolled in them nearly a million young people, nine-tenths of whom have no intention of going to college and do not need or desire college preparatory work. This transformation has come suddenly, without warning, and the schools have not been prepared to meet it.

From nearly every city in the land comes the call for help in making up new high-school courses which will prepare for life and vocation the 800,000 high-school boys and girls who want more schooling than that given in the common schools, but who do not want to go to college. A specialist in secondary education would be a man who, through training and experience, would be able to meet this call for advice and information.

There are many kinds of high schools. There is a Latin school in Boston and a school of commerce in New York, a mechanics-arts high school in Boston, and an industrial high school in Newton, Mass. There are literary high schools, cosmopolitan high schools, scientific high schools, manual-training high schools, agricultural high schools, and, in New York, a nautical school. Each locality needs to know what types there are and which will best satisfy its needs.

#### WIDER USE OF THE SCHOOL PLANT.

Another subject is the wider use of the school plant. The little red schoolhouse of our fathers' and grandfathers' days was the community meeting place, where debates, lectures, and entertainments were held. Now cities are awakening to the fact that it is a foolish and inefficient use of public property to keep schoolhouses shut up every night, Saturdays, Sundays, and all summer. In some cities schoolhouses are coming to be used as the clubhouses of the people. In them lectures and entertainments are being held and the rooms are being used for reading rooms and evening classes for adults. There is great need for general information as to the cost, organization, and results of different adaptations to work of this sort. A city can gain this information now only through long and costly experiment and repeated failures. A field specialist in the employ of the Federal Bureau of Education could render this long and wasteful process unnecessary by giving the information needed directly when requested to do so.

New York uses its schoolhouses for public lectures. Newark uses them to teach adults drawing. Hartford uses them to teach English to foreigners. Rochester, N. Y., uses them for clubhouses for the people. Milwaukee has pool tables in some of its schools, to keep the boys out of the corner saloons. How successful are these different plans and which is the best? What do they cost and how are they administered?

#### RURAL SCHOOLS.

The last of these subjects I will mention is rural schools. This is largely an unexplored, unmapped educational territory—and yet in it are a majority of all the school children of America. In many, if not in most, the conditions are in many respects just as they were a generation ago. We need light.

The rural school educates 10,000,000 of the 18,000,000 children in the United States. Is it educating them to stay on the farm or is it educating them for the city? Is it giving them the kind of education which will make farm life more agreeable or has it the opposite tendency? What knowledge have the teachers in rural schools of rural conditions, and are they qualified to give the proper sort of instruction? It is said that the teachers of rural schools are mostly city bred, and that they therefore

fall entirely short of being the proper teachers for rural schools. The shortcomings of the rural school are recognized by many States. New York has adopted a new course of study for rural schools. New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania are experimenting with medical inspection in rural schools. Virginia is transporting children from outlying districts to central schools and giving up the isolated rural schools. Wisconsin and other States are teaching agriculture and giving prizes to the boys who can raise the most corn to the acre. Hampton Institute, in Virginia, is taking up work among the colored people of one of the rural counties in Virginia to see what it can do to help them. Yet, strange to say, no one knows the results of rural school work and experiment in other States. A specialist in this work is needed to make available the information and to answer the innumerable questions that have come, and that are bound to come, from those concerned with the welfare of the 10,000,000 children in rural schools.

That conditions in the long-settled portions of the East are little, if any, better than those of the rest of the country is shown by the speech made by President Thomas, of Middlebury College, Vermont.

[From speech of the Rev. John M. Thomas, president of Middlebury College, at the dinner of the New England Society in New York City on Dec. 22, 1910.]

Regarding education, you may fancy that every little red schoolhouse in the six old States is taught by some master of the teaching art such as you knew in your childhood; that the boys are eager for learning, and that they are furnished with instruction in the fundamental branches, thorough, accurate, and well birched in, as it was in your early days. Let me read to you a few answers given by teachers now in actual service in New England: "Four places of historic interest in the United States are Boston, Ticonderoga, Spain, and England." "Four educational journals are McClure's Magazine, the Youth's Companion, and the Ladies' Home Journal." "A disinfectant is something that does not agree with your system." "A deodorizer is a person that has a desire he does not know about." I think the Pilgrim Fathers must have been pretty good deodorizers, according to that definition.

Not long since a superintendent of a union district comprising a number of towns visited one of these little red schoolhouses up in one of the mountain valleys. He found a schoolma'am, to whom he said, "You ought not to be teaching that boy percentage. He does not know how to add or subtract." She said, "Oh, I have got to; the front part of the arithmetic is torn out." You may think that that is backwoods Vermont, but I could read you from a recent report of the State superintendent of Connecticut, good authority for the opinion, that a large part of the money spent on rural education—not city, but rural education—in Connecticut is worse than wasted; that many of the teachers are woefully incompetent; that they are without the books and supplies necessary for the good conduct of a school; that the buildings would not be tolerated as subsidiary structures for a hospital or a jail in any well-ordered city of that commonwealth, and that pictures of buildings in use by those little children could not be sent through the United States mail.

#### NO FEAR OF CENTRALIZED CONTROL.

In conclusion let me say that no one need fear centralized control in this country. American educators do not favor it. On the contrary, they criticize centralized control as exemplified in the case of France, and they criticize it for the very reason that it is too uniform and leaves too little room for diversity of experiment and experience. The effects of the French system in regard to secondary education is thus set forth in *The Making of Citizens*, a study of comparative education in the *Contemporary Science Series*:

Observe the uniformity of the whole, the lack of variety. Every pupil passes through the same mill and comes out stamped in precisely the same way. The machine is designed by Government officials, and is admirably fitted for the manufacture of officials, but men and women it can not fashion. Its training absolutely unfits for life. The "Bachelor" finds himself crowded out of the professions, and the feeling of caste prevents his turning to mercantile or commercial pursuits.

The result of this training is that France has become, in the words of a French writer, M. Antoine Albalat, a huge civil-service employment agency. To get a Government post for his son is the ambition of every French parent. The prefect of the department of the Seine had 4 vacancies for junior clerks and 4,398 applicants; 42 male teachers were wanted, and there were 7,139 applicants; for the post of surveyor, 1 vacancy had 1,338 applicants; and M. A. Fouillée tells us that for 250 vacancies in the *École Polytechnique* there are from 1,000 to 1,700 candidates; for 40 places at the prefecture of police there are 2,300 aspirants; and for 150 vacancies in the primary schools of Paris there are 15,000 candidates. Many of the women teachers of France have had, through this fearful competition, to drink the cup of misery and shame to its dregs.

There is no school in the world so effective in suppressing individuality as the French Lycée. There are 7,000 bachelors annually turned out from the secondary schools of France, and it would be impossible to find greater uniformity amongst a similar number of young men anywhere else in the world. The life of these schools is of the most routine character. M. Lavissee assures us that even to-day the minister's watch is the great regulator. The minister knows that at a certain time every pupil is taking his recreation, whether at Dunkirk or Marseille. This uniformity knows no latitudes. He knows, too, what authors are being read, for the teacher has no choice.

Entirely illogical is it to set up fear of centralization as an argument against making the Bureau of Education available as a central bureau, in which shall be recorded the experiments and experience in different States, cities, and school districts, and which shall be ready to render assistance by way of expert advice when they call for it.

The questions that have been asked me betray the idea that many of us have had so long, that our education is superior to that of any in the world and that our system is the best there is, and that to do more is to waste effort and money. Such things we have long thought in our ignorance, but those who have studied the matter know that vast improvements should be made. Long steps toward their achievement can be taken by enabling the Bureau of Education to render assistance, a function that the Federal Government can assume without taking away one bit from the control that is now vested in the States. Accurate information from without will only stimulate each State and each community to better results. At the same time it will be left to each State to decide for itself the methods that it will pursue.

Are we going to give our children the opportunities which children have in other countries? Are we going to render available information which will enable the separate States to give their children an opportunity to receive as good an education as, for example, we are giving the Filipinos? If so, and if we intend to make our dual system the effective system that it may be, we should grant such an appropriation as this.

## APPENDIX.

Extracts from letters favoring an appropriation of \$75,000 for the specialists mentioned in the proposed amendment:

John W. Abercrombie, president University of Alabama: This appropriation is necessary in order that the bureau may meet the most pressing educational needs of the country, and is unanimously indorsed by the National Educational Association. As officer of the association, as educator, and as citizen I make this petition.

J. N. Adee, superintendent of schools, Winona, Minn.: Expert advice from Government officials who have thoroughly investigated these subjects would be a decided gain for the schools of our country. Anything you can do to help this movement will be greatly appreciated by the teachers of this community.

Carter Alexander, assistant professor of educational administration, University of Missouri: The kind of information needed for the best results in our administration of public education in the United States is of such a nature that it can be collected and circulated to the best advantage only by the Federal Government. For this reason I sincerely trust that you will recommend that the Bureau of Education be given the funds to carry on this much-needed work.

W. O. Allen, professor of education, Drury College: There is a general demand for this service among educators and the resulting profit to our school systems would far exceed the cost. I regard the situation as urgent as the demand for fire patrol in the forestry department and inspection in the Department of Agriculture.

S. Avery, chancellor, University of Nebraska: As one of those who voted at the Boston meeting of the National Education Association for the following resolution: "In particular we urge that in addition to the usual appropriations the sum of \$75,000 be made available at the next session of Congress for the organization of a more adequate staff of specialists, with particular reference to work in the field." I take the liberty of writing you expressing my personal interest in the matter, and assuring you that any favorable action taken will be highly appreciated by the teachers of Nebraska.

Brown Ayres, president of the University of Tennessee and of the National Association of State Universities: The educators of the country are feeling that they need the Bureau of Education to take an active lead in the educational development of the Nation. With an able man at the head of the bureau they feel that little is needed except additional funds to make the bureau many times as important to the Nation as it now can possibly be. I therefore beg your favorable consideration of the appropriation.

L. T. Baker, professor of pedagogy, University of South Carolina: Friends and students of education generally agree that the Bureau of Education, through its investigations and publications, has been more potent than any one agency in unifying the system and promoting the efficiency of public education in America. A further extension of its opportunities for national and local service would be gratifying and beneficial particularly to the people of the South, who at this time are making tremendous efforts in the cause of general education.

H. E. Balcomb, secretary of national committee on agricultural education and of the department of agriculture of the National Educational Association: On behalf of the national committee on agricultural education, as well as personally, I wish to request that you will give the item of \$75,000 for a field force under the United States Bureau of Education your most thoughtful consideration. The necessity for this additional sum is so apparent to all, and is so strongly urged by those interested in the education of the United States, that I am confident that you will give it your support.

Roger N. Baldwin, chief probation officer, St. Louis, Mo.: I beg to say that such an expenditure of money, so far as results can be seen from juvenile-court work, would return to the community many times its amount in its preventive effects in the field of health and delinquency. Those of us who observe the hundreds of children passing through juvenile courts, and who seek to ascertain the causes which bring them to us, come to feel more and more that the greatest preventive force must be the public school in all its efforts to meet delinquency by newer forms of education and to combat the influence of neglect at home with a better system of related care in school.

J. Edw. Banta, president Council of School Superintendents of the State of New York: The Council of School Superintendents of the State of New York desires to add its recommendation to that of other educational bodies, that the sum of \$75,000 be added to the appropriation for the Federal Bureau of Education.

George Eames Barstow, chairman Pan-American committee Eighteenth National Irrigation Congress: The writer desires most seriously and earnestly to call your attention to the matter of the enlargement of operations of the United States Board of Education by adding to its

already valuable staff of workers a corps of field specialists. I understand that the duty of that additional force will be along the lines of cooperating with local educational authorities, and give expert counsel upon subjects connected with our educational system that will be more highly promotive of that most important cause in the Nation's advancement.

C. J. Baxter, State superintendent of public instruction of New Jersey: Besides its present staff the bureau needs a corps of field specialists, to cooperate with local educational authorities and give expert counsel upon such subjects as the promotion of health of school children, vocational training, hygienic construction of school buildings, and financial administration. These are vital interests, in which there is much diversity of practice and great room for improvement, and whatever shall be done for their advancement will directly and materially contribute to the progress and welfare of the Nation. I sincerely hope that you will favor and, if within your power, will help us secure the appropriation desired.

J. R. Beachler, superintendent of schools, Nutley, N. J.: America's greatness will depend on the greatness of America's boys and girls, our Nation's greatest assets.

For the conservation of these vital resources they join me in soliciting your earnest support to the movement on foot to provide means by which the United States Bureau of Education may do some real service with the people and for all the people.

Frank L. Beggs, president Business Men's Association, Newark, Ohio: The request for this appropriation is not sectional, but general, and the results will be shared by all. It is not a luxury, but a necessity. It is not an expense, but an investment that will have public approval. I hope your consideration will enable you to recommend that the amount of \$75,000 be appropriated for a field force who shall give expert advice to local school authorities upon such subjects as shall come under their direction and supervision.

E. C. Bishop, State superintendent of public instruction of Nebraska: No county system of public-school education can be effective without a central authority and support which will reach every school district. No State system of education can be effective without a central authority and support that reaches to all counties. The same principle applies to the direction of the public-school interests of the Union. Our National Bureau of Education should have such financial support that it may be enabled to bring the best things from every part of the Union into workable form that may be made to serve every other part.

Kenyon L. Butterfield, president Massachusetts Agricultural College: I am most heartily in favor of this movement. In my judgment it has been delayed altogether too long. The Bureau of Education, because of its lack of sufficient appropriations, does not begin to do for the educational interests of the country what it ought to do. Dr. Brown has the confidence of American educators and should be given an adequate support by Congress.

H. B. Brown, president Valparaiso University: The fate of the appropriation of the \$75,000 for a field force under the United States Bureau of Education, as I understand it, is in your hands. As a trustee of the National Education Association, I venture the hope that you will consider this in the spirit in which it is suggested, and that it may be possible to have it for the National Education Association.

M. G. Brumbaugh, superintendent of schools, Philadelphia: If we are ever to arrive at anything like an adequate treatment of our public-school problem in America and administration that will be at the same time economical and wise, we must make this intensive and comprehensive study of the school problem. We are the only country of importance not doing it, and our people are the most generous in their enthusiasm for public schools.

Surely the National Government can render this small but very far-reaching and beneficent assistance to this great work. I earnestly trust that you will see your way to urge this appropriation.

Nathaniel Butler, professor of education, University of Chicago: It hardly requires any argument to enforce the statement that our educational interests lie at the very foundation of all other public and private interests of our great Republic. Whatever can be done adequately to equip the Bureau of Education as that it may thoroughly investigate existing conditions and devise ways and means for placing education upon a still sounder and more secure basis, will obviously be an investment of money, effort, and time of the very first importance. It seems clear that every interest will be promoted by measures of this sort.

F. G. Blair, State superintendent of public instruction of Illinois: I am heartily in favor of the enlargement of the Bureau of Education through the employment of experts, who shall assist the various State departments in investigations along certain special lines. To this end I strongly urge that the \$75,000 at your disposal be given to the Bureau of Education, if it is at all possible to do so.

Ben Blewett, superintendent of schools, St. Louis, Mo.: My very natural and great interest in all measures that look to the improvement of education is my warrant for adding my plea to others, which you will doubtless receive from other educators, that you may give most favorable consideration to the needs of the Bureau of Education when making the estimates for your department.

The bureau has in the past, even with its meager resources, established beyond question its great usefulness. If it is given the proper encouragement and financial support it can be of far greater service to our Republic concerning matters of most vital interest.

Stratton D. Brooks, superintendent of schools, Boston: I write to express the hope that you will exert your influence in favor of making an additional appropriation to the amount of \$75,000 to the Bureau of Education.

I have no doubt that the contemplated increase in the appropriation for this bureau will be of substantial advantage to the cause of education.

James W. Cain, president Washington College, Maryland: There is a belief in the minds of many people that, both in the schools and colleges of the country, much is being done that is purely experimental, and that the youth of the country suffer in consequence. I have no doubt that this belief is, to a considerable extent, true, and see no way by which the work of education can be more intelligently planned until we have collected a larger fund of facts than we have at present. This could be done most advantageously and thoroughly by such a corps as is referred to above, and I earnestly hope that the necessary appropriation for its establishment will be made.

Arthur Durin Call, principal the Henry Barnard School, Hartford, Conn.: I write to commend your sympathetic interest in our efforts to extend the field force of the United States Bureau of Education.

The \$75,000 asked for seems little enough for the promotion of this most important matter. \* \* \* If our nation is to progress in the direction of health, vocational training, and the like, it is of very great importance that these matters shall be studied by the nation as a whole. There is no bureau of greater importance to the vital interests of our people than the Federal Bureau of Education.

E. H. Callaway, attorney at law, Augusta, Ga.: The great results already obtained by the Department of Agriculture, through means of a similar staff of field experts, renders this method of procedure on the part of the Government no longer a matter of experiment. No other governmental aid to industrial education and development has ever accomplished such beneficial results in such short time, and at such comparative small cost. It seems to me that similar procedure on the part of the Government would be equally as efficient in the more important work of education.

William Riley Callicotte, superintendent of moral and humane education, Denver, Colo.: We need a most thorough inspection of the sanitary condition of all school buildings and surroundings, with especial reference to light, heat, ventilation, and location.

Vocational training is a necessity. The scientific up-to-date construction of school buildings, the physical examination of children, and kindred subjects need expert counsel.

This enlargement of the duties of the national Bureau of Education will be a great stroke for the uplift of our schools and the health of children.

W. S. Calvert, superintendent of schools, Guthrie, Okla.: It is not necessary to say that the people of Oklahoma will sustain this appropriation, but will feel that the National Government is neglecting an important step in educational matters if this is not done.

E. D. Comer, state superintendent of public instruction, Guthrie, Okla.: I desire to add my indorsement to the additional appropriation of \$75,000 to be made available at the next session of Congress for the adequate staff of specialists for the Bureau of Education.

P. P. Claxton, executive secretary Conference for Education in the South, Knoxville, Tenn.: I am convinced that such a body of specialists, under the direction of the National Bureau of Education, would be very helpful to all the educational interests in the whole country, and especially in the Southern States. Increasingly large amounts of money are being appropriated for public schools of all grades, the problems of education are becoming more complex, and the demands on the schools greater than ever before. There is great need for such expert advice as can be given only by men of scholarship and ability, who have had unusual opportunity for broad and adequate study. It is practically impossible for the several States to maintain such a body of experts; it can be done effectively only by the Federal Government.

J. A. Cline, prosecuting attorney, Cleveland, Ohio: Crime decreases as education increases, and the advancement of education therefore means less crime and better citizens. The amount is comparatively small in relation to the good which I believe will be accomplished.

George B. Cook, state superintendent of public instruction, Little Rock, Ark.: In addition to voting for the indorsement of this appropriation at the National Educational Association, it was my privilege to participate in the full discussion of the same by the State superintendents and to again vote when this measure was unanimously indorsed by the Southern State Superintendents' Association, concerning which meeting you have doubtless been advised by Hon. J. Y. Joyner, of North Carolina, the president of the association.

This appropriation has been considered from every conceivable viewpoint, and it is the unanimous opinion of the schoolmen with whom I have been associated in these discussions that the results would all be for the lasting advantage of the educational interests.

J. W. Carr, superintendent of schools, Bayonne, N. J.: I have been a superintendent of schools for 20 years, and I am sure that I could have rendered better service if there had been authoritative sources of information on the school subjects available.

George C. Chase, president Bates College, Lewiston, Me.: Such a body of specialists, while they would in no way intrude upon the sphere and the functions of State, county, and municipal educational authorities, would aid the American people in gaining a uniform system in the administration of educational affairs that could not fail to increase greatly the efficiency of popular education and to magnify and multiply its power to promote good citizenship and to improve the conditions, industrial, social, and moral, under which the coming generation are to live and work.

J. W. Church, Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, Hampton, Va.: My work in connection with Hampton Institute brings me very closely in touch with the conditions of school life in the rural districts throughout the South, and I believe it to be a conservative statement when I say that \$75,000 spent in securing expert knowledge tending toward the amelioration of the almost criminal conditions existing in many country schools solely through the ignorance which this expenditure will aid in dispelling will be worth many millions in years to come. \* \* \*

The widespread dissemination of expert advice resultant from the establishment of such a force as the above-mentioned appropriation will permit can not fail to be of incalculable value, not alone from the standpoint of education, but from its direct bearing upon physical health of future generations of the manhood and womanhood of America. In the name of thousands of school children, to whom the application of the knowledge thus gained will mean a better mental and physical chance to become valuable citizens, I earnestly urge your favorable consideration of this item.

James R. Day, chancellor Syracuse University: Permit me to urge upon your careful attention and your favorable consideration the additional item of \$75,000 for the Bureau of Education for the purpose of adding to the staff a corps of field specialists who shall be employed to cooperate with local educational authorities and give expert counsel upon such subjects as promotion of health of school children, vocational training, financial administration, construction of buildings, etc. It seems to me that this is an exceedingly important educational movement.

Henry B. Dewey, superintendent of public instruction, State of Washington: The Department of Education is making an effort to broaden the scope of its work by providing for a staff of field specialists who shall be able to give expert counsel upon matters connected with the school administration. The additional appropriation asked for and necessary to do this work satisfactorily is only \$75,000. I am sure that no appropriation that could possibly be made would mean more for the health and happiness of the boys and girls of this country than this one. On behalf of the teachers of this State I ask your cooperation in this matter.

L. E. Eggertsen, superintendent of schools, Provo, Utah: While we are growing educationally, the help that can come to the country district in the shape of suggestions from the Bureau of Education will be appreciated. Such subjects as the health of school children, vocational and industrial training, financial conditions, school buildings, etc., should be brought as near to the citizens as possible. The educational fraternity need the information and the assistance to bring the subject before the parents.

J. D. Eggleston, jr., superintendent of public instruction, Commonwealth of Virginia: I sincerely trust that you can see your way clear to recommend an appropriation of the sum of \$75,000 for the organization of a staff of specialists in the Bureau of Education for field work, which will include such subjects for investigation as construction of school buildings, industrial education, school and child hygiene, etc.

Here in Virginia, with the new movement for the extension of the public-school system, we feel the need at every turn and every day for light on these subjects and are greatly hampered for lack of it.

An appropriation of this nature wisely expended by the National Bureau of Education would be of immense benefit to our State school system and would necessarily be of similar help to every other State in the Union. With such knowledge in our hands at this time (which it is impossible for any one State to get without the assistance of the National Bureau of Education), I believe the efficiency of our school work would be increased at least 25 per cent.

Edward C. Elliott, director course for the training of teachers, University of Wisconsin: Teachers and public-spirited citizens the country over are keenly and vitally interested in the proposal to appropriate \$75,000 for a field force under the United States Bureau of Education. I am but one of thousands who are to-day hoping that there may be communicated to you in some effective degree a realization of the opportunity that the National Government possesses, through the Bureau of Education, for the betterment of education in this country.

W. H. Elson, superintendent of schools, Cleveland, Ohio: There is great need everywhere for the effective support for a bureau of education equipped with field specialists for the investigation of particular phases of education, which no local school administration can do, and which, if done, would still be ineffective in placing the matter at the disposal of the country at large. Such matters as the promotion of health, the problem of vocational training, financial administration, and standardization of statistics and accounts; these and other important problems call for an extension of the scope and efficiency of the National Bureau of Education.

H. F. Estell, principal Sam Houston Normal Institute, Huntsville, Tex.: In my judgment, there is no purpose for which a like sum of money could be appropriated that would produce greater results for the public welfare. Within recent years there has been a great educational awakening in this State. I believe that this movement would be greatly promoted and greater interest created with the active cooperation of field agents of the board of education, as proposed.

A. Grant Evans, president University of Oklahoma: We have needed and are needing to-day some body with authority to help in unifying the educational interests of the entire country, especially in such directions as exerting the pressure for a uniform upward movement of standards. This work so far has been done to some extent by private organizations, simply representing great benefactions. Surely the work of this kind ought to be undertaken by a commission more really representative of the people and their character.

H. A. Fairchild, county superintendent Wichita County, Wichita Falls, Tex.: The great Southwest is now stimulated to a point never before attained on the subject of a liberal education for every child, and I assure you that I am speaking the sentiment of every teacher in this section, and of a large body of intensely interested laymen, when I say we favor the proposed additional appropriation of \$75,000 for the Bureau of Education, that its work and influence may be more deeply felt in every section of our common country.

R. W. Ferrel, secretary Wilkes-Barre Board of Trade, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.: At a meeting of the Wilkes-Barre Board of Trade, held on June 27, indorsement was given to the project to have the Federal Bureau of Education provided with an appropriation of \$75,000 with which to carry on inquiries concerning public-school problems. The matter was quite thoroughly discussed at that meeting, and it was the general opinion that such inquiries under Federal auspices would be of great value to the local school districts, which, by reason of their limited powers, could not hope to carry on such inquiries on a requisite scale.

Austin H. Fitz, superintendent of schools, Norwood, Mass.: I am convinced that the right kind of field force under the direction of the Bureau of Education could bring by investigations what would tend largely to overcome the unfortunate certainty that now exists in the greater part of our educational endeavor.

Roy K. Flannagan, M. D., president Virginia Conference of Charities and Correction, Charlottesville, Va.: As a health officer I am particularly interested in being able readily to obtain expert advice in reference to school inspection and school hygiene generally. It seems to me that a force of Government workers, thoroughly equipped, operating in this field, could do more lasting good than perhaps along any other line of governmental development. The physical and mental health of our youth is surely the bulwark of the Nation.

Ida Capen Fleming, Greek department, Southwestern College, Winfield, Kans.: The teachers of the United States are particularly interested in the estimated appropriation of \$75,000 for a field force under the Bureau of Education, as the already multifarious duties of the teacher and the members of school boards preclude the possibility of their giving proper attention to child hygiene, vocational training, financial administration, construction of buildings, etc., and make such a force a real necessity for both system and uniformity in these lines.

W. T. Flynn, secretary Board of Education, Erie, Pa.: There has for five years been a very pressing demand for more general and more reliable information concerning the work of education in this country, and we feel sure that the wise expenditure of this amount of money will accomplish much in the direction of systematizing and centralizing information that is now not properly available for the use of local boards and their officers.

H. W. Foster, superintendent of schools, South Orange, N. J.: The prompt adjustment of the school system of the country to the changing conditions of this period of development can be accomplished only through expert knowledge of the underlying facts. It is of national importance, and the Nation only can accomplish the task.

Bruce Francis, superintendent city schools, Cedar Falls, Iowa: The importance of public education and the possibility of reducing waste and increasing efficiency carried by the proposed plan should, I believe, commend it as a wise use of public funds.

C. R. Frazier, superintendent of schools, Everett, Wash.: I believe that great good will come to every community in the country by such work as would be done by such a staff of specialists in matters of sanitation, industrial education, and school administration. So many thousand school children the country over are the victims of the mistakes of school boards, school superintendents, and school architects, who might be put right had we specialists working along these lines in the United States Bureau of Education.

Arthur T. Hadley, president Yale University: In general I am opposed to increase of appropriations, but this appears to me to be a case where we are already doing either too much or to little and where a moderate increase of expenditure would be accompanied by vastly increased efficiency.

Arthur G. Hall, registrar University of Michigan: I am sure that the public greatly desire and the school and college men of the country have especially at heart the raising of the United States Bureau of Education to a place of enlarged and more valuable service. I beg, therefore, to commend to your careful and, if possible, favorable consideration this most commendable enterprise.

Edward L. Hardy, president State Normal School, San Diego, Cal.: No plan to further the interests of education at large in this country was ever more happily conceived than this plan, and I sincerely trust that it will receive your indorsement. I know that the educational forces of the State of California are a unit in favor of the action contemplated and that they would cooperate in every possible way with a Bureau of Education thus made capable of doing expert work.

Paul H. Hanus, division of education, Harvard University: The Bureau of Education has suffered for a long time for lack of adequate funds to carry on necessary researches in its field of work. To secure accurate information in the field of education and to present it in such form as to promote educational progress throughout the country requires trained workers. Such workers should have had experience in educational research, in organizing materials, and in forcibly setting forth the conclusions to which they have been led by their researches. The bureau has not had a sufficient number of such workers because it has been unable to pay for them, and the cause of education throughout the country has suffered in consequence. No appropriation made by the Government for any purpose, however useful, would yield larger or more important returns than this.

Arthur F. Harman, president Alabama Educational Association: In behalf of the organized teachers of the State of Alabama I beg to add their indorsement to the movement to urge you to include in your budget the sum of \$75,000 to enlarge the Bureau of Education by adding to its staff a corps of field specialists to study, investigate, and consult with school men on such subjects as the construction of school buildings, school administration, industrial education, and the wider uses of the school plant. If any more significant, far-reaching movement for the betterment of educational conditions in this country has taken place within recent years, I am not aware of it.

T. H. Harris, State superintendent of public education of Louisiana: This appropriation has been indorsed by the National Education Association and by many other educational bodies throughout the country. Dr. Brown will be able to render the public-school system throughout the United States valuable assistance along many vital lines if he can secure the appropriation above referred to.

Cheesman A. Herrick, president Girard College: It has been my privilege to visit European countries and to know something of their departments of education, and I feel that the request of the Bureau of Education for the additional appropriation is modest and that it should be granted if the United States is to keep abreast of the educational developments in the world at large.

A. Ross Hill, president University of Missouri: As regards the administration of the Bureau of Education I may say I believe that there is no department of the Federal Government that does its work more economically than does this bureau, nor do I believe that any other department of the Government will give a larger proportionate return on the appropriation than will the bureau with this \$75,000, if it is made available.

D. H. Hill, president North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts: It seems to me that we need in our Bureau of Education a large and competent force of experts, who shall assist in all efforts made toward improving all the workers who are trying to train young men and young women for usefulness to themselves and to the Nation. I sincerely trust that our Government may see fit to add to the forces of this important bureau by giving it the means necessary for it to do its work with power and with promise of success.

David Spence Hills, professor of psychology and education, University of Nashville: This appropriation would go far in establishing a new movement for the conservation of the child life of our Nation. As an educator particularly interested in the problems of the South, I am convinced that we are greatly in need of a corps of specialists who shall devote a portion of their time to cooperating with and advising local authorities.

Joseph H. Hill, president Kansas State Normal Schools: I believe that no expenditure of money in the Government service could be more wisely made or would be farther reaching in its results. In the lines of research in connection with agriculture and other industrial pursuits the United States Government is utilizing, with results of inestimable value, the scientific training and skill of experts. In the direct field of popular education where as never before the problems that are presenting themselves are related to life, not only the individual life of the child, but the organic life of the community, there is a field that has scarcely been entered upon. The enlargement of the scope of the Bureau of Education along the lines suggested would be of the greatest service, and I trust that it may receive the cordial support of those with whom the authority rests for making this appropriation.

Edmund J. James, president University of Illinois: There are many departments of our educational life in which we need to have more accurate and comprehensive information. There is no organ, in my opinion, national or State, which can obtain this information so well at so small a cost as the United States Bureau of Education.

Albert E. Kagel, assistant superintendent of schools, Milwaukee, Wis.: It would save the country millions of dollars if educators could ascertain what others are achieving in these experimental fields, before launching a large school system into new paths, and repeating, perhaps, the mistakes made by others. Such information should be obtainable from a national source, and our Bureau of Education can give us this information if funds are available for securing it.

John R. Kirk, president State Normal School, Kirksville, Mo.: As an active member of the National Education Association and the head

of a State educational institution having 1,400 actual and prospective teachers enrolled annually, I beg leave to urge the appropriation from the National Treasury of \$75,000 per year for a field force under the United States Bureau of Education. There is very great need of field specialists to cooperate with local educational authorities and to give expert counsel upon the promotion of health of school children, upon vocational training, and the construction of buildings, playgrounds, and gymnasiums.

E. G. Lancaster, president Olivet College: With an annual expenditure of \$500,000,000, in round numbers, and the much larger sum invested in the plant, and with an army of 500,000 teachers in actual service, and over 20 per cent of our entire population going to school, it would seem wise to appoint the best specialists in the world to see to it that these vast sums of money and this great army of workers should accomplish the best possible results.

Henry B. F. Macfarland, ex-Commissioner of the District of Columbia: As one who for 10 years was president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and personally, as well as officially, deeply interested in the improvement of our schools, I believe that such an addition to the means of the Bureau of Education would enable it (especially under its present admirable head) to do a service for all schools in the United States which would be of incalculable value.

Charles McKenny, president State Normal School, Milwaukee, Wis.: The Federal Government is the only agency that can gather statistics, carry on experiments, do investigating, and report the results to the entire Nation. Educators are looking more and more to the Bureau of Education to do work which the States are unable to do.

Frank E. Miller, superintendent Union school district, Ludington, Mich.: We know that our local board of education would be much benefited could it receive advice in regard to such questions as the health of the school children, the installation of vocational training, construction of buildings, etc.

Louis C. Monin, dean Armour Institute of Technology: In view of the fact that the safety of our national, as well as individual, welfare depends largely upon the enlightenment and the moral progress of our citizens having enjoyed the benefits of a public-school education, no amount of money spent in this cause seems too great a sacrifice.

H. C. Morrison, State superintendent of public instruction of New Hampshire: The feasibility and enormous effectiveness of such undertaking is amply demonstrated by the Department of Agriculture. When the Federal Government is spending huge sums in the investigation of agricultural problems and the guidance of private agricultural undertakings throughout the Nation, surely the Federal Government ought to do something for the study and guidance of the great national and public effort in the direction of the bringing up of a generation of effective citizens.

Frank K. Sanders, president Washburn College: The Director of the Bureau of Education has proved himself a most valuable officer of the Government. He has worked wonders with the means at his disposal, but he is wholly unable to cover the growing demands of the bureau in such a way as seems rightfully demanded by the educational interests of our great country. With many others, I feel sure that this appropriation is justifiable, even on the score of economy.

Wilson M. Shafter, president Colorado State Teachers' Association: The leadership and initiative which would be rendered possible by this appropriation would avoid years of delay upon the part of many local school authorities. The need for such service is urgent, beyond all doubt.

J. S. Stewart, professor of secondary education, University of Georgia: On my recent visit to the Continent I was quite often struck with the vast difference in the influence and value of the national departments of education over our own, especially in the matter of supervisors, inspectors, and men to cooperate with the local authorities as well as in the publication of valuable bulletins. I believe that your administration would mark an era in American progress by beginning the development of the educational department in somewhat the same way that the Agricultural Department has now been developed and made such a power for the farmer.

J. S. Stout, Menomonie, Wis.: Our Bureau of Education is organized to carry on such work and is the only central organization in the United States for doing anything of the kind. I believe this work is greatly needed and that it can be done more effectively under the Bureau of Education than if undertaken through any other agencies.

I trust you will give the matter careful consideration and see your way clear to recommend the appropriation.

Joseph Swain, president Swarthmore College: The educational people of the United States believe very strongly that the special item of \$75,000, requested by the Bureau of Education, should be granted. The National Education Association, the largest educational body in the world, has not merely perfunctorily indorsed this request, but after careful consideration and with a clear conviction that the appropriation will be well spent and is especially needed.

J. E. Swearingen, State superintendent of education of South Carolina: On behalf of the children of South Carolina I write to add my personal and official indorsement to the request for an additional appropriation of \$75,000 for this purpose.

T. C. Thompson, mayor of Chattanooga, Tenn.: The whole Nation is interested in this proposition to advance educational facilities, and this section of the Nation is particularly interested.

A. W. Treeten, professor of education, University of South Dakota: There are many vital problems of child life, school hygiene, school organizations, vocational and industrial, civic and moral training that require the best efforts of a class of trained specialists, who can collect data and advise with parents and teachers and school officers in giving expert counsel and advice. If we consider the one item of school architecture alone, there is more money wasted every year in this field by bad planning and construction than would pay for a board of competent advisers.

Benjamin I. Wheeler, University of California: No branch of our Government, I am sure, has been so inadequately supported as the Bureau of Education. Nearly 25 per cent of our population is at this moment engaged in the schools, either as teachers or pupils, and no interest in this country has quite the importance or weight that education has.

Mary E. Wolley, president Holyoke College: The action of the National Education Association in its indorsement of an appropriation of \$75,000 for a field force under the United States Bureau of Education seems to me a most important one. For that reason I am venturing to urge this appropriation, that it may be possible to have field

specialists to cooperate with local authorities, and thus make our educational system more effective. There is no question more important than the wise training of the children of the country, a question which should have careful and expert Federal supervision.

J. Y. Joyner, State superintendent of public instruction of North Carolina: As president of the National Education Association in 1909-10, as president of the Association of Southern State Superintendents of Public Instruction for some years, I have had somewhat unusual opportunities to hear this matter freely discussed, privately and publicly, by many representative teachers from all parts of the country, and I am confident that I am within the bounds of truth when I say that the suggestion of the increased appropriation for this purpose has met with a hearty response everywhere, and has the active and almost unanimous support of the thoughtful, progressive teachers of this entire country.

Conference of Chief State School Officers of North Central and Western States, Salt Lake City, Utah, November 17 to 19, 1910: Owing to the fact that our States are not isolated communities, but rather intimately connected parts of a great Nation, we need as never before an adjustment and coordination in the administration of the various State educational systems. These have developed independently and without any reference to the interests of our country as a whole, causing confusion and waste in our education work and a sectional narrowness in educational administration. The only agent through which this work of adjustment and coordination can be done efficiently is the United States Bureau of Education. We recognize in this bureau a national clearing house for the collection and dissemination of valuable information bearing upon the school systems of the various States.

We deplore the fact that the bureau is hampered in its efforts to encourage the advancement of education by reason of inadequate appropriations, and we strongly urge upon Congress the necessity of appropriating \$75,000 and such additional amount as may be necessary to enable the bureau to employ a field force of specialists to be engaged in the extension of the type of work herein mentioned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before referring to the point of order I would like to call the attention of the committee to a proposition in reference to this matter. Some years ago by act of Congress we created the National Educational Association, with some gentlemen who were probably superabundantly endowed with enthusiasm, who claimed that this kind of work would be done by them and there will be no expense to the National Government. When it gets well started, the desire is to unload it and pay for it out of the National Treasury. It is not an infrequent occurrence that comes. Then, when the proposition comes here, instead of presenting to Congress a bill for consideration where the whole matter may be considered, if Congress desires to engage upon this work and make proper provision for it, the effort is made to sneak in—I will not say sneak in, but to get in a little office under the Commissioner of Education—

Mr. MACON. Make it "slip" in.

Mr. MANN (continuing). Knowing that that will not carry out the work and knowing that it is only the entering wedge, knowing there is no provision made to safeguard the Treasury or the Government in connection with that matter. The gentleman from New York has had ample time during his services in this House to prepare and introduce a bill and to have it referred to the proper Committee on Education, now presided over by a very able Member of this House and formerly presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Grow, the old Speaker of this House. But that has not been done. The gentleman from New York and the people behind this proposition knew that these items were not in order on an appropriation bill—

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Not just yet. They knew that the Committee on Appropriations is not the committee that ought to consider this matter. They knew there was a committee which could give consideration to this subject, which could work out a plan. That it should be worked out and presented to the House and let the Congress pass upon the proposition. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PARSONS. I wish to say to the gentleman that those gentlemen who were advocating this matter did not know it was subject to the point of order. When they spoke to me about it, I said that it might be, that I would look into the matter and see if I could not perfect an amendment which would not be subject to a point of order, and after studying the precedents I thought I had succeeded. That remains to be seen.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knew the Committee on Appropriations was not a legislative committee. He knew there was a legislative committee that had jurisdiction—

Mr. PARSONS. The legislation is all in the Revised Statutes. We do not need any more legislation.

Mr. MANN. I think you need a great deal more to do what the gentleman wants to do. It was easy for the gentleman to prepare a bill. It would have been easy when he first came here to have prepared a bill and to have presented it to a committee and brought it up for consideration long before this in this House and had it considered by Congress.

Mr. PARSONS. The gentleman did not think it was necessary, and he also knew the other specialists carried in the bill

in years past were not the result of bills introduced, but were put on by the Appropriations Committee on this bill under the clear purview of section 516 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman has served in this House a long time, and I wish he were going to serve a great deal longer; but he has served here long enough to know that if he has a great interest in a proposition to start the Government upon the expenditures of large sums of money in a new direction there is a proper method of presenting that before the House. It may be the National Educational Association is not familiar with the rules, although every day I read reports from somebody outside of Congress who seem to know, or think they know, a great deal more about the rules than anybody in the House does, and at least a great deal more than I have been able to learn in my service. Now, I do not undertake to say whether the Government ought to engage in this enterprise or not. I do not undertake to say at this time whether the Government ought to displace the State, whether we ought to have a universal bureau of education, and whether we ought to require the children of the States to study industry; but I am not at all alarmed by the complacency of the German gentleman who came over here and went back and reported very complacently that he thought the American people were too complacent in reference to their education. The complacency is on the part of the German gentleman, not on the part of the American people. We may not have the most perfect system of education that can be devised. Of course, we know that we do not have it, but I have sometimes questioned whether it is not as good a system of education now as it was when my distinguished friend from New York went to the public school.

We must not undertake to embark upon these enterprises directly contrary to the former attitude of the Government in reference to great expenditures of money without receiving proper consideration. That can not be done by a proposition to merely insert in an item of appropriation for a specific officer in an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much is necessary to say on the point of order. It seems to me that the amendment is so plainly subject to a point of order by providing for offices not now authorized by law that there can be only one ruling in reference to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The organic act creating the bureau called the Office of Education is very broad in its terms, almost or quite as broad as the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture. It has been held that an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill appropriating money to enable the Secretary to inquire into additional sources of raw material for making paper, processes of manufacturing, and cooperation with the several bureaus of the department with the paper mills was in order, and if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York went no further than appropriating money to enable the Office of Education to make any of these investigations it would probably be in order.

But the gentleman's amendment goes further, and gives affirmative direction to an executive officer as to how he shall make these investigations and whom he shall employ. It has been repeatedly held that propositions to establish affirmative directions for executive officers, even in cases where they may have discretion under the law so to do, or to take away an authority or discretion conferred by law are subject to points of order.

The gentleman cites a ruling found in paragraph 649 of Hinds' Precedents, but if the gentleman will look at that ruling he will find that that proposition, instead of giving directions as to how the work should be done or who should be employed to do it, provided that the Secretary might employ "such experts as he may deem necessary." And because the Chair believes that this is an attempt to give affirmative directions to an executive officer and to control his discretion, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in place of the words stricken out in the bill, commencing after the word "dollars," where it appears the second time in line 10, page 127, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 127, line 10, after the word "dollars," where it appears the second time, insert "for the investigation of higher education, rural education, and school hygiene, \$9,000."

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the merits of it. It has been discussed very fully. I desire to be heard, however, on the point of order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I drew this amendment with the idea of avoiding the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made to the language in the bill and likewise made



to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS]. In my judgment, the point of order against the amendment which I have offered does not lie. I call the attention of the Chair to the organic act, which he has before him, and to the fact that this amendment comes clearly within the scope of that act. I am moved somewhat not to discuss it, from the comment the Chair made in just passing upon the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, finding an objection in which I believe the Chair was right on the point of order against his amendment, in that it created an instruction not authorized in the law and provided for a new official. I call the attention of the Chair also to one of the citations which the Chair read in passing upon the original point of order made to the words in the bill as reported by the committee, where it is stated in effect that the point of order will lie or would lie against an amendment to a provision in an appropriation bill that created a new office or a new clerkship, although such a point of order would not lie against the appropriation to the same effect that did not create a new office. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Nebraska if he thinks it is possible for the Bureau of Education or the chief of that bureau to expend any part of this money in the work of extending the investigation thereby authorized.

Mr. NORRIS. As a matter of fact, I do.

Mr. TAWNEY. The law would expressly prohibit it. He can not employ or expend any part of the money in the employment of personal services in the city of Washington under the act of 1882.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, the gentleman from Minnesota makes objection that he can not, under this appropriation, employ any additional clerks.

Mr. TAWNEY. Any personal services of any kind in the District of Columbia.

Mr. NORRIS. But he could use any machinery he has now in the bureau for the purpose of carrying out the object for which this particular appropriation is made. I do not contend that the Bureau of Education would have the right to employ new clerks, perhaps; but they could use any machinery that they now have under their control for the purpose of making the investigation provided for in the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman from Nebraska allow me to ask him a question? The amount of your amendment is \$9,000?

Mr. NORRIS. Nine thousand dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Where did the gentleman get that limit for so important a work?

Mr. NORRIS. In answer to the gentleman, I will say I simply put in the sum of \$9,000 because that was the appropriation carried originally in the bill and stricken out. This will make the appropriation the same as the committee reported.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, if it be held to be in order it is certainly subject to increase.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANN. I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The amendment provides for an appropriation, as I recall it, for higher education, rural education, and school hygiene. I would like, if I can, to have the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, the act which has been referred to provides for an investigation by the bureau called the Office of Education, the duties of which as defined in the act shall be to collect statistics and facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and to diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of school systems, methods of teaching, etc.

The proposition which was in the bill, and which is now repeated by the gentleman, will embark the Government on a study of hygiene, not as a matter-of-fact education at all; plainly disclosed by the statements in this report and on the floor, not a matter of education at all. The subject of hygiene as related to the construction of school buildings is in no wise a part of statistics or facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States.

Nor does the amendment limit the appropriation to the study of education in the several States. The Commissioner of Education is already engaged in studying education in foreign countries, and under the amendment offered by the gentleman, and especially in view of the fact that no portion

of it could be used for services in the District of Columbia, it could be used, and very likely might be used, in sending people to Germany, in view of the remarks quoted by the gentleman from New York as to the great value of German education. It could be used for the purpose of obtaining information concerning education in foreign countries. There is, in other words, no limitation, such as is made in the act creating the office of the Bureau of Education.

Mr. CULLOP. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. I understand he bases his objection upon the organic act, section 516 covering this matter. The last clause of that section certainly covers this. It is as follows:

And otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

Now, it strikes me that clause covers the very purpose embraced in the amendment under consideration and gives ample authority for the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not read the section carefully.

Mr. CULLOP. I have read the last clause of it just as it is.

Mr. MANN. But let me tell the gentleman what it does say:

There shall be in the Department of the Interior a bureau called the Office of Education, the purpose and duties of which shall be—

What are they to do?

to collect statistics and facts showing the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories and to diffuse such information—

That is, information relating to statistics and facts.

Mr. CULLOP. Oh, no. That construction is too narrow.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PARSONS. Does the gentleman contend that "such" refers to the statistics and facts in regard to education in the several States and Territories?

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly.

Mr. PARSONS. Certainly not. It is—

such information as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote—

Mr. MANN. It merely refers—

Mr. CULLOP. If you will read on a little further you will see it means more than you claim for it.

Mr. MANN. I will, if I ever get the chance.

And to diffuse such information—

"Such" referring specifically to the collection of statistics and facts.

Mr. PARSONS. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. It says:

And to diffuse such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise promote the cause of education throughout the country.

The latter clause relates to the previous part of the section, which in no wise refers to school hygiene. Whatever the contention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS] or myself may be as to the word "such," plainly it does not cover school hygiene.

Mr. PARSONS. How does the word "as" connect with it?

Mr. NORRIS. Does the gentleman claim that school hygiene is no part of school education, or that the study of health, or athletics, for instance, would not be included in educational instruction?

Mr. MANN. I stated before that the words "school hygiene" as they appear in this amendment, copied from a provision taken out of the bill and explained in the House, do not refer to education at all. They refer to the management and construction of school buildings and the ventilation of school-rooms, and do not refer to education at all.

Mr. NORRIS. School hygiene is a good deal broader than that. I do not know where the gentleman gets his definition, but we are not bound by any definition of that kind. That is not a correct definition of it.

Mr. MANN. It might be that if this appropriation were made it would be confined, possibly wholly, to the study of the subject of school hygiene; but it authorizes an appropriation for purposes in regard to school hygiene which go away beyond that. The purpose of the provision in the bill was to study the construction of buildings as admitted and stated here under that term "school hygiene."

Mr. PARSONS. Oh, no; that was not the only matter.

Mr. NORRIS. Even if it were, I do not think we are bound now by that construction.

Mr. MANN. I did not say that that was the only matter. It went to the construction of school buildings, and under the act the appropriation is not warranted, and if under this appropriation, if it should be made, you can use a part of this money

for the purpose of studying the construction of buildings, as you plainly could—

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; you could not.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from Nebraska says you could not, but the Committee on Appropriations reported a bill in which they said you could.

Mr. NORRIS. They have not passed on this proposition.

Mr. MANN. They passed on this language, "school hygiene," and it is susceptible of that construction.

Mr. NORRIS. That does not settle the definition, even if the Committee on Appropriations did pass on this language.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman will deny that his purpose is to provide in an indirect way for what was stricken out on the point of order.

Mr. NORRIS. I have no intention of providing in this amendment for the study of the construction and management of school buildings. It is for the purpose of instructing the school children along particular lines of health.

Mr. CULLOP. Even if the gentleman did have that intention it is entirely proper under this statute, because it is one of the essential things in an efficient school system.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, that is one of the essentials of education.

Mr. CULLOP. To have a system of furnishing education, and this statute expressly provides for that.

Mr. MANN. Gentlemen seem to think that because you can do one thing under an appropriation it is therefore in order. The test is whether you can do something under the appropriation which is not now provided by law, and if this appropriation be made everyone here knows that the commissioner of education will construe, and properly will construe, that this is a new authority granted to him; for him to study the subject of school hygiene as apart from the ordinary study in the schools. That is the very purpose of it.

Mr. PARSONS. Does not the annual report of the Commissioner of Education now give such information, as he can gather without any expenditure, in regard to the school hygiene, and also in regard to the construction of buildings, and is not all that within his authority under section 516 of the act?

Mr. MANN. The office of the Bureau of Education does a great many things that are not covered by the provisions of the act. There are a whole lot of items in the bill which would not be warranted, but to which no point of order has been made. Whether they are in this bill as now provided has nothing to do with the test as to whether they would be provided for.

Mr. PARSONS. It shows the construction that has been put on the language of section 516 of the Revised Statutes for a great many years.

Mr. MANN. I do not think that it does.

Mr. PARSONS. And shows that all these things are included. The reason that the commissioner does not study them more particularly is that he has not had the money to do it with.

Mr. MANN. There are a great many things in here that are not covered by the act. There is a specialist on the foreign educational system which has been carried for years, but which is not warranted by section 516.

Mr. PARSONS. Certainly it is warranted by section 516, if the gentleman will accentuate the word "as" which refers to such, instead of dropping his voice when he gets to the word "as."

Mr. MANN. I am very sorry that I do not read to suit my friend from New York. I wish I had the pleasant and resonant voice that I often hear from him, but I can not compete in this respect with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I would like to ask if the dropping of the voice is a part of the foreign system of education?

Mr. GOULDEN. When you do not want to be heard. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair thinks that every investigation authorized in the amendment is clearly within the scope of the organic act creating a Bureau of Education, and overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by inserting, after the words "rural education," the words "industrial education."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, as amended.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment and the attitude of the committee at the present time is a very good illustration of the effect of a small lobby throughout the country. I suppose every Member of this House has received a letter or telegram, or letters and telegrams, from certain educational gentlemen or institutions in his district asking him to support this proposition, all the result of just a little educational association organized a few years ago, unwilling now to longer bear the burdens and wishing to transfer them to the General Government. That association sends out a hurry call to various educators throughout the country, who, without any knowledge of the subject whatever, repeat, parrot like, the information which is furnished to them by the secretary or somebody else connected with the educational association, and get various Members on the floor of the House very active upon the subject. Everybody naturally says, "Well, yes, I have been asked to do this, and therefore I am going to do it."

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Why, if it is a pertinent question I will.

Mr. PARSONS. Was not a resolution passed at a meeting of the National Educational Association favoring an appropriation of \$75,000 for these objects, and also a resolution passed at a meeting of the Southern States Superintendents' Association?

Mr. MANN. That is just what I was calling attention to. That was not a pertinent question. I did not even need the gentleman's information. I was just trying to call the attention of the House to the fact that because an educational association created by Congress, through its secretary, has passed a resolution favoring such a thing we must therefore be impurported to do it. That is the way it is usually done. It is asking now to transfer its burden from its shoulders to the shoulders of the General Government, and here we are met with requests from all over the country because these resolutions have been passed by these two associations. I presume they are in identically the same language, or close to it, probably because the secretary of one association wrote to the secretary of the other association and said that he would like to have the matter passed in that way. We are all familiar with the methods by which these things are done, and every Member here having received a request and having written to the man who requested it, under the belief that the subject would never be before the House, that if it did come before the House he would support it [laughter]; every Member now feels under an obligation to do that. I have had the same request from some friends of mine urging and insisting that that should be done, because that is the form of the letter they take. They are all in the same form practically that came to me, and I presume that those that came to others are in the same form—originally provided by the ingenious person, whoever he may be, and I am not familiar with him, who had charge of the National Educational Association. And because of all that it is proposed to the Government upon propositions without consideration which will involve the expenditure of millions of dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Does not the gentleman believe that it is a matter for congratulation of the House and the country that public-spirited citizens throughout the country will organize themselves into associations for the promotion of a cause so eminently appropriate and just as this?

Mr. MANN. Oh, that is not a pertinent question either. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. The gentleman remains the sole judge of pertinency in this case.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PARSONS. Without qualification?

Mr. MANN. I will if I have the time, but I do not want all of my time taken up.

Mr. PARSONS. Was not this matter discussed, not simply resolutions passed, but discussed at considerable length, both at the last meeting of the National Educational Association and at the meeting of the Southern Superintendents' Association?

Mr. MANN. Now, I do not wish to be put in any false attitude. I am not criticizing the National Educational Association or the Southern Superintendents' Association, whatever the title may be. I am talking about the effect upon Members of Congress, because they receive a letter from somebody in their district where the man writing knew nothing about the subject of the letter he was writing and the Member of Congress receiving the letter knew perhaps a precious little more. I think the gentleman from New York has studied the subject, but I do

not think anybody else in the House has to any extent, and I wish the gentleman from New York were going to be in the next House in order that he might prosecute his endeavors. But if we engage upon this enterprise, talk about this work being done by one individual, one specialist; it means a specialist in charge of a new division of the Government in each case. You have various specialists in the Bureau of Education now, who receive much less than \$3,000 salary, who have charge of quite a bunch of work in the office, with men under them, and if you undertake to say that the National Government shall develop the question of industrial education or of school hygiene or of rural education, it means the building up of a new division in each branch in this office of the Commissioner of Education. They have been seeking for this power for years.

The office of the Commissioner of Education was created years ago. There was nothing for it to do and they hunted around until they got to the raising of reindeer in Alaska, and the principal good work which has been done by that office since it was created was in reference to raising reindeer in Alaska. I suppose that is a proper subject of education.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended for five minutes more.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment to the amendment, to strike out the word "nine" and insert the word "twenty."

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that that amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is to perfect an amendment, and the Chair thinks it is in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word in reference to this matter to the Committee of the Whole House. In the first place, I have not been fortunate enough to receive any letters, such as indicated by the gentleman from Illinois, from anyone in my district on this subject, and I rather regret to say it. I am sorry to say that there was no one in my district who was appealed to or who took sufficient interest in this matter to write me about it. Neither do I think it is a subject for harsh criticism that men, having the public good at heart, should organize themselves into a voluntary association for the promotion of a great educational good like this and then appeal to Members of the House to support it. It seems to me this is a rather new criticism of public spirit in this country. Now, I have taken, in a very modest way, a great interest in this matter of elemental public-school education, especially in the rural districts. Out of all of the children of this country who attend school some 50 per cent of them are educated in the small country and village schools, and out of that 50 per cent there is not 5 per cent of them who ever go to school beyond the primary grades. What is the result? It is that nearly half of all the children that are educated in this country receive the whole of their education in the country schoolhouse; and we have this unfortunate, as I believe greatly unfortunate, situation, that there is absolutely no material difference, in at least nine out of every 10 of the States, in the education of boys and girls in the cities and in the country. In other words, the children born of parents on the farm, children of tenants and small farmers throughout the country, get an education just exactly as if they were going to live in the town, instead of being educated with a view to their probable life in the country.

I do believe that there is nothing more fundamentally essential to-day to the wholesome life of this Nation than the correction of that evil. In other words, that children in the country ought to be educated for the country; that boys should be taught something about agriculture and farm life, and that girls should be taught something about domestic science, to prepare them for being housewives in the country. And so I do believe that, whether this office of education has heretofore accomplished anything of good or not, here is a line of work which can be done in a centralized place, a place where the small amount of money required, in comparison with the amount of money which we waste, as I believe, in other things, military, naval, and expenses of that sort, can certainly be justly and wisely expended along the lines indicated by this amendment. And so I hope, instead of giving to this office for this work \$9,000, we will increase it to \$20,000. But give it some appropriation, which I hope will be the opening door to larger appropriations along lines so much to be desired in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with all the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said with respect to a centralized organization for the purpose of taking under its

jurisdiction the educational systems of the various States for the purpose of improving them, and also for the purpose of giving to them uniformity.

Mr. Chairman, there is a more serious proposition involved here than the mere question of improving the educational systems of the States. Under what function of our Federal Government do we propose to take over the supervision of the educational systems of the various States of our Union? This is but the entering wedge. We all know that there has been going on for a number of years throughout this country an agitation in favor of a department of education—a new department—to take charge generally of supervising and controlling the schools and our State educational systems.

In 1867 Congress created a department of education, and in the following year, 1868, it repealed the law creating that department, leaving merely a Bureau of Education, with the limited functions prescribed in the act of 1868, which is now a part of the Revised Statutes.

I consented in committee to the appropriation of two of these positions, one a specialist on higher education, that we have had heretofore, but I do not believe that we are justified in going further. I personally do not believe we are justified in going as far as providing for these three, because there is an evident purpose behind all this to shirk the responsibility and discharge functions which belong to the States to perform, and unload upon the Federal Government ultimately the supervision and control of our educational systems in order that the States may avoid the expense incident to the exercise of that function.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing connected with our Government that is dearer to the people than the immediate control of their schools and their educational systems. If our schools are inefficient, if our school systems are defective, it is not the fault of Congress nor of the General Government. It is the fault of the States themselves. Let the States, therefore, correct these things themselves. When the Federal Government takes over that control and supervision, and when the children in municipalities and in communities are under the supervision of Federal inspectors appointed by some Federal authority not taken from the body of the people as the teachers are now, when those in charge of the public schools are not selected by the vote of the people in the local community, then the people will discover that they have surrendered one of their most important rights—the right of local self-government in respect to the education of their children, and they will then realize their mistake. This proposition is merely the entering wedge, and that is one reason why I have heretofore opposed going beyond the letter of the statute which created the Bureau of Education and defines its function, which is merely to collect statistical information regarding the progress of education in the several States for dissemination throughout the United States. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that this proposition ought to be defeated, now that it has been enlarged as it has, for that reason. There is no function of our Government that authorizes Congress to appropriate money or to authorize activities on the part of any bureau of education that will in any way infringe upon the right of the States, and when this demand comes, as it does, from the Educational Association and from the superintendents of the States, it comes merely because they seek to unload onto the Federal Government the expense of exercising the functions and rights which belong exclusively to the States to perform.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized for just a moment. Have I any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no time remaining. Of course, he may proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes, in which to reply to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this to the members of the committee in behalf of the general proposition we are considering: The gentleman from Minnesota asks a question which it is exceedingly difficult for any man to answer, for it would be hard for him or anyone else to define clearly and exclusively the difference in matters of this sort as to what part of the work shall be under State and what under national supervision. But I defy the gentleman from Minnesota or any other Member of the House to frame a definition in regard to the subject that would exclude the work contemplated by this amendment and include the work done by the Department of Agriculture. When we had the question of the

Investigation of mine accidents before the House I gave this subject a very great deal of careful consideration, and found that the whole question had been very carefully and fully and with great ability discussed at the time the Department of Agriculture was created; and exactly the same complaint was then made—that it was proposed to take from the States the regulation and control of certain work which was strictly and entirely within their purview. I submit now to the gentleman from Minnesota that in this case we are not proposing any control whatever of the legislation of any State in dealing with the actual educational system of such State. We are simply calling on the General Government for the diffusion among the States of scientific and correct information on the subject of education, and this is essentially and strictly a legitimate business for the General Government.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman's suggestion is exactly in line with the question I was about to propound to the gentleman from Minnesota. I was going to ask the gentleman from Minnesota, Is it not a fact we appropriate annually for specialists in the Department of Agriculture—men who are experts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We also do in the Geological Survey, and I have no doubt in the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Every one of them, and they make reports to the department, and their reports are printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Exactly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The Department of Agriculture issues bulletins. They are sent to all the farmers in the country who desire them. It does not interfere with any law that any State may see fit to enact on the same subject, does it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not at all.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does not intend to control?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It does on the quarantine question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This is entirely different from the quarantine question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The gentleman is making a very good speech in my time. If it be true, as the gentleman from Minnesota would have us believe, in his just and proper disposition to guard the Treasury, as he does continually, warning us that this is but an "entering wedge" for something that is to be dreadfully expensive in one way and another, I appeal to members of the committee that on this question of appropriating \$20,000 for the collection of statistics throughout the country which may be valuable on rural and industrial education, we can not only well afford to do it, but I think that it ought to be increased very much over that amount. I think that at least this amount can be wisely, and I have no doubt will be wisely, expended for the purposes indicated. Certainly Congress can spend no money more advantageously than this. I appeal to members of the committee to increase the amount and pass the amendment.

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to controvert the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota, that the people back of this want the Federal Government to supervise or control education in the country. They do not. But they do want to have one agency through which they can gain information which may be needed by the different States and cities and to have that information so that it can be available to the different States and cities and school districts.

Anyone who has studied the school systems of the different countries knows that the thing which the gentleman from Minnesota says these people are after is a thing that the American educators everywhere criticize. What he says we want is the system they have in France. I say that you can not find an article by an American educator that does not criticize the French system, for the very reason that control and supervision there are centralized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 23, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 32, noes 26.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of building northeast corner Eighth and F Streets NW. for the Bureau of Mines, \$7,500.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 131, in line 11, strike out the letter "F" and insert in lieu thereof the letter "G."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a formal amendment.

Several gentlemen have asked me how long it is the intention of the committee to proceed this afternoon. I will say that it is our purpose to conclude this department in the bill and then to move that the committee rise.

Mr. MANN. That is, until you get to the Post Office Department.

Mr. GILLETT. Until we get to the Post Office Department. The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. GILLETT was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds is authorized and directed, within 60 days after the passage of this act, to invite proposals for, and dispose of to the highest bidder therefor, all of the Patent Office models now stored in the basement of the House Office Building, and after paying the necessary expenses incurred hereunder out of the proceeds of such disposal he shall cover the balance thereof into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I make a point of order against that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. GILLETT. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I ask unanimous consent to extend a few remarks in the RECORD on this point and to insert a letter which I have received from a constituent of mine on the subject.

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

Mr. MANN. How can the gentleman extend remarks when he has already stricken out the item on a point of order?

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I wish to state my reasons for making the point of order.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman made his point of order, and thereby cut off everybody else from discussing the matter. Now he asks that he be permitted to discuss it himself. However, I will not object.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I did not want to take up the time of the committee.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman made his point of order and prevented anybody from explaining it, but now he asks to discuss it himself.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Does the gentleman from Illinois want to discuss it?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman might have asked that question before.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman from New York might have reserved his point of order.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. GILLETT. But the point has been made and the item stricken out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I made the point of order against this paragraph and insisted on it, not to be technical, but because in my judgment it would be a mistake to sell or destroy these old models. The last century was the inventive age along the line of mechanics. These old and dust-covered models represent countless hours of time and toil and thought of the best and most useful inventors who ever lived in any period of the world's history. They also represent the crude conceptions and first ideas of mechanical appliances and instruments, which have been improved upon and developed from time to time into our present highly organized system of industrial machinery. In many instances the model itself gives a clearer idea of the invention than it is possible to express on paper by drawings and specifications. Frequently judges and referees insist on examining the original models, and they are of much assistance in the correct and equitable determination of closely contested patent cases.

If they were of no actual use or benefit except as curiosities they should be carefully preserved. It will not cost much. They are not now encumbering the Patent Office. They have been packed up in large wooden boxes, like coarse coffins, and

are stored away in the cellar of the House Office Building. There they are safe from fire and no rent must be paid for their storage. The Government should, and will in the near future, erect several large administration buildings, in the cellars of which will be plenty of room for the storage of these models and other kinds of property which should be perpetually preserved. Little or nothing could be realized from their sale, perhaps not enough to pay the expenses. If they are of any value now or in the future to any person or institution, they are of value to the Government and to the people at large. They should not be broken up into kindling wood and old junk. Sentiment alone should protect and preserve them.

I wish to insert in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, a letter received this morning from Mr. William Allen Dyer, vice president and general manager of the Smith Premier Typewriter Co., of Syracuse, N. Y., which in my judgment gives good and sufficient reasons why these old models should not be sold or destroyed. The following is a copy of that letter:

THE SMITH PREMIER TYPEWRITER CO.,  
Syracuse, N. Y., January 4, 1911.

Hon. M. E. DRISCOLL, Syracuse, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. DRISCOLL: In further reference to the matter of the destruction of the old patent models, as I understand it, these models are now boxed and stored in the basement of the House Office Building, there being in the neighborhood of 2,200 boxes, each containing a number of models. To the best of our knowledge it would seem that Mr. Elliott Woods, Architect of the Capitol, is in a considerable degree responsible for the suggested sale of the models, his object being to get them out of the building, because they are in the way and occupy space wanted for something else.

These models possess very great value as evidence of what the patentees invented and disclosed, and it is frequently the case that points which are obscure in the drawings and descriptions are made clear by reference to these models. It is a common thing for the models themselves to be sent, in the care of a proper custodian, to the courts throughout the country for use in patent suits. Our own attorneys have frequently caused models to be sent in this way from this collection, and there are probably now 10 or a dozen models which, either themselves or by certified copies made under the supervision of the Patent Office, are introduced in evidence in pending suits at the present time.

Although models are no longer required to be filed with applications, they were at the time these old models were filed. The courts have repeatedly held that any point which is doubtful or ambiguous may be cleared up by the model, and have repeatedly said that the model is readily understood by them, whereas drawings are not readily understood by the average court, and when any specifications or drawings are ambiguous amendments have been permitted to be made in accordance with the models, drawings, or descriptions, according as one or the other contained the matter sought to be introduced. The models are, therefore, in the judgment of many, just as much a part of the record of each of those cases as the drawings themselves, and the destruction of these models or the taking of them out of the custody of the Patent Office would seem to be the destruction of existing records and a violation of the provision in the statute that these models shall be preserved.

It is probably extremely doubtful whether the sale of the entire lot of these models would pay the expense of conducting a sale, even should such a sale be proper. We believe that in a previous agitation of this subject special examiners of the Patent Office reported that the models should be retained. Our attorney suggests that we may find some literature on this subject, including the report noted, in a document entitled "Legislative, etc., appropriation bill; statements before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, consisting of Senators CULLOM (chairman), WARREN, WETMORE, TELLER, and DANIEL, on the bill (H. R. 21574) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes." This document, we understand, you can readily obtain from either the House or Senate document room, and the particular matter in question will be found at pages 39 to 58, inclusive.

May I suggest that you make every effort in our behalf that the models be retained in the old building of the National Museum or the new National Museum Building, or in some other place where they may be properly preserved and displayed?

Thanking you very kindly in advance, I beg to remain,

Yours, very truly,

THE SMITH PREMIER TYPEWRITER CO.,  
W. A. DYER, General Manager.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor general of the Territory of Arizona, \$2,500; and for the clerks in his office, \$13,000; in all, \$15,500.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I reserve a point of order on that paragraph. I should like to inquire if this is to increase the salary of the surveyor general from \$2,000 to \$2,500.

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. GILLET. It is not.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. There are no increases in this?

Mr. GILLET. There are in one or two cases, but not in this instance.

Mr. MANN. There are no increases of salaries on this page.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

That no expenses chargeable to the foregoing appropriations for clerk hire and incidental expenses, in the offices of the surveyors general, shall be incurred by the respective surveyors general in the conduct of said offices, except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. GILLET. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, H. R. 29360, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted—

To Mr. BURLISON, for five days, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Texas, for 10 days, on account of important business.

#### LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS—JOHN A. WALDEN.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. Moss, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John A. Walden, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### WARREN C. BEACH.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to withhold his motion for a moment.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. GILLET. I will.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote of yesterday by which the House concurred in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole to strike out the enacting clause of the bill (S. 1028) for the relief of Capt. Warren C. Beach.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York moves to reconsider the vote by which the House concurred in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House in striking out the enacting clause of Senate bill 1028.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman desires only to enter the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman enters the motion.

Mr. SULZER. Yes; and I should like to have the bill take its usual place on the calendar.

Mr. MANN. It would come up for reconsideration on Private Calendar day, I take it.

The SPEAKER. That is correct, unless the House, by unanimous consent, should agree to the motion.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill now take its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The proper way is for the gentleman to ask unanimous consent to take up the motion at this time to reconsider.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from New York that if he enters his motion now it will be in order whenever the House goes into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and if the House then reconsiders it, it takes its place on the calendar for consideration or for disposition without taking its place on the calendar. I have no objection to its going back on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to consider the motion to reconsider at this time.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to take it up when the time comes. Let the gentleman from New York enter his motion now, and we can dispose of it when we go into Committee of the Whole on private bills. The gentleman will lose no rights by that.

Mr. SULZER. It will only take a minute to do it now, and I want the bill to be placed on the calendar now.

Mr. MANN. I will take no advantage of the gentleman, but it seems to me that we ought not to take it up now.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Illinois to say to me to-day that he would not object.

Mr. MANN. I am not objecting to the gentleman's entering his motion to reconsider, and probably could not make an objection, anyway. But at the time I said to the gentleman I would not object I understood that the motion to reconsider had been made and laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The motion to reconsider has been entered. It would be in order to consider it only on Friday, when the bill itself would be in order; but the gentleman, as the Chair understands, desires unanimous consent to consider the motion to reconsider at this time.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take any advantage of the gentleman from New York, who happened to be absent when the bill was up in the House. I am opposed to the bill, and if the House by unanimous consent reconsiders it, it would seem to have put the House on record as in favor of the proposition.

Mr. SULZER. Not at all. The bill would then take its place on the calendar; that is all.

Mr. MANN. If the motion to reconsider should prevail, of course, it is before the House.

The SPEAKER. Only for nonconcurrency, if that motion should be made, and not upon the merits of the bill.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from New York that it is not possible to put the bill back where it was. The Committee of the Whole reported this bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. That recommendation was concurred in by the House. Now, if the motion to reconsider prevails, the question before the House is whether it will concur in the recommendation of the committee to strike out the enacting clause. But if the gentleman waits until the House is in session on private-bill day and then his motion to nonconcur prevails, it goes back to the Committee of the Whole for further report.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, if my motion prevails, it simply restores the bill to its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. No; one more step would be necessary, namely, will the House concur in the recommendation? And if the House refuses to concur in the recommendation, it would then go to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULZER. Quite right; and of course I shall make that motion.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I happened to make the motion in the Committee of the Whole to strike out the enacting clause. I think no one wishes to take advantage of the gentleman from New York, and I ask unanimous consent that all proceedings in regard to this bill be vacated, both in the House and in Committee of the Whole, if that is possible, and that it be restored to the calendar.

The SPEAKER. It occurs to the Chair that the object which the gentleman now seeks to accomplish would be better obtained in the ordinary parliamentary way.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from New York will lose no rights by pursuing the ordinary course.

The SPEAKER. Precisely. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from New York to ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered now and nonconcurring in. In other words, that the House refuse to concur in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole House to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. MANN. That puts the House on record as voting on the proposition.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from New York is asking unanimous consent.

Mr. SULZER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to reconsider the motion whereby the House concurred in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole and nonconcur in the action of the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to reconsider the motion whereby the House concurred in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole and that the House do nonconcur in that recommendation.

Mr. MANN. That leaves the bill before the House.

The SPEAKER. No; under the rule it would go to the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

#### IMPROVEMENTS IN POSTAL ORGANIZATION.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the insertion of an extract from the report of the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extract referred to is as follows:

#### IMPROVEMENTS IN ORGANIZATION AND METHODS.

Among the more important improvements that have been made in postal organization and methods during the present administration may be mentioned the following:

(1) The consolidation of the important divisions having charge, respectively, of the rural delivery and the star-route services in order to secure the development under one management of these two systems, thus preventing much duplication of service and making it possible to accomplish large economies without loss in efficiency.

(2) The consolidation under the chief inspector of the several groups of field agents of the department, thereby insuring better supervision and greater economy of time and travel.

(3) The abolishment of an accounting division in the department that duplicated to a large extent the work of the Auditor for the Post Office Department.

(4) The introduction in the department of the double-entry system of bookkeeping in order to provide a more businesslike method of accounting for the postal and money-order funds.

(5) The adoption of improved methods of accounting by which the surplus or deficiency in the postal revenues is approximately determined

within three weeks from the close of each quarter instead of three months thereafter on the completion of the audit of postmasters' accounts.

(6) The adoption of an accounting plan that insures the prompt deposit in the Treasury of postal funds not immediately required for disbursement at post offices, thus making available for use by the department several millions of dollars that, under the old practice, would be tied up in post offices.

(7) The introduction of a system of accounting that enables the department to make prompt adjustments of transfers between money-order and postal funds, thus rendering large sums of money more quickly available to meet postal needs.

(8) The adoption of the requirement that postmasters shall not make deposits of surplus postal funds until the amount due at the close of a depository period exceeds \$10, thus doing away with the expensive method of submitting separately innumerable smaller items.

(9) The adoption of the requirement that postmasters shall account for the "surplus revenue" derived from the sale singly and in odd lots of stamped envelopes and newspaper wrappers at prices higher than are charged the postmaster on the issue of such envelopes and wrappers in thousand lots, thus saving to the Government a considerable revenue not previously collected.

(10) The successful completion of an inquiry into the cost of handling and transporting mail of the several classes and of conducting the money-order, registry, and special-delivery services.

(11) The successful prosecution of an inquiry into the cost to the railroad companies of carrying the mails, the results of which will form a reliable basis for fixing rates of pay for railroad mail transportation.

(12) The completion of the readjustment of railroad mail pay on the basis of the average daily weights determined by dividing the weight of the mail by the whole number of days in the weighing period instead of the number of week days, as formerly, thereby reducing the cost of such service to the Government.

(13) The correction of an inconsistency in the rates of pay that had been fixed by law for carrying certain weights of mail on land-grant railroads, thus effecting a substantial saving to the Government.

(14) The adoption of a new form of contract for the transportation of mail by wagon and automobile in cities, under which compensation is placed on a mileage basis and regulated in accordance with the amount of service performed, thus making possible important economies.

(15) The provision for South American and West Indian mails received and dispatched at New York of a harbor mail steamer service similar to that now afforded trans-Atlantic mails.

(16) The adoption, by authority of law, of the plan of returning undeliverable second-class matter to the publishers and collecting postage thereon at the third-class rate.

(17) A reduction from 30 days to 5, 10, or 15 days, according to the circumstances, in the period during which undelivered mail is held before its return to senders who have not specified the time of holding.

(18) The discontinuance of the requirement that the postmaster issuing a money order shall mail a notice or "advice" thereof to the postmaster on whom it is drawn, a practice begun many years ago before the money order was perfected, and the abolishment of which will not only expedite the handling of the money-order business, but also greatly reduce its expenses.

(19) The adoption of a new form of money order, with a coupon which, when detached and filed in the paying office, forms an alphabetic record of payments, replacing at a much lower cost the file of advices formerly maintained.

(20) The omission from the money-order accounting forms of many items found to be unnecessary, thus reducing materially the work of preparing the accounts.

(21) The concentration of the money-order accounting work of city postal systems in the main offices, where it can be done more satisfactorily than at the small branches and stations.

(22) The extension to Mexico of the domestic or direct system of exchanging money orders, superseding the more cumbersome and expensive method of the international system.

(23) The abolishment of the special envelopes formerly used for inclosing registered articles while in transit, thereby effecting a saving of the cost of such envelopes and of the time consumed in sealing, addressing, and removing them.

(24) The omission of the post-card acknowledgment of the receipt of a registered article, unless requested by the sender, thereby saving in a large number of cases its cost and the time required to prepare it.

(25) A change in the methods of distributing registered mail whereby matter for distant States is dispatched in sacks and jackets under State labels to be sorted by railway postal clerks familiar with its distribution, thereby simplifying the work in the post office and expediting dispatch.

(26) The discontinuance of the manufacture of special registry transportation equipment and the authorization of the use for registered mail of the much lighter and less expensive ordinary equipment, thereby reducing the cost of manufacture and of transportation.

(27) The improvement of the facilities for exchanging registered mails by authorizing the dispatch of registered pouches and sacks to all first and second class offices whenever there is sufficient mail to warrant it, instead of requiring departmental authority for exchanges, thus greatly expediting the movement of such mails.

(28) The use of the incoming registry bills or invoices as records of delivery, instead of making additional records in detail, as formerly, thus saving a large amount of time and labor.

(29) The amendment of the postal regulations so as to permit the delivery of registered mail to any member of the addressee's family, or to any of his clerical employees, instead of only to the addressee or on his written order, and to permit also that it may be forwarded on the written order of any person authorized to receive it, instead of on the written order only of the addressee, thus removing a source of irritation to the public and relieving the department of the expense of repeated attempts at delivery.

(30) The adoption of measures that have effected a material reduction in the amount of official registered mail sent free, with a corresponding decrease in the expenses of the registry system.

(31) The reorganization of the working forces in city post offices by consolidating under one superintendent the divisions that have to do with the handling of the mails, and under another superintendent the divisions that have charge of financial matters, thus permitting a more effective utilization of the employees concerned.

(32) The extension of the classified civil service to assistant postmasters and hitherto unclassified clerks in post offices of the first and second classes.

(33) The successful employment of a uniform system of efficiency records as a basis for the promotion of post-office clerks and city letter carriers.

(34) The adoption of a plan for a better utilization of the time of city letter carriers under the decision of the Court of Claims permitting them to work more than 8 hours a day if the total number of hours a week does not exceed 48, a decision that enables the department to require of the carriers that they complete their closing deliveries or collections instead of stopping work, as hitherto, whenever the 8-hour limit finds them with a route uncompleted.

(35) The introduction of the plan of having the routes of carriers on vacation served by the carriers on adjoining routes whose time is not fully occupied owing to the usual falling off in the amount of mail for city residential districts during the summer season, thus rendering unnecessary in many cases the employment of substitutes and thereby accomplishing important savings.

(36) A reduction in the number of substitute letter carriers appointed at city offices, so as to render this line of employment more attractive because of the shorter period during which substitutes are obliged to wait for regular appointments.

(37) The adoption of the policy that suitable receptacles for mail must be provided at the entrances of residences and offices as one of the conditions required for the extension of City Delivery Service by carrier.

(38) A decided reduction in the amount of Sunday and holiday service required of post-office clerks and city letter carriers.

(39) The adoption of a plan for equalizing the amount of work required of railway postal clerks.

(40) The granting of allowances to railway postal clerks to aid in meeting their expenses for subsistence while traveling.

(41) The adoption in several large cities of the plan of locating the principal post-office building at the main railway station, in order to secure a more expeditious handling of the incoming and outgoing mails.

(42) The planning and equipment of the workrooms of large post offices in course of construction by a committee of postal experts chosen to standardize the equipment by selecting the best types for general use throughout the service.

(43) The enforcement of more rigid requirements with respect to the safety and the sanitary condition of railway post-office cars in the interest of the health and security of railway mail clerks.

(44) The adoption of an improved mail pouch of a lighter type that will make possible an important saving in the cost of transportation.

(45) The establishment in Chicago of a branch of the department's shop for repairing mail bags, thus saving the expense of shipping large numbers of damaged bags from the West to Washington.

(46) The adoption of an improved automatic catching and delivering device for the receipt and dispatch of mails on moving trains.

(47) The adoption of a new postal card printed on a finer and more expensive paper, with a better writing surface, to replace the cheaper and highly unsatisfactory cards previously supplied.

(48) A revision of the larger printed forms used in the postal service for various records and their reduction to a smaller size suitable for typewriting on standard machines, thus rendering unnecessary the further utilization of the wide-carriage typewriters previously supplied at great expense.

(49) The adoption of a more effective method in cases that involve the fraudulent use of the mails by proceeding immediately to the arrest and prosecution of offenders, instead of merely issuing so-called "fraud orders" to withhold the delivery of their mail.

(50) The formulation of detailed plans for the conduct of the postal-savings system authorized at the last session of Congress by the act of June 25, 1910, and to be put into operation on January 1, 1911.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, January 9, 1911, at 12 o'clock.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the claims of the State of Oregon for equipment of volunteer troops (H. Doc. No. 1265); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a schedule of papers, documents, etc., no longer needed in the service of the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 1266); to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 259) providing for the construction in the navy yards of two revenue cutters heretofore authorized, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1862), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11593) authorizing the building of a dam across the

Savannah River at Cherokee Shoals, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1863), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15429) extending the provisions of the act approved March 10, 1908, entitled "An act granting to A. J. Smith and his associates, their successors and assigns, authority to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across the Choctawhatchee River about one-eighth of a mile below or west of the bridge across said river on the road known as the Newton and Ozark public road, in Dale County, in the State of Alabama, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of dams across navigable waters,'" approved June 21, 1906, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1864), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 15664) permitting the building of a dam across Rock River near Byron, Ill., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1865), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOWNSEND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 26580) to extend the time for commencing the construction and for the completion of a dam across the St. Joseph River near Mottville, St. Joseph County, Mich., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1866), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6693) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1867), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 28624) authorizing the town of Blackberry to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in Itasca County, Minn., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1868), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, adverse reports were delivered to the Clerk and laid on the table, as follows:

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13989) for the relief of Charles Steer, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1859), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19988) for the relief of Reece Boan Stump, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1860), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

Mr. CANDLER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 26198) for the relief of H. E. Spoonemore, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1861), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13190) to reopen and adjust the accounts for services of Brig. Gen. Thomas Ward, United States Army, retired, and Maj. William Silvey, United States Army, deceased; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 29235) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Ray; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 30333) granting a pension to John W. McKissick; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 30360) granting an increase of pension to John E. Jones; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Mr. MANN, by request, introduced bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 30775) putting cotton cloth of any sort valued at not over 9 cents per square yard imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30776) putting cattle, swine, horses, mules, and sheep imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30777) putting timber and lumber, hewn, sided, squared, or sawed (not planed or finished) imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30778) putting barley, buckwheat, corn or maize, oats, rice, rye, and wheat imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30779) putting barley malt, corn meal, macaroni, vermicelli, oatmeal, rolled oats, and biscuits imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30780) putting butter, cheese, and milk imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30781) putting beans, beets, onions, peas, and potatoes imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30782) putting eggs imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30783) putting hay, straw, and flax straw imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30784) putting hops imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30785) putting seeds of beet, carrot, radish, turnip, rutabaga, cabbage, collard, kale, kohlrabi, eggplant, and pepper imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30786) putting fish in all forms and preparations imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30787) putting meats and poultry of all kinds imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30788) putting grain, buff, split, rough, and sole leather; boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value from cattle hides or cattle skins; and harness, saddles, and saddlery made wholly or in chief value of leather imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30789) putting salt imported into the United States on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 30790) to define the hours of labor of certain employees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 30791) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 30792) to protect American trade and American shipping from foreign monopolies; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 30793) to authorize the Fargo & Moorhead Street Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 30794) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 30795) authorizing the disposition of water under the reclamation act for commercial and other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 30796) to authorize the Controller Railway & Navigation Co. to construct two bridges across the Bering River in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 30797) as to evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30798) to authorize the issuance of search warrants for stolen or misappropriated property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 30799) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," approved June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: A bill (H. R. 30800) granting a pension to Fred J. Bruce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30801) granting an increase of pension to Emil Bock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30802) granting leave to the executors or administrators of the estate of Isadore Termini, deceased, to commence an action against the United States of America for the alleged wrongful act in causing his death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30803) for the relief of Alexander W. Hoffman; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 30804) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30805) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Schickedantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30806) granting an increase of pension to Miles C. Judson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30807) granting an increase of pension to Nehemiah C. Hilford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30808) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Grundy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30809) granting an increase of pension to John Lutz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 30810) to extend the provisions of the act of February 24, 1897, to John T. Nagle, late assistant surgeon of the One hundred and ninety-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 30811) for the relief of William C. Corbett; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY: A bill (H. R. 30812) granting an increase of pension to John McHugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30813) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Parsels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30814) granting an increase of pension to Martin C. Rosencrantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 30815) granting an increase of pension to William Murdock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30816) for the relief of the Turner Produce Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 30817) to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Arizona Territory, to apply the proceeds derived from the sale of its sewer bonds, to the amount of \$60,000, for the purchase of the sewer system of the Phoenix Sewer & Drainage Co., a corporation; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 30818) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Maxberry, alias Samuel Logan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAPRON: A bill (H. R. 30819) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Fairbanks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30820) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30821) granting an increase of pension to Emily Fish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30822) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Bliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30823) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Weld; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30824) granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30825) granting an increase of pension to Martha White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY: A bill (H. R. 30826) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. Fanning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.



By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 30827) granting an increase of pension to William H. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 30828) granting a pension to James L. Herod; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 30829) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 30830) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30831) granting a pension to Jessie D. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30832) granting an increase of pension to Henri B. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 30833) granting an increase of pension to William Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30834) granting an increase of pension to A. C. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30835) granting an increase of pension to Margaret W. Ide; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30836) granting a pension to Evogene Birney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 30837) granting a pension to Melinda E. Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30838) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ann Duffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 30839) granting a pension to Albert Truffner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30840) granting an increase of pension to Peter J. Shanley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANNA: A bill (H. R. 30841) granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Fridiger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 30842) granting an increase of pension to John Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30843) granting an increase of pension to Austin W. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 30844) granting an increase of pension to Abner L. Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 30845) granting an increase of pension to James Salsgiver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30846) granting an increase of pension to George W. Mogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30847) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Klingensmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30848) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Stitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 30849) granting an increase of pension to Harvey W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30850) granting an increase of pension to Henry Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30851) granting an increase of pension to Andre C. Chamberlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30852) granting an increase of pension to William H. Livingston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUNDIN: A bill (H. R. 30853) granting a pension to Annie B. Schubert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 30854) to correct the military record of Arthur Wood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MALBY: A bill (H. R. 30855) granting an increase of pension to Wilson F. Ball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30856) granting an increase of pension to John V. R. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30857) granting an increase of pension to Edmund Doran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30858) granting an increase of pension to Edward Sayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30859) granting a pension to Catherine E. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30860) for the relief of Maxim Lizette; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASSEY: A bill (H. R. 30861) to correct the military record of Owen C. Gilliland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30862) to correct the military record of Thomas Earls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 30863) granting an increase of pension to Louise S. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 30864) granting an increase of pension to John F. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOXLEY: A bill (H. R. 30865) granting a pension to Margaret J. Brennan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30866) granting a pension to Alfred J. Parsons; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 30867) for the relief of William H. Walsh; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OLMSTED: A bill (H. R. 30868) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Eisenhower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30869) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Engle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30870) granting a pension to Mary M. Shambaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30871) to correct the military record of William Irving; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 30872) granting an increase of pension to Oscar L. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30873) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 30874) granting an increase of pension to William Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30875) granting an increase of pension to William Manely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30876) granting a pension to Cassie Zimmerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 30877) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in case of William E. Floyd, administrator of Asa Crow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 30878) granting an increase of pension to John H. Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30879) granting an increase of pension to Winfield S. Creighton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 30880) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Rowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30881) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Dechanet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30882) granting an increase of pension to S. S. Tenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: A bill (H. R. 30883) granting a pension to Martin Probst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30884) granting an increase of pension to Elias McQuay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 30885) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Rhine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER of New York: Petition of Central Labor Union of Lancaster, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Williamsville (N. Y.) Business Association, for issuance of permit to Erie & Ontario Sanitary Canal for use of water from Lake Erie and Niagara River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ANDERSON: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Joseph Diedler, William Hill, William Held, A. H. Ash, John F. Stallsmith, Charles S. Beman, Charles E. Campbell, Edward Cassidy, George Kross, Lafayette Johnston, Joshua B. Davis, John G. Reynolds, Uriah Huber, David Henderson, Nicholas B. Querrin, Harris W. Conner, John Redd, Charles E. Ely, Pat Driscoll, James Hockett, Dr. Berry W. Mercer, and Henry Roeder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Sides & Needler, of Van Wert, Ohio, against a local parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Mertzler & Doak, merchants, of West Lafayette, Ohio, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of George Brenizer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Petition of Modern Brotherhood of America, Evergreen Lodge, No. 1306, favoring the

Dodds bill (H. R. 22239); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Aberdeen Commercial Club, favoring San Francisco as site of Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BURLISON: Petitions of Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Houston Lodge, No. 697; Coopers' International Union of Alton, Ill.; Quincy (Ill.) Typographical Union; American Federation of Musicians, of Ardmore, Okla.; Pride Lodge, No. 502, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of Louisville, Ky.; Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, No. 777, of Billings, Mont.; Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, Lake Shore Lodge, of Ashtabula, Ohio; Local No. 335, Metal Polishers and Brass Workers, of Elkhart, Ind.; Stove Mounters' International Union, of Rochester, N. Y.; Iron City Lodge, No. 179, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Pittsburg, Pa.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, No. 43, of Meadville, Pa.; Cigar Makers' International Union of America, Local No. 242, of York, Pa.; Hat Makers' Association of South Norwalk, Conn.; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, of Springfield, Mo.; Labor Assembly of Logansport, Ind.; Allied Printing Trades Council of Washington, D. C., for the Burleson bill, repealing the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petitions of Rhode Island Retail Grocers and Maritime Association, relative to taxation and sale of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of board of directors of the Society for the Relief and Control of Tuberculosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of board of aldermen of Newport, R. I.; Rhode Island Business Men's Association; T. G. Hazard, Stephen F. Browning, and other citizens of Narragansett Pier; Milton Dickworth and other citizens of Parolina, R. I.; E. Lamphear and other masters, shipowners, and others interested in maritime affairs, for bill to promote efficiency of the Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of the Town Council of Westerly and Middletown, R. I.; Rhode Island Bar Association; committee on morals of the Federation of Churches and Christian Workers of Rhode Island; and the superintendent of public schools of Warwick, R. I., favoring the Life-Saving Service bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, against establishment of a criminal reformatory near Mount Vernon; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of T. G. Hayard, jr., Nathaniel T. Bacon, and others, of Peace Dale, R. I., against increase of pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Martha White, Emily Fish, Stephen D. Smith, Mary A. Clark, and Catherine Fairbanks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Communications from merchants and citizens of the fourth congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against the establishment of a parcels-post system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Wisconsin, objecting to Senate bill 6055; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, letter from Alfred Winder, in support of bill granting pensions to the military telegraph operators of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY: Petition of Forest City Post, No. 556, Grand Army of the Republic, of Cleveland, Ohio, for amendment of age pension act; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petition of citizens of twenty-fourth Illinois congressional district, against a rural parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of Herman Wickford and other citizens of Le Sueur, Minn., and business men of Glencoe, Minn., against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of A. G. Kegler and six others, of Bellevue, Iowa, against a local rural parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of California Club, favoring investigation of causes of tuberculosis, typhoid fever, and other diseases originating in dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of California Division Farmers' Educational and Protective Union, against the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. L. Beal and citizens of Red Bluff, Cal., against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, against the Tou Velle bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, for fortifying harbor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, favoring embassy buildings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Oakland Chamber of Commerce and the Associated Chamber of Commerce, for improvement of the channel at and to Mare Island Navy Yard; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Walla Walla Trades and Labor Council, relative to disposition of the Fort Walla Walla tract of land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Seward Commercial Club, requesting remedial legislation as to Alaska coal lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Walla Walla Trades and Labor Council, of Washington, relative to distribution of Fort Walla Walla tract of land; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, for legislation to prevent sale of liquor in the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Jessie D. Bennett, Henri B. Cole, and Amos C. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Ephriam Hommel, Charles S. Swineford, and Samuel De Armit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of J. E. Edmunds Co. and others, of Ottawa, Ill., and J. A. La Farge and others, of Yorkville, Ill.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Sunny Brook Distillery, for House bill 29466, the leakage bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. C. Jordan, of Ottawa, Ill., against the Tou Velle Bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. B. Robinson and others, of Wheaton, Ill., for House bill 17883; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Robert B. Duncan and others, citizens of the District of Columbia, against Senate bill 6065, for extension of Barry Place; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of W. G. Edens, of Chicago, Ill., favoring San Francisco as site of Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GARNER of Texas: Petition of citizens of Texas, against the establishment of a local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Omar A. Du Esler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of William B. Gish, Amos G. Mount, James S. Vincent, B. F. Brown, Josiah Bangher, and James W. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of D. V. Reed, of Slayton, and Seb. Zimmermann, of Mankato, Minn., against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the executive council of Minnesota State Federation of Labor, favoring use of Minnesota granite in construction of Federal building at Minneapolis; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of American Bar Association, asking for postponement of certain bill to abolish circuit courts of the United States; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Also, petition of the American Federation of Labor, favoring Federal supervision of boiler inspection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: Petition of numerous citizens of Iowa, against parcels-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of W. H. Morris and others, soldiers of the Civil War, citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring House bill 29346; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LATTA: Petition of numerous citizens of the third congressional district of Nebraska, against the parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petition of J. E. Cramer, of Pigeon, and A. Herdell and seven other business firms of Argyle, all of the State of Michigan, protesting against a local rural parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of Middle West Implement Dealers of Nebraska, against parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bills for relief of John F. Taylor and Emmer H. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Missouri: Petition of Post No. 461, Grand Army of the Republic, of Missouri, for volunteer officers' retired bill and granting pensions of \$30 per month to enlisted men; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLLS: Petition of Grange 899, Patrons of Husbandry, of Madisonville, Pa., for Senate bill 5842, oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Sarah M. King and Oscar L. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of N. J. Hudson and others, for the antifutures bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPERRY: Resolutions of the Elias Howe, jr., Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the Sulloway pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Texas, against a parcels-post law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of citizens of Washington, D. C., against extension of Barry Place; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of American Federation of Labor, favoring Federal inspection of locomotive boilers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Business League of America, favoring San Francisco as site of Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of Second Baptist Church, Columbus, Ohio, for the Burkett-Sims bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, January 9, 1911.

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

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated by M. C. Latta, Executive clerk.

### USELESS PAPERS IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of certain papers in that department which are not needed or useful in the transaction of the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest.

The communication, with the accompanying paper, will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] members of that committee on the part of the Senate.

### REGISTRATION OF ELECTORS IN ARIZONA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a letter from the secretary of the Territory of Arizona, together with a copy of a resolution adopted by the constitutional convention of that Territory, relative to the enactment of legislation authorizing a reregistration of the qualified electors of that Territory for the first election of State and county officers, members of the legislature, and Representatives in Congress, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed.

### EXPENDITURES IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the classified and detailed estimates of expenditures of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, together with reports of all expenditures under any appropriation for such service during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910, etc., which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

### BUREAU OF EQUIPMENT, NAVY DEPARTMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the distribution of the duties of the

Bureau of Equipment, Navy Department, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### ALABAMA INDIANS IN TEXAS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the result of an investigation into the conditions of the Alabama Indians in Texas, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

### GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co. for the fiscal year ended November 30, 1910 (S. Doc. No. 733), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

### FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

William A. Wroe *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 723);  
Robert M. Cannon, administrator of the estate of Alfred L. Shotwell, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 727);  
Newton C. Maney, administrator of the estate of James Maney, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 729);  
Aaron C. Dean *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 728);  
Victor E. De Georgis, administrator of the estate of Francis A. De Georgis, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 726);  
Gotlieb Feldmeyer *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 730);  
C. C. Jones, administrator of Thomas J. Jones, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 731);  
The Ladies' Ursuline Community, of Columbia, S. C., *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 735); and  
John W. King *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 732).  
The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### C. B. M'CLENNY *v.* THE UNITED STATES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and opinion filed by the court in the cause of C. B. McClenny *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 734), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### INCOME TAX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the governor of Texas, transmitting a certified copy of a joint resolution passed by the legislature of that State, ratifying the proposed income-tax amendment to the Constitution. The Chair is of the opinion that the communication should be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Secretary of the Senate, to be kept in his custody.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be placed on the files of the Senate and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, STATE OF TEXAS,  
Austin, January 3, 1911.

HON. JAMES S. SHERMAN,  
Vice President of the United States of America,  
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Pursuant to senate joint resolution No. 1, adopted by the thirty-first legislature of the State of Texas, at its third called session, and approved by me as governor on August 17, 1910, ratifying the proposed sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, I am inclosing you herewith copy of said resolution.

With assurances of my highest esteem, I am,

Very respectfully,

T. M. CAMPBELL, Governor of Texas.

### Senate joint resolution 1.

Joint resolution ratifying the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

Whereas both Houses of the Sixty-first Congress of the United States of America at its first session, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE XVI. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportion-