

Also, petition of Mrs. Allan McIntyre, corresponding secretary United States Daughters of 1812, Pasadena, Cal., favoring passage of House joint resolution 230; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of W. G. Fitzgerald, president Chamber of Commerce, Gilroy; C. N. White, business manager San Francisco Advertising Club; C. A. Bernhard, secretary Ukiah Farmers' Club (Inc.), Ukiah; J. H. Whitaker, secretary Board of Trade, Anaheim; Charles H. Roberts, secretary Chamber of Commerce, San Luis Obispo; and Walter G. Schmidt, Western Precipitation Co., Los Angeles, all in the State of California, favoring appropriation of \$300,000 for Yosemite Park, enlargement of Sequoia National Park, and creation of Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Edwin R. Snyder, commissioner State Board of Education, Sacramento; Edward Hyatt, superintendent State of California, office superintendent of public instruction, Sacramento; and L. Woodard, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, Campbell, all in the State of California, favoring passage of Smith-Hughes vocational-education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Paul A. Learned, president Cooks, Waiters, and Waitresses' Union, No. 673, San Bernardino; James A. Francis, president Church Federation of Los Angeles, Los Angeles; Julius Gabriel, Gabriel-Meyerfeld Co., San Francisco; John A. O'Connell, secretary Labor Council, San Francisco; and William C. Eddef, secretary Federated Trades Council, Sacramento, all in the State of California, protesting against House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John W. Mott, Retail Dealers' Credit Association, San Diego, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429—mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, favoring the passage of House bill 20080 and Senate bill 7857; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of James W. Cain, favoring a women's division in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Miss Sallie Mules and Electric Metallurgical Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Nooker Electro Gem Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Titanium Alloy Manufacturing Co., favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of president Niagara Falls Board of Trade, favoring diversion of waters of Niagara River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the mayor and common council of the city of Astoria, Oreg., urging appropriation by Congress for the purchase of a suitable post-office site and the erection of a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Messrs. F. M. Duff, F. H. Johnson, H. M. Cole, O. T. Patterson, Wesley A. Lowney, and W. S. Miller, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., with reference to the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh Crushed Steel Co. and Wolverine Supply & Manufacturing Co., of Pittsburgh, with reference to excise tax on net incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OAKEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Hartford, Conn., opposing the passage of mail-exclusion and prohibition bills pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Protest of E. La Montagne's Sons against House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, protest of Man-Suffrage Association of New York against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of National Temperance Union, of Boston, Mass., favoring national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of sundry citizens of the tenth Minnesota congressional district, favoring increase of rural mail carriers' salaries; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIMS: Petition of Baptist Sunday School, 90 people; Woman's Missionary Society, 18 people; Southern Methodist

Episcopal Sunday School, 125 people; Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, 75 people; Tennessee Training and Industrial School; Presbyterian Sunday School, 75 people; Baptist Church, 100 people; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 58 people; Woman's Club, 19 people; First Presbyterian Church, 85 people; Christian Church, 60 people; Christian Church Sunday School, 75 people; Young People's Union, 40 people; Aid Society, Presbyterian Church, 24 people; all of Huntington, Carroll County, Tenn., favoring a national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 19719, for granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: Petitions of Presbyterian Church, Londonderry; Congregational Sunday School, Hampton; St. John's Methodist Episcopal Church, Stafford; 27 voters, Rochester; all of New Hampshire, favoring a constitutional amendment providing for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of John Devoy Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, Roxbury, Mass., favoring warning American citizens that they take passage or employment on armed ships of belligerent nations at their own risk; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Bismarck (N. Dak.) postal clerks, for increase of pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the North Dakota Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, favoring exclusion of liquor advertising from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 26, 1917.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray that we may fully recognize the sacredness of our citizenship in a land built upon such boundless resources, such Divine ideals, such world-wide principles. Thou hast given to us to write the laws of a Christian Nation. We have not exhausted the treasure house of divine wisdom as Thou hast revealed to us Thy will in Thy word. In the fixing relation of these great principles to our national and social life we pray that we may be guided from day to day by Thy spirit, that the law of our land may be a transcript of the Divine mind. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Bankhead	Gallinger	Norris	Smoot
Beckham	Hardwick	Overman	Sterling
Borah	Hitchcock	Page	Thomas
Brady	Hollis	Pittman	Townsend
Bryan	Hughes	Poindexter	Vardaman
Catron	Johnson, Me.	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Chamberlain	Jones	Robinson	Warren
Colt	Kenyon	Shafroth	Watson
Culberson	Lane	Sheppard	Weeks
Cummins	McCumber	Sherman	Works
Curtis	McLean	Smith, Ga.	
Dillingham	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Md.	
Fletcher	Nelson	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GOBE] through illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of sickness, and that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent on account of sickness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] on account of illness in his family. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I was requested to announce that the following members of the Committee on Indian Affairs are detained in that committee, but if their presence is required for a quorum they will come into the Chamber:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr.

GRONNA), the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Sallie Berry Ennes, widow (remarried) of Arthur Berry, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 691);

Elizabeth A. Jennings, daughter of Aaron Bunnell, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 690); and

Edith M. Little, widow of Thomas J. Little, deceased, *v.* The United States (S. Doc. No. 689).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the granting of Federal permits or licenses for the sale of liquor as a beverage in prohibition States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Parent-Teachers' Association of the Johnson and Powell Schools, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide adequate appropriation for the support of the extension and development of the public library in the city of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the National Drug Trade Conference at its meeting held at Washington, D. C., January 16, 1917, favoring the adoption of certain changes in section 8 of the Harrison Antinarcotic Act, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of California and Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to exclude liquor advertisements from the mail, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of the Wyoming Wool Growers' Association, praying for an appropriation for the equipment and maintenance of a sheep experiment station in Fremont County, Idaho, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the senate of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, which I ask may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 8 (by Senator Kimball).

Whereas the people of Kansas have for many years enjoyed the great benefit and satisfaction resulting from the prohibition of the liquor traffic within the State of Kansas and strongly favor both State and National prohibition; and

Whereas the people of Kansas realize the good to humanity and to the people of the United States that will result from the adoption of national prohibition: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring therein). That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to fulfill its duty to the Nation by submitting to the people thereof at the earliest possible date an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and importation of alcoholic beverages in the United States, and to in the meantime enact such additional legislation as may be necessary to aid and assist the States having prohibitory laws to better enforce them; and be it further

Resolved. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States and to the Members of the United States Congress and Senate from the State of Kansas.

Mr. WATSON presented a petition of Black Creek Local Union, United Mine Workers of America, of Linton, Ind., praying for the placing of an embargo on food products, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Thomas J. Clark Branch, Friends of Irish Freedom, of Indianapolis, Ind., praying that the good offices of the United States be employed in the recognition of the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of the congregation of the Free Baptist Church of Waterbury Center, Vt., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of the Nonpartisan League of Newburg, N. Dak., remonstrating against any change

in second-class postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Nonpartisan League of Newburg, N. Dak., remonstrating against large appropriations being made for the Military and Naval Establishments, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Nonpartisan League of Newburg, N. Dak., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Texas, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 4 (by Mr. Bailey).

Whereas the decision of the United States Supreme Court in what is known as the Shreveport rate case gives the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to strike down a State-made rate, notwithstanding the fact that the State rate may be just and reasonable within itself; and

Whereas, if such is to remain the law, the right of a sovereign State to regulate its lines of railway transportation will be seriously crippled if not destroyed; and

Whereas the platform of the Republican Party, recently adopted at Chicago, contains a plank which boldly declares for the abolition of State railroad commissions: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Legislature of Texas, voicing the sentiment of the people of this State, is irrevocably in favor of the doctrine of the right of a State to regulate purely State commerce, and that we now here declare our steadfast opposition to any further encroachment by the Federal Government upon the rights of this State to regulate purely State commerce, and that our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Texas are earnestly requested to support and vote for any and every measure that has for its object the abridgment of the right of the Interstate Commerce Commission to further encroach upon the rights of a State, and for its further object the perpetuation of the right of a State to regulate purely State commerce and to fix and establish freight rates charged by railroad companies operative entirely within this State.

Resolved further. That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Indorsed: January 18, 1917.

Read and adopted.

JOHN D. MCCALL,
Secretary of the Senate.

In the house, January 18, 1917.

Received from the senate.

Read and adopted.

BOB BARKER,
Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have introduced a bill intended to cure the situation referred to in that resolution. The bill is pending before the Interstate Commerce Committee. A hearing was held on the bill at my request during the last session of Congress. So far, the committee has not taken any action on the bill. At the hearing representatives of the National Association of State Railroad Commissioners, members of State railroad commissions, including Hon. Earl Mayfield, railroad commissioner of Texas, and secretaries of several chambers of commerce of Texas cities, appeared and spoke. The city of Shreveport and the State of Louisiana were represented in opposition to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. CATRON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7601) for the relief of Caleb T. Holland, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 984) thereon.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7433) for the relief of Winfield S. Solomon, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 982) thereon.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 7598) for the relief of John H. Kidd, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 983) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. CATRON:

A bill (S. 8034) granting an increase of pension to John C. Daley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 8035) to amend section 4 of the act of September 6, 1916, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code, to fix the time when the annual terms of the Supreme Court shall commence, and, further, to define the jurisdiction of that court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 8036) to allow a pension of \$30 per month to Edward Marvin Carter, of Savannah, Ga., for loss of eye at military camp, Macon, Ga., on July 13, 1916, while serving in the United States Army; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 8037) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Davis;

A bill (S. 8038) granting an increase of pension to George R. Ashley;

A bill (S. 8039) granting an increase of pension to Susan Soehner; and

A bill (S. 8040) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Fraley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 8041) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. McCoy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 8042) granting a pension to Mrs. Thomas Kelly (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 8043) granting a pension to Ellen H. Russell (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 203) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1917; to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment providing that drop or local letters shall pay postage at the rate of 1 cent per ounce or a fraction thereof, including delivery at letter-carrying offices and on rural routes, intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the maintenance and education of children of lighthouse keepers for a period of three months in each year where there are no school facilities, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 to be expended under the direction of the Department of the Interior and the supervision of the National Park Service for constructive and conservational work in the newly created Sieur de Monts National Monument or Park, located on Mount Desert Island off the coast of Maine, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the public-buildings bill (H. R. 18994), which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES.

Mr. THOMAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 7066) to provide for the investigation of controversies affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS.

Mr. JONES. I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 330), as follows:

Resolved, That the Vice President be authorized and directed to appoint a committee of five Senators to consider what clerical help should be allowed Senators and Senate committees. Such committee is authorized to sit while the Senate is in session or in recess, and is instructed to consider and report to the Senate on or before December 15, 1917, what clerical assistance should be allowed Senators to do their individual official work and what help should be allowed the different Senate committees to do committee work, and the compensation which, in its judgment, should be paid such help, with a view to securing economy, efficiency, and fair treatment in the performance of the business of the Senate and the official work of Senators.

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

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if there is any expense attached to the resolution?

Mr. JONES. There is not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on January 25, 1917, approved and signed the following acts:

S. 5718. An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona; and

S. 1093. An act to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease and to include within said lease other lands within the segregated coal area.

THE INAUGURATION.

Mr. OVERMAN. I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States on March 5, 1917, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, March 5, 1917, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police for three days, at \$3 per day, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$35,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the same to be immediately available; payment to be made upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said joint committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator a question or two before giving consent for the consideration of the joint resolution.

I notice that there has been introduced a joint resolution referring to the protection of life and property of citizens during the inaugural. I did not hear it read; in fact, it was not read. I do not know whether this joint resolution refers to the protection of life or of property, but I wish to suggest to the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that in a great many cities in this country on great occasions steps have been taken to prevent the public from being robbed.

The Senator is as well aware as I am that these inaugurals have been made the occasions to grossly rob the American people. It was not very long ago that I had a constituent wire me—I will not say it was for the inaugural—to get a room at a certain hotel. I phoned down to the hotel and I found that he could get that room for \$200. Rates something similar to that have been the rates that have been charged the American people by hotels in the city of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator if it is his intention or the purpose of his committee to allow another inaugural to pass without some protection of the American people who are invited to come to Washington?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the joint resolution which I have introduced is to protect the Capitol Grounds, to erect stands, and to illuminate the Capitol, and as far as the grounds are concerned to the pay of policemen and officers to protect the public here. Of course, the joint resolution has nothing to do with the city outside of the Capitol Grounds. What the Senator refers to relates to the city and that is in charge of the city.

Mr. McCUMBER. I know, but, Mr. President, in a joint resolution or bill of this kind there could be well inserted an amendment that would take care of the visitors to the Capital and protect them against exorbitant charges.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is right about that and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has just introduced a joint resolution which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations to aid the District in keeping order. I suggest that that would be the place for the amendment, because that is under the supervision, I understand, of the police department of the city. This joint resolution is simply for the Capitol and Capitol Grounds, to erect stands.

Mr. McCUMBER. As all the principal committees are in charge of Members of the Senate on the other side of the Chamber I hope the appropriate committee will take this matter up and do something to protect the people who are invited to come to Washington to view the inaugural.

Mr. OVERMAN. I fully agree with the Senator, and if the Senator will suggest to the Committee on Appropriations what he thinks would be necessary to put that suggestion into law I would be glad to consider it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a simple little law that shall provide a penalty to be imposed upon any hotel keeper who shall make a greater charge for the use of his rooms during the inaugural than is his usual charge, or if they think that is not enough they can double it and treble it, and yet you would save the people millions of dollars.

Mr. BORAH. The law might be simple in its terms, but it would be very difficult to pass it, I should suppose.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is a very difficult thing to handle, but it will have to be handled on another joint resolution that will come up hereafter.

Mr. McCUMBER. Why does the Senator from Idaho say it would be difficult to pass it?

Mr. BORAH. I am not quite ready for the Government of the United States to enter into the business of fixing hotel rates, at least I should want to reflect upon the matter.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am quite ready for the Government of the United States to enter into the business of protecting its citizens from robbery wherever that robbery may occur.

Mr. BORAH. Well, we can pass a law if we want against robbery and arson or anything of that kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. Or extortion, and this is extortion.

Mr. BORAH. But it can hardly be extortion in the ordinary when a man voluntarily goes into a hotel and registers. Whatever is done will have to be done by cooperation between the citizens and the hotel keepers here in Washington, but without considerable opposition would I consent to passing a law of the Government of the United States establishing hotel rates. I do not want to see the Government assume the burden of establishing hotel rates. That would give rise to a few hundred more Government employees.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think we can prohibit extortionate charges by the proprietors of hotels as well as by other people. The Senator might say that he would not support a measure that would fix a reasonable rate of interest to be charged, but we do fix such rates, and we provide a penalty for extortionate interest charges.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. I have watched, Mr. President, with great interest all that is being done here in the city of Washington to get a big crowd to attend the inaugural ceremonies. The people here get the use of the public streets and public buildings and secure aid to get visitors to come here from all over the country. That is well and good, but I have not noticed any efforts being made in the local press, by the local associations, or by any of the people of Washington to prevent the people of the United States from being robbed and plundered when they come here to attend the inauguration. I therefore suggest that before we afford them all of these accommodations and facilities we require from them something in the shape of protection for the American people who come here.

Mr. President, I have been here during several presidential inaugurations, and I have noticed the same thing to which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] refers—how the people are brought in here and how they are robbed by the proprietors of hotels and restaurants. It will be time enough for us to give the people here all these advantages and facilities when they show a disposition to properly regulate the rates to be charged here, and to prevent the visitors who come here to attend the inaugural ceremonies from being plundered and robbed.

Mr. OVERMAN. A discussion of that matter would be proper on a resolution pertaining to that subject; but this resolution only refers to the inaugural ceremonies. The Inaugural Committee has nothing whatever to do with the regulation of the city or the establishment of police regulations outside of the Capitol Grounds. This resolution is to enable the committee appointed by the Senate to arrange for the proper ceremonies at the Capitol. That is all it proposes to accomplish. There will probably be a resolution reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia to assist in keeping order in the city, but as to this resolution the Inaugural Committee has nothing whatever to do, except what is to be done right here at the Capitol.

Mr. WARREN. The Appropriations Committee is simply to appropriate the money to carry the laws into effect, and the matter to which the Senator from Minnesota refers will rest with some other committee. A resolution of that kind, it seems to me, should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary or

to some committee which might properly take jurisdiction of the subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. That matter can be discussed later, when a proper resolution is before the Senate. The passage of this resolution will merely enable your committee to erect stands and to provide for the ceremonies in the Senate and at the front of the Capitol. Our committee have no jurisdiction whatever over the city.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am not going to object to the present consideration of this resolution, but I want to enter my protest against any such expenditure of the public moneys as that for which it provides. The inaugural ceremonies in Washington are largely, almost entirely, a commercial enterprise, to which the Government should not make itself a party. I should like to see one President of the United States inaugurated with appropriate and dignified ceremonies suitable to a democracy. We are having in this country a coronation every four years. It is undemocratic; it is un-American; and I should like to see it abolished.

There is no reason why such ceremonies as these should be conducted upon the inauguration of the President of the United States, but there is every reason, to my mind, why it should not be done. I am not willing to make myself a party to any such proceedings as are going on now in the District of Columbia by which there will be spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to inaugurate the President of the United States. I should like to see the President himself declare against that sort of thing and protest against his inauguration being made the means of any such ceremony.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the contemplated ceremonies will be very simple, and a resolution providing for similar ceremonies is passed by Congress every four years. No matter what the President or anybody else says, there will be at least 100,000 people here on the Capitol Grounds. Would not the Senator from California comfortably provide for them, so far as he could, seating capacity?

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, these 100,000 people are inveigled into coming to Washington through the instrumentality of the people of the District of Columbia, who are advertising this as a great show.

Mr. OVERMAN. This resolution has nothing to do with the ceremonies in the District of Columbia outside of the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. WORKS. It has a good deal to do with it. We are contributing our funds for the purpose of helping carry out this entire proceeding.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. WORKS. There is no occasion for the Government of the United States to expend \$25,000 or any like sum for the purpose of providing a place for the mere inauguration of the President. It is absurd on the face of it, and I should like to see the Senate raise its voice against that sort of misappropriation of public funds and the violation, as I think, of the very principles of the Government under which we are living.

As I said in the beginning, I am not going to object to the present consideration of the resolution, because I know very well it will be adopted. We are doing what we have been doing for a good many years; this, of course, is not the first occasion on which it has been done; but I had hoped that the President, who has done something toward preventing the expenditure of moneys in this way in the past, would go a little further than he has already done, and would enter his protest—which would be entirely sufficient—against this great show that is going to be carried on in the District of Columbia, merely because he is to be inaugurated President of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall not oppose the consideration of the resolution, although I largely sympathize with the views which have just been expressed by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS]. I am gratified that the amount embodied in the resolution is not larger than it is. I am astonished, to paraphrase a familiar expression, at our own moderation under the circumstances. I am also in hearty sympathy with the suggestions made by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I do not know that we can directly reach the evil to which he refers. It is not confined to Washington, but is characteristic of caterers wherever there is an unusual gathering of American citizens. The old Spanish buccaneer, who rode the Spanish Main, flew the black flag, and took his life in his hands when he attacked his prey, must, if there is such a thing as a future life, turn over in his grave whenever he thinks of his modern successor, disguised as the proprietor of a hotel or at the head of some institution furnishing the necessities of life, because of the impunity with

which they carry on his old business sheltered under the forms of law.

I have observed, Mr. President, in this District that the people are largely a unit in their support of everything designed to get money out of the Federal Treasury when it is to be expended here. The amount which will be expended by the visitors to the inaugural ceremonies, unless something can be done to prevent it, will, as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has suggested, probably be expressed by a million of dollars in the aggregate, and the greater portion of it will be extortion, pure and simple.

Some of us are trying to prevent an increase of appropriations by this Congress. In so doing we are obliged to resist an organized movement to increase the salaries of all employees. Instead of our receiving some little encouragement in the District, every newspaper and every organization is behind the movement, and some of them are ungenerous enough to criticize those of us who believe that this is not the time or the occasion for such increases. A morning paper in its issue of yesterday morning went so far as to assert that this proposed increase was an act of justice to an unorganized body of employees, when we know that they are not only organized, and thoroughly organized, but that they are affiliated with the greatest labor organization in the world and that they are carrying on an organized propaganda in the Capitol. As I have said, instead of receiving sympathetic support from the people of the District, or any part of them, in our efforts to economize, the entire trend of public sentiment and public effort is in favor of these increases. Of course the reason is obvious; the money is to be expended here, and the object of the business community of the District is to secure these added appropriations, because the great body of employees will merely be a conduit through which they will pass on the way to their own coffers.

Now, Mr. President, there should be some way of economizing so as to offset the consequences of this propaganda and in some degree make reparation for the extortions that are sure to be practiced upon the people of the United States who come to this inaugural. For instance, we can adopt a different system of taxation for the District.

Mr. President, I have been an advocate of what is called the half-and-half system. I have believed, all things considered, that it was fair both to the people and to the Government, and therefore I have voted against efforts to abolish it since I have been here; but I am about to pass the Rubicon. If the people of the District will manifest no disposition to assist those of us here who are trying to economize, if they band together on occasions like the inauguration to extort money from visitors—and they will do it—then let us require them to pay all the taxes essential for the support of the District Government; and if this propaganda of increases becomes successful, as it bids fair to be, then I must give notice that hereafter wherever it is possible to economize in the District I shall make the effort and join those committed to the abolition of the half-and-half system.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] has suggested that the proposition of which I spoke could be considered in connection with another joint resolution which has been introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. The joint resolution which the Senator from Maryland has introduced reads, in part, as follows:

Said commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property and fixing fares by public conveyance—

I think that we could leave the matter to which I have referred to the commissioners, and if we would add after the words "public conveyance" the words "hotels and restaurants," I think it would cover the matter.

I see no reason why we should throw the protecting arm of the Government around the citizen to save him from an extortion of \$5 by a public conveyance and leave him unprotected when it comes to a hotel charging him \$200 for a \$5 room. I can see no great difference in principle unless it should be applied with a stronger arm where the extortion is the greater.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do I understand this joint resolution is now before the Senate?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; the one from which I have read has merely been introduced for reference to the appropriate committee.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the matter now, but I shall do so when the proper time comes.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. WORKS. I desire to ask the Senator from North Dakota how many people he thinks would come here to be robbed if the President were inaugurated in a quiet and dignified way, as I think the President of the United States should be inaugurated?

Mr. McCUMBER. I think, Mr. President, there would be very few of them; and I desire to say now that I agree with the views of the Senator in every respect in reference to the inaugural ceremonies.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am just as much opposed to ostentatious display as are the Senators who have spoken, but no one will come here to the inauguration who has not some money to spend. People understand before they come here the conditions which will prevail, for these things have been going on for years and years, and they understand perfectly well that they are coming here to have a good time, to share in the occasion, in its display, and in its good time with the people of the District of Columbia, and they know before they come that they will have to share their money with the people of the District of Columbia. That is what it takes to make a "good time"; and so long as we have inaugurations conducted in this way thousands and thousands of people are coming, and I have not seen any petition or other request coming from those people asking us to protect them after they get here. Before they come they understand precisely the conditions, and they are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves.

Mr. WORKS. Does not the Senator think that people who come here under those circumstances deserve to be robbed?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has said, people will come here, but they will have to pay their bills, and I hope that the information furnished the Senate this morning will be given wide publicity, so that a certain number of my constituents will not have to borrow money from me with which to get home. [Laughter.] I have a considerable sum invested in that way that I never expect to see again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment, offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], begins on page 62. It proposes to strike out all after line 18 down to and including the last line on page 65, striking out the Subtreasuries at Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the question of striking out the provision for the Subtreasuries, as provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, was considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations; and the action of the committee was determined, I think, on a statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury. There were no detail reasons submitted by the Secretary why the Subtreasuries should not be abolished, but he did state to the committee, through the chairman of the committee and over the telephone, that he thought it would be very unwise to strike out the appropriations providing for the Subtreasuries.

The committee then prepared an amendment to the bill, as found on page 31, referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] yesterday, which reads as follows:

The Bureau of Efficiency shall investigate the work performed by the Subtreasuries and report to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session what part of the work of the Subtreasuries may be transferred to other offices of the Government or banks of the Federal Reserve System, and for the purpose of this investigation the representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency shall have access to all necessary books and other records of the Government.

After a discussion of this amendment, Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States decides to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota, the Senate then can reconsider the amendment offered by the committee and disagree to it.

Mr. President, in the speech made yesterday by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] in opposition to the amendment I notice this statement:

What are these Federal reserve banks? We talk of them here in the Senate sometimes as though they were Government banks, owned, controlled, and managed by the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the Federal reserve banks are private institutions, the stock of which is owned by the various national banks and the few State banks and trust companies that have joined the Federal Reserve System. The majority of the board of directors of every one of these Federal reserve banks is elected by the member banks, and every officer save one within the banks is appointed by the officers who are elected by the member banks. The proposition, therefore, is to turn over certain functions, powers, and duties of the Government to private institutions that are owned and controlled by the banks of the country. When we propose to enter into that sort of thing it would be well for us to pause and reflect and make certain that we are not committing a great error.

I think it is proper to call attention to the law and see whether the Federal reserve banks are privately owned banks and whether the Government of the United States has no control over them.

The Federal reserve act, in section 15, provides that the Federal reserve banks—

When required by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as fiscal agents of the United States.

The act further, in section 11, authorizes the Federal Reserve Board—

To exercise general supervision over said Federal reserve banks.

Again—

To suspend or remove any officer or director of any Federal reserve bank.

Again—

To suspend for the violation of any of the provisions of this act the operations of any Federal reserve bank, to take possession thereof, administer the same during the period of suspension, and, when deemed advisable, to liquidate or reorganize such bank.

In view of these provisions there seems to be no more danger that a Federal reserve bank might refuse to perform the duties required of it by the Secretary of the Treasury as fiscal agent of the United States under the Federal reserve act than there is fear that the Secretary of the Treasury himself might neglect to perform the duties required of him by law. If any reserve bank should violate the law, it would be the duty of the Federal Reserve Board to remove its officers and assume charge of the bank. If the board failed to do this, it would be the duty of the President to remove the members of the board and appoint persons who would perform their duty.

However, there is no conceivable incentive for any Federal reserve bank to lay itself open to the penalties provided for refusal to comply with the law. The banks would redeem gold and silver certificates out of moneys deposited with them by the Secretary of the Treasury. They would normally use these deposits as directed by the depositor, just as they would use any other deposit. It would, of course, be incumbent on the Secretary of the Treasury to keep in every reserve bank a sufficient amount of gold deposited to redeem all certificates presented by the bank. If, however, he should fail to do so the reserve bank could still receive gold and silver certificates presented for redemption and issue certificates of deposit therefor. These certificates of deposit could then be exchanged for gold and silver dollars at the nearest mint at the New York Assay Office or at the Treasury here at Washington.

At present a very large percentage of the redemptions at the Subtreasuries are made in this manner and doubtless the majority of the large redemptions made through the Federal reserve banks would be effected in the same way. Even if it were conceivable that a Federal reserve bank should expose itself to the penalties of disobeying the law, such action would have no more serious effect than to inconvenience the person presenting gold certificates for redemption. If the Subtreasuries should be discontinued, the Treasurer should continue to redeem gold and silver certificates at Washington, and he should retain in the Treasury, the mints, and the assay offices the entire amount of gold and silver dollars that is necessary to redeem the outstanding gold and silver certificates. The Federal reserve banks should be required to make redemptions out of the general fund deposits placed with them, or else by means of order on the assay office at New York, the mints, or the Treasury at Washington. Ordinarily the certificates redeemed would be reissued if fit for circulation and replaced by new ones if unfit for circulation. If, however, a Federal reserve bank should need an addition to its supply of metallic gold, such gold would have to be shipped from the nearest mint or assay office, either as additional deposit or in exchange for certificates returned to Washington.

Mr. President, even if every dollar had to be transported by express and the cost of transportation paid by the Government, it would be a small amount compared to the expense of main-

taining the Subtreasuries that now exist. I will frankly state that I thought at first it was not wise to abolish these Subtreasuries; but after going into the details and finding out just the workings of the Subtreasuries, I am convinced that they ought to be abolished and that no harm will come to the business of the country if they are abolished at the present time.

In the discussion upon this subject four questions have arisen, and there seems to be some misunderstanding about them. I want to discuss briefly the workings of the department and of the Subtreasuries as affecting these questions that have arisen in this debate.

The first is that the Secretary of the Treasury is not authorized to deposit in the Federal reserve banks the gold and the silver dollars held for the redemption of gold and silver certificates and United States notes; that is, the so-called trust fund.

This is true; but only a small part, 12.5 per cent, of the gold held to redeem gold certificates and United States notes is kept in the Subtreasuries. Out of a total of two billion and ninety-three millions of dollars in gold held by the Treasury Office, according to the reports received December 14, 1916, there is one billion seven hundred and forty millions in the mints and assay offices of the country. Of this one billion seven hundred and forty millions of dollars, about four hundred and fifty millions is in the Denver Mint, three hundred and fifty-seven millions in the San Francisco Mint, three hundred and twenty-five millions in the Philadelphia Mint, and six hundred and seven millions in the New York Assay Office. The remainder of all the gold held by the Government, amounting to only three hundred and fifty-three millions of dollars, is in the Treasury and Subtreasuries. Of this \$353,000,000, more than \$100,000,000 is in the general fund and can legally be deposited in Federal reserve banks. Four millions of dollars is in the Treasury at Washington. The balance of the gold trust fund in the Subtreasuries is, therefore, only about \$250,000,000, out of a total of two billion and ninety-three millions of dollars.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. WORKS. May I ask the Senator how many of these Subtreasuries are in the same cities that have reserve banks?

Mr. SMOOT. All of them with the exception of one, and that is at Baltimore. No; there may be two.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken about that. Why, there are half a dozen.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. I do not think Baltimore is the only one.

Mr. POMERENE. No, Mr. President; the city of Cincinnati has a Subtreasury and the Federal reserve bank of that district is located at Cleveland. There is no branch in Cincinnati.

Mr. OVERMAN. There are half a dozen of them; so the Senator is altogether wrong.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, I will name where they are, and then we will see.

One of the Subtreasuries is located at Baltimore, and, as I stated, there is no Federal reserve bank in Baltimore. Even if there is no Federal reserve bank there, Mr. President, there is no question but that the business of Baltimore can be taken care of just as well from Washington or the nearest Federal reserve bank as at present.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I want to say—

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can in a few moments speak in his own time. Before I get through I will give my reasons for my statement. Then the Senator can criticize my reasons, if he so desires.

The next is at Chicago, one at Cincinnati, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco. Those are the places where the Subtreasuries are located.

Mr. POMERENE. The matter the Senator is discussing now is covered by the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury himself, and, if I may read just three lines, the Secretary says:

Federal reserve banks are located in the Subtreasury cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco. New Orleans has a branch of the Federal reserve bank of Atlanta, while neither Baltimore nor Cincinnati has a Federal reserve bank.

Neither has a branch.

Mr. SMOOT. I forgot Cincinnati. I did mention Baltimore, but I really had forgotten Cincinnati.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. There are two cities that have neither mints nor assay offices nor Federal reserve banks. Those are Baltimore and Cincinnati.

Mr. SMOOT. Those are the only two.

Mr. NELSON. Those are the only possible exceptions where anything can be urged in favor of retaining the Subtreasury.

Mr. SMOOT. The committee first agreed to strike out Baltimore from the bill, thinking that the Subtreasury there was unnecessary; but after a reconsideration, as I stated in my opening remarks, Baltimore was put back into the bill.

Mr. President, I desire to continue. A statement of the Federal reserve banks shows that they held on December 8, 1916, \$427,000,000 in gold certificates; that is, they owned more of the gold in the Government custody than is kept in the Subtreasury. They could therefore, without authority of law, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, take over all the gold in all the Subtreasuries by simply presenting the gold certificates which they hold. These figures make it apparent that the Subtreasuries are not needed for the custody of the gold trust funds.

Of the silver dollars held by the Treasury officers, about \$156,000,000 is now in the Treasury at Washington, \$190,000,000 in the mints, and \$148,000,000 in the Subtreasuries. Of this \$148,000,000, about \$18,000,000 is in the general fund and can be deposited in Federal reserve banks.

The balance of the silver trust fund held in Subtreasuries is therefore about \$130,000,000. This amount could not be deposited in the reserve banks, but would have to be transferred to the custody of superintendents of the mints or assay offices or else shipped to Washington. That is all the trouble there would be. There is no question but that the Treasury of the United States could order it to-morrow to be done, even if the Subtreasuries continue.

The other statement made, or one of the others, was that it is necessary to keep large amounts of metallic gold at the port of New York, and perhaps at other ports, in order to settle our trade balances in gold. In the New York Subtreasury there is about \$113,000,000 in gold coin and no gold bullion. The assay office at New York has \$607,000,000 in gold bullion. Foreign balances are commonly settled in bullion, not in coin. This bullion comes not from the Subtreasury but from the assay office in the form of certificate bars.

Mr. OVERMAN. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a statement that was made by Mr. Brown on a request for the facts as to where the gold of the Government was located and just what the Subtreasuries, the mints, and assay offices of the country hold.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. Brown wants to have the Subtreasuries abolished.

Mr. SMOOT. He does not make any recommendation.

Mr. President, foreign balances are commonly settled in bullion, not in coin. The purchasers of these bars—that is, gold bars—deposit their money in the Subtreasury and receive a certificate of deposit, which they present to the assay office as an order for the bars. The Federal reserve bank could with equal facility receive the purchase money and issue the certificate of deposit, which would be paid by the assay office. Therefore, while a Government office able to handle large amounts of gold is needed in New York to receive and furnish gold for the settlement of foreign balances, the Subtreasury is not needed for that purpose, as the assay office supplies the need.

The other statement was that the abolishment of the Subtreasuries would not save any money, because all the expense of more clerk hire, space, and transportation of currency that is now borne by the Government would have to be borne by the banks if the Subtreasuries were discontinued. In support of this contention it was stated that the transfer of the disbursing officers' accounts from the Subtreasuries to Washington in 1913, although proposed as a measure of economy, did not actually save any money.

The facts are, Mr. President, that the Federal reserve banks would undoubtedly have to assume the responsibility of transporting a large amount of currency to and from Washington if the Subtreasuries were discontinued. The estimate for 1918 for this purpose and other purposes amounts to \$150,000.

To offset this expense the Federal reserve banks would necessarily receive, if the Subtreasuries were abolished to-day, gold deposits amounting to at least \$70,000,000. These deposits would be interest free, as are the \$30,000,000 of Government deposits the Federal reserve banks already hold. Interest on the total deposits of \$100,000,000 at 2 per cent would exceed by about \$1,400,000 a year the total amount of the clerical expense and transportation charges that the banks would incur by taking over the Subtreasuries' work.

The transfer of this business to Federal reserve banks would therefore not merely relieve the Government of a large amount of expense but would also provide the Federal reserve banks with increased opportunities for profits. There would be no

offsetting loss to the United States, for the money in the Subtreasuries now earns no interest.

It should be noted also that the transfer of the disbursing officers' accounts to Washington in 1913 did not result in a saving of more than \$50,000 a year, as is shown by a reduction in the estimates of the Treasurer's office as well as for the Subtreasuries.

The other statement was that the Federal reserve banks in some cities do not have adequate quarters, and particularly do they lack the vault space necessary to take over the Subtreasury business. If the Federal reserve banks had no other quarters with adequate vault facilities, there seems to be no reason why they should not be allowed for a moderate rental to use the quarters now occupied by the Subtreasuries. Such a plan would be convenient to the bank and profitable to the Government.

Mr. President, there is no question but that if the Subtreasuries are abolished the Government will save millions of dollars, and there is no question but that if the gold is deposited in the Federal reserve banks, and if they secure 2 per cent upon the amount of the deposit, there will be over a million dollars to the credit of these banks annually.

If we want to save in this bill money for the Government, and do no harm whatever to the business interests of the country, we can abolish the Subtreasuries now and allow the Federal reserve banks to do the business. They can do it now under the law as it exists, the very law that created them, as I have called attention to, section 15 and section 11 of the act itself.

Mr. President, I thought perhaps it would be better to make an investigation, as the committee thought, but after finding out just where the Government gold is deposited, how it is transferred from the credit of one Subtreasury to the other, I have become convinced there is no question but that it would be a proper thing to abolish all the Subtreasuries and allow the business to be done by the Federal reserve banks.

I therefore hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be adopted.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I notice about five Democrats in their seats on this side of the Chamber. They ought to know what we are doing so as to be able to vote intelligently. Therefore, before beginning the few remarks I want to make, and it will be only a few, I feel compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum. I want to say that all during the consideration of this bill a number of the friends on this side have not been here. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARSON in the chair). The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Beckham	Gronna	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Hollis	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Husting	Oliver	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Overman	Sterling
Clapp	Jones	Page	Sutherland
Clark	Kenyon	Phelan	Thomas
Culberson	Kern	Pittman	Townsend
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Poindexter	Vardaman
Curtis	Lippitt	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Robinson	Warren
Fall	McCumber	Shafroth	Watson
Fletcher	McLean	Sheppard	Works
Gallinger	Martine	Sherman	

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of Michigan]. He is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] are absent engaged on important business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the proposed abolishment of the Subtreasuries. The head of the great fiscal department of our Government is the Secretary of the Treasury. Who knows most about whether the Subtreasuries ought to be abolished or not; the man who administers the fiscal concerns of the Government, or a Senator who has investigated this matter in a cursory manner here while the appropriation bill is before us?

It is contended that to abolish these Subtreasuries would save a great deal of money; that it would save \$300,000. That is impossible. If the Subtreasuries are abolished, the Secretary of the Treasury reports that all of the business which is now done

by the Subtreasuries would have to be done somewhere. Therefore you will have to provide for the clerks that are now in the Subtreasuries if you abolish them. Instead of doing this and for the convenience of the people of the country at Boston, Cincinnati, and the other Subtreasury cities all the work will have to be done in Washington. The Secretary of the Treasury will be required to have a number of clerks to do the work that is being done now in these great cities. Therefore you might save the place of the superintendent of the Subtreasury, but the work which is done by all the other officers who perform the service that is done in the Subtreasuries will have to be done here in Washington, at a great inconvenience to the citizens of the country who have business with the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, the committee had this question before them for consideration. It has been time and again contended that the Subtreasuries ought to be abolished, and the committee think that is a question which ought to be investigated. We brought this matter to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury in order that we might have a report from him, and he has reported that it would be suicidal now to abolish these Subtreasuries. Your committee thinking that probably, as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has stated, the Subtreasuries in time should be abolished have provided in the pending bill that a report on that subject be made to the next Congress with a view to their abolishment. Ought we now at once to abolish the Subtreasuries when we have a report from the Secretary of the Treasury to the effect that the reserve system, which it is proposed to substitute for them, has only been in operation a little over a year and a half or two years? We shall probably abolish them in the future; they will be abolished, but they should not be abolished now, especially, I repeat, when we have made no provision in the pending bill for clerks in the Treasury Department to do the work which is now being done in the Subtreasuries in the great cities. Your committee thoroughly investigated the matter so far as we could, and we came to the conclusion that, instead of abolishing the Subtreasuries, we had better direct the Efficiency Board to go thoroughly into the matter and to report to us at the next session of Congress.

Mr. President, we could not abolish the Subtreasuries at this time. If this body should attempt to do it, or should adopt this amendment, it would not be sustained. There has been a fight in the House of Representatives on this subject. The committee in the other House did report to abolish the Subtreasury at Baltimore, and there is less necessity there for a Subtreasury than there is anywhere else, I will say with all deference to the Senator from Maryland, but on the floor of the House they reversed what the committee had done, because, as the House of Representatives think, and as our committee think, and as other Senators think, this is not the time to abolish the Subtreasuries.

Mr. President, I do not propose to read from the record, though a great many Senators have not heard this debate, but I am relying on what the Secretary of the Treasury says. I am going to read a few lines of his testimony, he being the head of this great service for the Treasury Department, being the man to whom we look, whose duty it is to report to us, and can we not rely on what he says about this matter?

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to call the attention of the able acting chairman of the committee to the fact that I have understood, and I so reported to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], that in support of the position taken by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Secretary of the Treasury and the members of the Federal Reserve Board say that if these Subtreasuries are abolished they not only will continue to require, as the Senator from North Carolina has said, the same amount of force, but they will have also to be located at the same places; that they will have to send them to the people and not bring the people here, and that in the end we should neither save money nor force, nor would such action make for convenience.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Illinois has brought out that point. Not only has the Secretary of the Treasury reported against the abolishment of the Subtreasuries now, but the Federal Reserve Board, which knows more about this matter than does any Senator upon this floor, has also done so.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] stood with the committee here at first, but now he is upon the floor fighting their action, because, forsooth, he has received a little report from Mr. Brown, who has not investigated the matter thoroughly,

as he should have done. I am surprised at the Senator from Utah. When this subject was before the committee we provided for a plan by which we could investigate it with a view to the abolishment of the Subtreasuries, but the Senator now comes in and advocates this amendment, when we had formerly voted that plan down in committee, and had even voted to restore the Baltimore Subtreasury. I am surprised at the Senator from Utah coming in here and doing that after we had considered the matter in committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OVERMAN. I always gladly yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, inasmuch as we have put a provision into the bill directing the Efficiency Board to investigate this matter and to report to Congress, does the Senator from North Carolina think it was a very proper thing for the head of that Efficiency Board to interfere in any way with the subject?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not. That is what I am referring to here and to the Senator from Utah now coming here with a report from Mr. Brown before Mr. Brown has been ordered to make this investigation. Does that indicate that Mr. Brown has prejudged the case?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

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

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether or not the Senator from North Carolina was in the Chamber when I made my opening statement, but from the remarks which he has just made I should judge he was not. If the Senator was present, however, I will say that what he says is uncalled for. I told the Senate plainly that I had agreed in committee to allow this provision to go into the bill, and I called attention to the provision on page 31 of the bill authorizing an investigation to be made by the Efficiency Bureau. I then stated why I had changed my mind on the subject.

I do not want any Senator to cast reflections upon Mr. Brown. As I stated in my opening remarks, I asked Mr. Brown to inform me where the gold which had been deposited with the Treasury of the United States had been placed; whether it was in the mint, whether in the assay offices, or whether it was in the Treasury here in Washington, and the amount that was in the Subtreasuries. Mr. Brown merely furnished me that information. He has made no report. I have not said that Mr. Brown has made a report upon this matter after a thorough investigation. He simply states exactly where the gold is and how the transfers have been made, as I have previously stated.

Mr. OVERMAN. I am not reflecting on Mr. Brown. I think he is a very efficient officer. I desire to say that he has heretofore had duties placed upon him by provisions incorporated by the committee on appropriation bills, and I want to know why he has been investigating this matter without any authority? The only authority he has is that which we now propose to confer upon him. That he has been using his time in investigating this subject when he had no authority to do so seems to me apparent from the fact that the Senator from Utah comes here and reads a long statement which has been prepared for him by Mr. Brown, which occupied a half hour or an hour in its reading.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if anyone is to blame in the matter, it is not Mr. Brown. On the basis of statements made here, I asked for certain information of Mr. Brown, if he could obtain it for me. Mr. Brown prepared the figures which I have presented, and I believe they are perfectly correct. If there is anything wrong with the statement which I have made, then, of course, the statement should be criticized; but do not criticize Mr. Brown because of that fact, for I believe the figures are absolutely correct.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the committee had, and the Senator from Utah, as a member of it had, a report from the Secretary of the Treasury; we had also a report submitted by Mr. Warburg, of the Federal Reserve Board; and, instead of relying on the report of the Secretary of the Treasury and of the Federal Reserve Board, the Senator from Utah goes back on his committee, stands up in the Senate, and uses a statement made by a man who had no authority to make an investigation. He did, however, make it, and the Senator reads that statement upon the floor here as against the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and as against the desires of the Federal Reserve Board—12 good men, who are trying to do their duty and to inform Congress as to what it ought to do or not to do. The law has placed upon these officials the respon-

sibility of reporting to this Congress what we should do and what we should not do in regard to such matters.

The Senator from Utah does not rely upon the Secretary of the Treasury or upon the Federal Reserve Board, but he comes here relying upon an ex parte statement made by a Government official. It is of that I complain. I am not criticizing Mr. Brown, for he is a good and faithful officer; he has done great work, and I hope he will do greater work when we confer authority upon him to investigate this matter. I have no doubt he will then give us the right kind of a report. When, however, has he had time to investigate this subject? The matter we have given him to investigate was not along these lines at all. Hereafter, if this bill passes, Mr. Brown will investigate the matter.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. Brown has not made an investigation. I had not the time to do so or I could have gathered the facts myself which Mr. Brown secured for me. Not having the time, I asked him to do it for me.

So far as my action is concerned in approving an amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] which is not in conformity with the action of the committee, I desire to say that I do not believe that I am bound by any action of any committee. I do not believe that I have to rely on whatever the Secretary of the Treasury says; and until to-day I have never heard of any report having been made by the Federal Reserve Board on the subject.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, the Senator was present and heard the debate on yesterday, and so I infer he heard the statement as to what Mr. Warburg had stated.

Mr. SMOOT. All I know is that it was not before the committee. I have not heard of a report until to-day, and it was never mentioned in the committee what the attitude of the Federal Reserve Board was. I desire to say now that whether or not this amendment carries—and I doubt whether it will carry—the Subtreasuries will be abolished, and I want to have particular notice taken of what I say on this day, that the Subtreasuries will be abolished. Why? Because they are a useless expense to the Government of the United States, and because the Federal reserve banks can do the same work and do it with less expense.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that the Subtreasuries will be abolished. As a member of the committee, I have been trying to do my duty, and I have not had time to investigate this matter as fully perhaps as has the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], but I want to say that, being a member of the committee, I would rather rely upon the sworn estimates sent to the committee than to go out and get an estimate from some man who is not informed on the subject, and who has not been given the authority to investigate. I will state further that this report was before the committee, and the Senator from Utah saw it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. OVERMAN. I gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator has seen fit to extoll the Secretary of the Treasury, and he has just admitted that he thought this system ought to be abolished.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I said that in time it would be abolished. I agree with the Senator as to that.

Mr. NELSON. That "in time it would be abolished," but he wants an investigation. I desire to say to the Senator that if the Secretary of the Treasury had done his duty he would have come before Congress with a scheme for abolishing this system and would have made recommendations to Congress accordingly; but he did not do that because it involved too many Democratic officeholders.

Mr. OVERMAN. Ah, Mr. President, my friend is bringing partisanship into this matter. My distinguished old friend from Minnesota, one of the best friends I have in the Chamber, now and then shows that he has a little yellow streak of Republicanism in him that will make itself manifest on occasions. This is no Democratic matter or Republican matter; it is a business matter. The Federal Reserve Board have reported that this is not the time to abolish the Subtreasuries.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, may I say to the able Senator from North Carolina that there are 11 officers in the Subtreasuries who have been appointed by the Democratic admin-

istration, but there are 153 others connected with the Subtreasuries appointed by preceding Republican administrations, who will likewise suffer if the mere question of politics is to be considered, being wholly Republican.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have no doubt that two-thirds of the employees of these Subtreasuries are Republicans, as is the case in every other department of the Government, but that does not make any difference to me. I consider this a pure matter of business, and I ask Senators to throw aside politics and let us look at this question from a business standpoint. The Federal Reserve System has only been in existence a short time, and is probably not now prepared to take over this work. When the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board say that the Subtreasuries ought not to be abolished at this time, not as Republicans or as Democrats, but as business men—when that opinion is given to us by the head of the department having supervision of all these matters—what are we going to do about it? Shall we vote according to our political sentiments, even if we destroy what has been considered heretofore a splendid system inaugurated for the benefit and convenience of the people who live away from Washington and who have business to transact with the Treasury? Shall we so vote as to make them come to Washington to transact their business?

Mr. President, let us see what the Secretary of the Treasury says on this subject. I want to read just a few words from his letter:

I am of the opinion that it would be inadvisable at this time to abolish all, or any, of the Subtreasuries.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, from whom is the Senator quoting?

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Secretary of the Treasury. He continues:

It is an important matter, and should be considered deliberately.

We have not now time to consider this matter deliberately, as we should do, and that is the reason why the committee asks for a board to investigate it.

The Secretary continues:

With the test of further experience it may develop that the functions of the Subtreasuries, or some of them, may be transferred to Washington, or to some other agency, but action should not be taken hastily or inadvisedly.

In another part of his letter the Secretary of the Treasury says:

Aside from New York, the cost of maintaining the other eight Subtreasuries is \$347,416.88.

As the Senator from Minnesota has stated—

Which is a comparatively small sum to pay for the service and convenience they provide. If these institutions were abolished, the total cost of operating them would not be saved, as a counter expenditure by the office of the Treasurer in Washington, resulting from the increased work that would be thrown upon that office, would be entailed.

Now, the Senator from Utah and other Senators want to abolish these Subtreasuries without providing a system in the Treasury to take their place.

Mr. NELSON. Let me ask the Senator a question, Mr. President. What does the argument which he has just read amount to? The statement of the Secretary of the Treasury amounts to this, that these institutions ought to be continued perpetually.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. NELSON. He does not recommend anything; he does not intimate that there ought to be a change. If he had done his duty, he would have looked into this matter and recommended the proper legislation for the abolition of the Subtreasuries.

Mr. OVERMAN. Well, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury does say that it may be advisable to abolish them at some time in the future; but here comes the Senator again criticizing the Secretary of the Treasury, whose sworn duty it is to make these reports. I do not care what the Senator from Minnesota or any other Senator may say, the present Secretary of the Treasury, as almost everyone admits, has made a great Secretary of the Treasury, and has done a tremendous amount of work for the good of the people. He is trying to serve the people as best he can; and when we impose upon him the duty of telling us what should be done, and he performs that duty, the Senator from Minnesota rises, showing his politics and partisanship again, and criticizes the man who has been directed by law to send his report here. I am surprised that my very good friend should stand up here and criticize the Secretary of the Treasury simply because, in response to the law, he sends to Congress a letter in which he says that just at this time it would be very inadvisable to abolish the Subtreasuries.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. OVERMAN. I desire to read one further extract, and then I shall take my seat.

Mr. OLIVER. Very well.

Mr. OVERMAN. I quote further from the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury:

It has been suggested that the Subtreasuries are merely conveniences and not necessities, and that their duties might be performed entirely by the Treasury in Washington.

That is what Senators have said. Let us see:

This is in a sense true, but the cost of handling all the business from a common center, in a country so extensive as the United States, might be greater than the expense of the Subtreasury system.

Think of handling the business of the people of San Francisco here in Washington, when now it is handled in their own city through the Subtreasury there! Why should not the people of Philadelphia transact their business in that city, with the Subtreasury there, instead of coming here to Washington to transact it?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the Senator from Utah does not say that the business of the Subtreasuries should or would be transacted at Washington. The Senator from Utah claims that the Federal reserve banks have the authority under the law to do nearly all of this work, and therefore there would not be very much more work in Washington if the Federal reserve banks should take over the business of the Subtreasuries and administer it, as I believe they will.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator does believe that, but the men who are best informed about it do not believe so; the men under whose administration this matter comes do not agree with the Senator from Utah. I know the Senator from Utah is very wise, but sometimes he is about as wrong as others are, and in this case he has gone off halfcocked in making an effort in the Senate to-day to defeat the committee. That is what he has done. It shows that he went off halfcocked when last night he obtained a report from a man here in Washington, when all the time he had before him the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, saying:

Whereas the delays and inconveniences which the public would have to suffer might prove a very serious handicap upon business.

The Secretary of the Treasury expresses that as his opinion; the Federal Reserve Board concurs in that view; and I know that when the Senator investigates the matter thoroughly he will agree with them. That is the reason why I want to advise him hereafter not to take a position upon a mere ex parte statement. I do not blame him for fighting the committee if he desires to do so; he has a right to do that, and he has a right to change his mind; but I do criticize him for securing a paper and reading it this morning embodying a report from a man who was not authorized to make any investigation and putting that forward as against the statements of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Reserve Board. That is what I criticize.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not care anything about the criticism, but I do want to say that if the report of the Secretary of the Treasury is right and it is going to be an inconvenience to the business interests of the United States to abolish the Subtreasuries, then they never ought to be abolished; it would be wrong to abolish them, and the mere expense that there is attached to maintaining the Subtreasuries should not be considered if their abolition is going to interfere with the business of the United States; and I want to say to the Senator that he ought to change his mind and I ought to change my mind, and the Subtreasuries never ought to be abolished.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; all the Secretary of the Treasury says is that at this time they ought not to be abolished, but he intimates that a system can be worked out by which they can be abolished. He says:

It could with equal force be argued that internal-revenue offices throughout the United States could be abolished and all of the work done at Washington, and, in like manner, that many of the customs offices throughout the country could be abolished and all of the work done from Washington.

Why, Mr. President, all these things have been established for the benefit of the business men of this country, instead of requiring one central establishment here. This is a great, big country, and these conveniences ought to be furnished to the people.

I repeat that I think in time these Subtreasuries will be abolished; but let us not abolish them until we provide the necessary clerks to transact the business that is now being transacted by the Subtreasuries.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I confess that I have not had the time to make the personal investigation I should like to have made on this subject. I have relied largely upon the statements made by the Secretary of the Treasury and what I understand to be the position of the Federal Reserve Board.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a moment ago referred to the city of Cincinnati and the Subtreasury in that city, and I address myself rather to the conditions there than to the situation generally throughout the country.

I am satisfied, from the information I have, that it would be a very great mistake for the Congress of the United States to discontinue the Subtreasury in Cincinnati. I think it will offend the entire business public in that section of the country. I know that the business people of that city are almost a unit in opposition to the attempt to abolish the Subtreasury. They have felt for a long time that they ought to have a branch of the Federal reserve bank, if not the Federal reserve bank itself, in that city. This position may be in part due to local pride; but there is a very large commercial business conducted from that city, and the Subtreasury there is serving a very large section of the country. I do not think I can place the situation before the Senate better than to read a paragraph or two from a letter I have received from Mr. Arthur Espy, the subtreasurer. He says, under date of November 17:

The functions of the Treasuries, particularly that of redemption and exchange, do not seem to me to be such that it would be wise for any private or semiprivate institution to be permitted to discharge them.

Then, referring to the local conditions, he says:

My office is located in the center of the large territory that it serves, and the business of the office has grown very much since I have been assistant treasurer.

I think he has been assistant treasurer for perhaps two years.

For instance, yesterday I made more than 50 shipments of coin in the territory bounded by the Lakes, Tuscaloosa, Ala., the eastern part of West Virginia, and Terre Haute, Ind. I can not see how any substitute system could be devised that would accomplish these services at so small a cost as the Subtreasuries can accomplish them. Appropriations for my office are only \$24,830 for salaries, and about \$1,000 for contingent expenses. The functions of the Subtreasuries can not be made profitable; and if the Federal reserve banks should assume them, they would certainly have to be paid a larger sum than it now costs to maintain the Subtreasuries. It is well to have the Government's gold widely distributed and in its exclusive charge. I have more than twenty millions of gold in my vaults, against which, of course, there have been issued gold certificates which are in circulation, and to-order gold certificates under the act of 1900. My business amounts to nearly \$1,000,000 per day.

If the Subtreasury at Cincinnati is to be abolished, then, in my judgment, there must be some other arrangement made to accommodate the business of that section. Possibly it could be done by a branch bank, but that branch bank has not been organized. It has not yet been demonstrated that this branch bank could be conducted with more satisfaction or with less expense to the Government than the Subtreasury. I think that the Senate has done wisely by adopting the provision they have in the bill directing the Efficiency Bureau to investigate this subject and make a report. I have so much confidence in the Secretary of the Treasury, and in the Federal reserve banks, and in Mr. Brown, whom the Senator from Utah quotes, that I believe that if they have an opportunity to investigate this matter they can come before the Congress of the United States with some concrete suggestions which will perhaps be to the benefit of the country financially as well as to the business world, and for this reason I am very clearly of the opinion that the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota ought not to prevail.

I realize that we sometimes like to inject a little politics into subjects of this character, and perhaps both sides of the Chamber are chargeable with that fault; but if it be pure politics, I think only one Democrat in the Subtreasury at Cincinnati would be displaced. I know the vast majority of the others, and I think all of them are Republicans. They are protected by the civil service. There has been no attempt by the Democrats to remove them; but if there had been a change of administration I think Senators on both sides will agree that there would have been an attempt to remove the subtreasurer.

Mr. REED. But not to abolish the Subtreasury.

Mr. POMERENE. But not to abolish the Subtreasury.

Of course, I do not think conditions have very materially changed in the last generation. All of these places were regarded as important and necessary to the public business during the Republican administrations. It may be that they have offended against business policy by retaining them; but if they have so offended for so many years, they ought not to object to a retention of this system for another year, until we shall have had a full opportunity to investigate and get full knowledge on the subject.

Mr. OLIVER and Mr. PHELAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). The Chair begs pardon. Did the Senator from California address the Chair prior to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from California first addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania realize that such is the case? The Chair does not wish to seem—

Mr. OLIVER. I addressed the Chair first, and I do realize that; but I am perfectly willing to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. If that is the Senator's understanding, I shall be pleased to yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLIVER. I am perfectly willing to listen to the Senator from California, and I hope he will be allowed to take the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is now recognized.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that in San Francisco, Cal., there is a Subtreasury, I desire to bring such information as I have to the attention of the Senate, just as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] described the conditions in Cincinnati.

If the Subtreasuries were abolished, I do not know that it would be possible to transfer their functions to the Federal reserve bank, because the Federal reserve bank as I know it in California has not at the present time the facilities for doing the work of the Subtreasury. I will not advert to the fact that the Federal reserve banks are, like the national banks, private corporations, and therefore that they should not be wholly entrusted with the custody of the great reserves in coin and currency which belong to the United States; but I do know that the Federal reserve bank has no facilities whatever for the storage of coin. The Subtreasuries in all parts of the country have large storage facilities, vaults which give security; and within the last year and a half there has been erected in San Francisco a monumental Subtreasury building, costing for land and structure probably \$500,000, and equipped with the best possible storage facilities. I do not know whether or not in this debate the question of storage has been raised, and yet it is one of the most important phases of this question.

I read but the day before yesterday that so large an accumulation of gold and silver had been piled up in the assay office and Subtreasury at New York that permission had been asked of the Government to transfer the major portion of it to the Philadelphia Mint for mere purposes of storage. Now, the Federal reserve banks not having facilities for storage, it would be utterly impossible, if this amendment prevailed—the amendment proposing the abolition of the Subtreasuries—for them to handle and hold the funds of the United States.

The Senator from North Carolina calls my attention to the table. In New York there is accumulated \$320,000,000. In San Francisco I know there is approximately \$100,000,000 in storage. The transactions there approximate \$300,000,000; and, in passing, I may say that this enormous volume of business has been handled for \$25,000. If the transfer were made in the interest of economy, I do not believe it would be possible for the Federal reserve banks to take care of this business of the Government at any such comparatively insignificant cost, for the reason that the Government would have to make arrangements with the Federal reserve banks in the first instance as to taking over this enormous business, and I do not believe that bankers would undertake that enormous responsibility at any such cost, because we all know that private banks pay very much more for the services of their assistants and their employees than does the Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. PHELAN. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator inform us as to what it would probably cost the Government to furnish adequate storage facilities if this Subtreasury system were done away with and this gold were to be turned over to the Federal reserve banks?

Mr. PHELAN. I am not in possession of that information; but it stands to reason that it would cost the Government—or more properly cost the banks who are conducting that business for their stockholders for profit—a sum so large that they would have to make a very considerable charge to the Government for increasing their facilities. In the second place, it is a matter of time. It could not possibly be done, should this motion prevail, before there would be a need to make the transfer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PHELAN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. There is only a certain amount of the gold in the United States Treasury that could be deposited in the banks, as suggested by the Senator, amounting to about \$70,000,000. Now, does the Senator know that there is \$1,740,000,000 of gold at the present time deposited in the mints and assay offices—not in the Subtreasuries, but in the mints and assay offices? You have in the San Francisco Mint, not in the Subtreasury, \$357,000,000. So all that the reserve banks would be called upon to do would be to receive \$70,000,000; and I do not know of a bank in all the world that does not want to receive deposits. The Federal reserve banks will not be permitted to receive the money that is in assay offices or in mints. That is not intended. That would not be the case if the Subtreasuries were abolished. But the Federal reserve banks could receive the \$70,000,000 in the general fund, and that could be used just the same as any other deposits.

Mr. PHELAN. I will say in answer to the Senator that these mints, wherever they may be located—there is a mint in Philadelphia, in Denver, and in San Francisco—could doubtless be used for storage purposes; but there is a question there of divided responsibility. Should the Federal reserve banks receive \$70,000,000, they would in that event have to provide increased storage facilities, let us grant; and in the second place they would have to obligate themselves to hold that money in storage. It is not true that by depositing this money, this coin, silver and gold, in the Federal reserve banks it will get into circulation—a thing highly desirable in most instances—but this money is held as a trust fund for the payment of gold and silver certificates and of greenbacks, and hence it is not desirable for the Federal reserve banks as such either to seek or to acquire it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know the Senator from California wants to be absolutely correct. The gold that is in the mints and the assay offices is held to redeem the gold certificates, just as the Senator says; but I was speaking of gold in the general fund. It is not held for the redemption of gold certificates. It will be deposited just the same as the Senator himself deposits money. It would be in circulation just the same as the deposits of the Senator go into circulation. I admit that the gold that is in the mints and the assay offices—the \$1,740,000,000—is held for the redemption of gold certificates, and the silver that is held is held for the redemption of the silver certificates; and I called attention in my remarks to where the silver bullion was located.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] calls my attention to a comment of the Secretary of the Treasury on the subject, which I will read before I quote the subtreasurer at San Francisco on the same subject. The Secretary of the Treasury says:

The gold coin and bullion held against gold certificates, amounting at present to more than \$2,000,000,000, a considerable part of which is deposited in the Subtreasuries, should not, in my opinion, be committed to the custody of any private corporations (and the Federal reserve banks are private corporations), but should be in the physical control of the Government itself. This applies with equal force to the \$152,979,025 of gold reserve held against United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890 and the silver dollars held against silver certificates.

The subtreasurer at San Francisco, who, by the way, is a very competent subtreasurer, and who is the only Democrat, if I may refer to partisan politics, which has been raised here, in the Subtreasury, so far as I am advised, because the entire staff is under the civil service, has prepared a statement with his full and intimate knowledge of his own Subtreasury, in which he says—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend until the Chair announces that, the hour of 1 o'clock having arrived the unfinished business must be laid before the Senate? It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is temporarily recognized for the purpose for which he rises.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No objection being heard by the Chair, it is so granted.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PHELAN. I yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed with the consideration of House bill 18542.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now lays before the Senate House bill 18542, and upon the request of the Senator from Utah for unanimous consent, there being no objection, it is so granted and the bill is before the Senate. The Senator from California is now recognized.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, in the statement of the sub-treasurer at San Francisco he says:

In addition to the foregoing duties and functions of the Subtreasuries, they have the custody of a large part of the reserve and trust funds, consisting of gold coin and bullion and silver dollars deposited to secure gold and silver certificates and greenbacks; much vault space is required for the deposit of these trust funds, especially the silver dollars; the new San Francisco Subtreasury Building, which has only been completed a year and a half, cost approximately a half million of dollars, and its vaults, among the largest and best in the country, cost \$130,000; besides the large amount of gold coin stored in these vaults, they contain over \$25,000,000 in silver dollars, nearly all of which are held as trust funds against outstanding silver certificates.

He goes on:

A large portion of the money in the Subtreasuries are trust funds which really do not belong to the Government and can not be used by the Government because they are held as security for the payment of gold and silver certificates and greenbacks; hence it is a fallacy to argue that this money should be put in circulation through the medium of the Federal reserve banks. Any agency that holds this trust fund must hold it as a trust fund, or, in other words, must hold it in storage.

I make the point that, inasmuch as we have not got in all parts of the country storage facilities connected with Federal reserve banks, it will be impracticable at this time to make the transfer.

I am not arguing against the abolition of Subtreasuries. Possibly there will be a way found when we receive the report of the Bureau of Efficiency, when the Secretary of the Treasury, under a resolution adopted last year by the House, makes his final report on the means by which a transfer can be made and the necessary provision made for storage and for the additional assistance; but at this time, if we put the money accumulated in such vast quantities in the hands of Federal reserve banks, there will not be sufficient facility, in the first place, nor would there be sufficient expert help, unless we took over the staff of the Subtreasuries, and there would not be fixed and bonded responsibility.

My recollection is that the subtreasurer at San Francisco receives \$4,500 a year, but out of that he pays \$500 to an insurance indemnity company for the enormous bond which is required of him; and instead of that office being one desirable for deserving or other Democrats, it is an office which seeks the man. Very few have the combined ability and responsibility to assume duties of that kind. In this instance I know that in seeking a man for that position who would be worthy of it there was very considerable difficulty encountered.

So there is nothing before us now but a mere business question, which is certainly not a political question, and I am sure we are united in the desire to accomplish for the Government the very best results.

It stands practically uncontradicted that the Federal reserve banks are not at this time capable of assuming the work of the Subtreasuries. In the second place, there is no demand from any part of the country that such a transfer be made, except the general demand, which is incessant all the time, to conduct the Government on business principles and with economy. There can be no economy now in making this transfer, possibly no economy at any time. It will only tend to a greater centralization if the money, as has been suggested, be transferred to Washington. The very purpose of the Federal Reserve System was to decentralize, to give to the different sections of the country facilities for doing their business without coming with hat in hand to Wall Street or with hat in hand to Washington.

On the Pacific coast we have a great territory which is served by our institutions, notably by the Subtreasury there. We have the Panama Canal, and the merchants have been accustomed, under authority of the Treasury Department, to deposit the tolls in the Subtreasury at San Francisco for the payment of their vessels passing through that waterway. That is an enormous advantage to the shipping of that port. Our port of San Francisco is a great commercial port. For transactions in the Orient it is necessary to ship gold to it and to ship gold in the course of business of full weight. The Subtreasury has served that purpose by giving full-weight gold in exchange for worn or abraded or depreciated currency or coin. We are in receipt constantly of great shipments of coin and metal from Australia.

So I think if on a fair consideration of this matter it were determined to abolish any Subtreasury, it would be necessary, on account of the peculiar character of the business of the port of San Francisco and the distance from the central Government,

to maintain it there as an arm of the Treasury. The Treasury has provided for itself, as I told the Senate, a monumental building, a matter of pride to the Federal Government and the people, and in that building has installed great vaults for the storing of the coin and bullion.

I am merely making my contribution to this discussion as one having knowledge of that particular Subtreasury. I am willing, however, when the time comes and when we are advised by the Treasury Department and by the Efficiency Bureau, probably at the next session, to seek a consolidation, if such a thing were practicable, in order that there may be a decrease of cost and an increase of efficiency. But unless that can be proven, which I am disposed to doubt, so far as San Francisco is concerned, it would be futile for this body to take up a matter which would lead nowhere. There is no complaint whatever as to the administration of the Treasury Department; there is no political question involved; there is no petition either from the head of the Treasury Department or from the Federal reserve bank to make the transfer at this time.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. To the contrary, they protest against it.

Mr. PHELAN. To the contrary, the Senator from Maryland reminds me, both the Department of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have asked the National Legislature not at this time to interfere, and I submit it would be an interference with the orderly conduct of their great department to make a violent change at this time.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I have no doubt from the information which has come to me and from what I have gathered during this discussion that eventually these Subtreasuries will have to go, and in some way or other the duties now performed by them, with the possible exception of San Francisco, where the Subtreasury might be maintained on account of its great distance from the center, will be merged with the duties of the Federal reserve banks. I think this is all the more probable from the fact that in some places at least the regional Federal reserve banks maintain very expensive quarters and have a very expensive organization with very little to do, and it would be somewhat of a charity to give them additional reasons for existence by consolidating them with the Subtreasuries in the immediate neighborhood.

A Subtreasury is not necessary to the existence of a place. There is no Subtreasury in the great city of Pittsburgh, where I live, and still that city and that district conduct a banking and monetary business far exceeding that of Baltimore or Cincinnati or San Francisco. On account of the great size of the pay rolls handed out week by week in that section the demand for coin and for currency is greater there than it is in almost any other city in the country.

But, Mr. President, I think that before we tear down this old system we ought to have something in view with regard to building up the new, and as there is nothing proposed except the mere abolition of these Subtreasuries now the duty would be cast upon the Treasury Department to legislate to a certain extent with regard to the method of transferring their duties.

The Bureau of Efficiency is at work upon this very question, and inasmuch as they are now in existence and going along doing the work, and doing the work at a very reasonable cost, I think Congress ought to be rather slow about abolishing them and should give the Bureau of Efficiency a chance to recommend a system upon which the substitution can be made.

I therefore am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and will vote for the continuance of these institutions for the present at least.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Mr. President, I think it probably entirely unnecessary that I should have anything to say upon this subject after listening to the lucid explanation of the Senators who have preceded me, who have shown most conclusively the fact that it is unwise at this time to abolish the Subtreasuries of the United States; but inasmuch as the city of Baltimore was involved in the doing away with the Subtreasury of that city I feel that I want to say a few words in regard to Baltimore City.

This matter was brought up in the House and the Subtreasury of Baltimore City was abolished by the House committee without any knowledge whatever on the part of the representatives of Baltimore City. After learning that such had been the case a committee came from Baltimore in order that they might be heard. I attended that meeting. I attended the hearings with the gentlemen who went before the committee of the House and it was proven most conclusively to that committee that they had done wrong in abolishing the Subtreasury at Baltimore, and, as we are all aware, it was put back.

Now, the argument used here is that they are seeking to abolish the Subtreasuries in order to save money. So far as

the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and so far as recommendations and the report of the reserve banks are concerned, I have come to the conclusion that there will be very little money saved.

Mr. President, aside from saving money it seems to me the convenience of the people of the United States should be considered to some extent. So far as Baltimore City is concerned, we felt that we were entitled to a reserve bank in Baltimore City. We were unfortunate and it was not given to us.

Owing to our inability to secure a reserve bank we are obliged to fall back upon the Subtreasury in order to conduct the business of Baltimore. There is over \$200,000,000 worth of business done through the Subtreasury. In the statement by the bankers and business men of Baltimore before the committee, men in whom I have the utmost confidence and who would not make a misstatement, it was stated that if the Subtreasury was abolished in Baltimore City the expense to the business people and bankers of Baltimore City would amount to over \$200,000.

Now, it does seem to me that we should not take this action in view of the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and the Federal Reserve Board have protested against the abolishment of these Subtreasuries, in view of the fact that they have stated that there would be very little saving if they were abolished, in view of the fact that the convenience to the people of the United States would be very greatly interfered with. I will state to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, for whom I have the highest regard, when he says that it is a political matter, that so far as Baltimore is concerned, I think that every man in the Subtreasury is a Republican but one. Therefore no such purpose as that can be accomplished. I think he was mistaken entirely in his statement. I think from what the Senator from Illinois stated that such is not the case with a majority of the employees.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do.

Mr. NELSON. I want to say to the Senator I am very sorry I injected that matter into the debate. It came from the fact that I thought the Senator from North Carolina took an unusual and undue and untenable course in the matter. He rather provoked me into saying what I ought not to have said. Senators who have served with me here for many years know that in matters of legislation I have as a rule never been actuated by a partisan spirit.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I do not believe—

Mr. NELSON. I want to say further, if he will permit me—

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. That is all right.

Mr. NELSON. I think myself that under present circumstances an exception should be made in respect to Baltimore and Cincinnati. It was my original purpose to offer the amendment in that form, but I thought perhaps that could be adjusted in conference. But I take it that the other side of the Chamber will be unanimous in voting down this proposition, so that it will not go to conference. If it could possibly pass and the matter go to conference, I should be very glad if an exception was made for the time being in favor of Baltimore and Cincinnati. I realize how both cities feel; that they feel they were slighted and discriminated against by the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota there is no man in this body for whom I have a higher regard, and I am sure he would not have any political reason for the abolishment of the Subtreasury if he thought it was an improper thing to do, and I recognize that was not his intention.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will allow me a word further, when I first took up this matter and made my first remarks on the subject and afterwards until I was somewhat provoked by the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina the thought of politics never entered into my head. I never had the least idea of looking at it from that standpoint.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. Now, Mr. President, in regard to this matter it does seem to me that a matter of so great importance, that affects so many people throughout the country, that brings about so much convenience to so many citizens, it would be a most improper thing to take this action without due consideration and in the face of the protests of the Secretary of the Treasury, in face of the protests of the Federal Reserve Board, in face of the fact that there will be very little money saved, in face of the fact that there is in the bill to-day an efficiency commission provided for that has been authorized to investigate this matter and see whereby it shall be abolished the ma-

chinery shall be instituted to replace the work that is being done now by the Subtreasuries.

I do hope that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota will not prevail.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, there are seven Democrats on the floor and but six of the minority party. I do not think we ought to legislate with so small a number on the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Johnson, Me.	Norris	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Jones	Overman	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Kenyon	Page	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Kern	Phelan	Smoot
Chamberlain	Lane	Pittman	Thomas
Dillingham	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lewis	Ransdell	Walsh
Gallinger	Lippitt	Saulsbury	Warren
Gronna	McLean	Shafer	Watson
Husting	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Weeks
James	Nelson	Sherman	Works

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. FERNALD, Mr. STERLING, Mr. LODGE, Mr. FALL, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CUMMINS, and Mr. BANKHEAD answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-two Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am not in the habit of basing my action in opposing or favoring legislation which has to do with public matters which are located in Massachusetts, on the fact that they are located there. Although I think there is a great deal of sound reason and sense in the statement which has been made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] relating to the Subtreasuries, I am convinced that Senators do not understand all the details of the work which is done by the Subtreasuries, and I am confident that there must be legislation passed which will enable the Federal reserve banks in cities where Subtreasuries are located to take over the functions which are now performed by the Subtreasuries. I have no doubt that an investigation, when it is made, will show that very many of the activities of the Subtreasury may be dispensed with, if they may not be entirely abolished. I hope such an investigation will be made, if this motion does not prevail; but it does seem to me that we ought to know more about the question than is contained in the information which has been thus far furnished to the Senate. Therefore I am opposed to action being taken at this time. Next winter I shall take a different position if the testimony which will be presented at that time convinces me that the Subtreasuries are no longer necessary.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has very generously conceded that it was a mistake to consider this matter from a partisan standpoint. In view of that concession, I should like to call his attention and the attention of others here to-day to another general, broad consideration that applies to this proposition to abolish the Subtreasuries throughout the country.

Mr. President, the Subtreasuries are the direct fiscal agents of the United States Treasury throughout the land. Looking at the matter broadly, I can not help thinking that it is in the interest of the country to have these agents for this financial distribution, themselves holding Government cash, throughout the country in addition to the Federal reserve banks, because these agencies are direct agencies, subject to the direct policy of the Treasury Department. There is no board of directors, there are no stockholders with any kind of financial interest or policy that can intervene or affect or retard the action of the Subtreasury performing its functions under the orders of the Treasurer of the United States. Therefore, looking at this matter broadly, instead of abolishing these Subtreasuries I think every one of them should be preserved, and where necessary transferred to the cities of next size and importance so as to give to such cities the financial advantages which the functions of the Subtreasuries give wherever they may be located.

We have had rather a peculiar situation in Baltimore, the seventh city in the United States in size. Right down the line you may say the Federal reserve banks were given to the cities in proportion to their size and financial importance; but when it came to Baltimore there was a jump—a jump to the thirty-fifth city in the United States—namely, Richmond. Under

other circumstances, if we had had a Federal reserve bank in Baltimore, we would not have been able to have our bankers come to Washington and tell the committee of the House how important the Subtreasury was. They would have simply said, "Go ahead; we will transact this business through the Federal reserve bank."

I have no objection, Mr. President, to giving Federal reserve banks, wherever they may be located, powers similar to those that the Subtreasuries now exercise, but I do say that, in addition to the Federal reserve banks, the Subtreasuries should be preserved and should be further distributed throughout the country.

In the hearing we had before the House Committee on Appropriations when it was proposed to single out Baltimore and, in addition to the disadvantage of not having given her a Federal reserve bank, to which she was entitled in view of her size, business, and the volume of the financial transactions of our great Maryland city, it was proposed to take away the subtreasuryship also. Under such circumstances, Mr. President, we had quite a rally of our bankers. They came over here and told the House committee that the expenditure of \$40,000, which the Government makes in Baltimore to maintain the subtreasurer's office, saves the city a direct outlay, in the opinion of those bankers, \$200,000 a year just as a cash cost, and that the advantage to Baltimore in other ways was very large, and not a matter of dollars and cents. I want to read very briefly, in conclusion, from the testimony of Mr. Ingle, who is the president of the Baltimore Trust Co., and who, as a banking man, would naturally lean to putting this power in the hands of a Federal reserve bank, if there were one in Baltimore; but there being none in Baltimore, he states very clearly how important this Subtreasury is to that city. Mr. Ingle says:

We find in having no reserve bank but in having a Subtreasury we are greatly inconvenienced for the very reasons I have told you about. We have not only all these little currency exchanges and nickels and smaller currency cared for immediately on the premises; but we are a community of 700,000 people, and as a part of the population of the United States entitled to some little measure of consideration in the expense undertaken by the Government on behalf of the people as a whole; and that expense, mark you, is \$40,000 in serving a community of 700,000 people. But, as a banking proposition, as a matter of convenience, we put our money down there and get the certificates of the Subtreasury which we use as clearing-house funds, in \$10,000 certificates. We make all of our 5 per cent deposits in there in cash from day to day, deposits in the redemption of circulating notes, all the deposits for transfer of funds, and so on. That represents deposits made in cities like Norfolk or wherever there is a collector of internal revenue or what not, and where they want to transfer funds in any particular direction they will ask us to make the deposit for them; and I could give you a whole lot of reasons, most important to those immediately in touch, why we should not be deprived of this very small look-in on the beneficence of the Government.

Continuing, at another place, he said:

That is only one instance of many other facilities which it furnishes the banks, and through the banks the community at large. As Mr. Homer—

The president of the Baltimore Clearing House—

said, there is a great demand there for nickels. Baltimore is the seat of the principal packing industry in the country—I believe that is not an overstatement—in fruits and vegetables and oysters, and such matters as that. They will go to the Subtreasury and get \$1,000 worth of nickels instead of having little tin tags, and so on, to pay a man every time he shucks a quart of oysters, and every time he shucks out a quart of oysters they pass him out a nickel. Now, as you say, that oyster packer could go to Mr. Homer's bank and ask for \$500 worth of nickels, and Mr. Homer could go to the Subtreasury and get the nickels and pass them over to his customer; but it all comes from the Subtreasury. Our subtreasurer is altogether indifferent as to whether he pays it to Mr. Homer's messenger or to the messenger of the packer, but it saves the labor of one man in the premises to get them direct. Take the railway system of Baltimore. They deal directly, not because the banks unloaded it on the Government, but that is a very large corporation. It handles a very large quantity of small change of one kind and another. Ordinarily, it would have to go to the bank, and the bank would probably count it and it would go to the Subtreasury and be counted again. Under the practice of the Treasurer's office many large enterprises of that sort deal with the Subtreasury, and it is a very great convenience indeed.

Mr. President, there is one other feature about which I want to speak in connection with which, it has always seemed to me, the functions of the Subtreasury should be enlarged rather than decreased. I refer to the question of the sanitary cleanliness of money. I believe that the insanitary condition of the circulating medium in this country should be changed, as far as possible, and that one of the present functions of the Subtreasuries all over the country should be increased and additional power and facility given the public for keeping money clean from a sanitary standpoint. One of the great changes of the future, as science further fights disease, will be added care and expenditure by the National Government, especially in the great cities, to prevent the currency from circulating contagion. Under those circumstances, and viewing the question either as a financial proposition or as a health proposition, the Subtreas-

uries should not be abolished, but, on the contrary, they should be more wisely distributed and their functions should be increased.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], I desire to add to the debate just a word. Since the statement was made that the Subtreasuries were maintained because of political conditions, it will be interesting to know what the real facts are. I have since inquired of one of the Congressmen from the Cincinnati district, and I find that the office force of the Subtreasury in Cincinnati consists of the assistant treasurer and 16 subordinates. The assistant treasurer is a Democrat; the 16 subordinates are all Republicans; and I dare say that those 16 Republicans are safer under a Democratic chief than 16 Democrats would be under a Republican chief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], but I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote and vote "nay."

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence I feel constrained to withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON]. I understand that if present he would vote as I propose to vote. Therefore I record my vote "nay."

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], but I am privileged to vote on this bill, and I vote "nay."

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

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLLIER] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). I inquire if the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have a pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina (after having voted in the negative). I desire to ask if the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. CLARK (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], who, I understand, is absent from the city. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. REED. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. STONE] has been called from the city on some important matters, and that it is absolutely impossible for him to be here.

Mr. BRADY. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and therefore withhold my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—15.			
Borah	Gronna	Nelson	Sutherland
Brandegee	Kenyon	Norris	Watson
Cummins	Lippitt	Poindexter	Works
Curtis	McCumber	Smoot	
NAYS—45.			
Ashurst	Dillingham	Johnson, Me.	Myers
Bankhead	Fall	Kern	Oliver
Beckham	Fletcher	Lane	Overman
Broussard	Gallinger	Lee, Md.	Page
Bryan	Hardwick	Lewis	Phelan
Catron	Hughes	Lodge	Pittman
Chamberlain	Husting	McLean	Pomerene
Culberson	James	Martine, N. J.	Ransdell

Reed	Sherman	Thomas	Weeks
Saulsbury	Smith, Ga.	Thompson	
Shafroth	Smith, Md.	Walsh	
Sheppard	Smith, S. C.	Warren	

NOT VOTING—36.

Brady	Harding	Newlands	Sterling
Chilton	Hitchcock	O'Gorman	Stone
Clapp	Hollis	Owen	Swanson
Clark	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Tillman
Colt	Jones	Robinson	Townsend
du Pont	Kirby	Shields	Underwood
Fernald	La Follette	Simmons	Vardaman
Goff	Lea, Tenn.	Smith, Ariz.	Wadsworth
Gore	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.	Williams

So Mr. NELSON'S amendment was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 2, page 103, it is proposed to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the appropriations made for the Bureau of Education, whether for salaries or expenses or any other purpose connected therewith, shall be used in connection with any money contributed or tendered by the General Education Board or any corporate or other organization or individual in any way associated with it, either directly or indirectly, or contributed or tendered by any corporation or individual other than such as may be contributed by State, county, or municipal agencies; nor shall the Bureau of Education receive any moneys for salaries or any other purpose for the General Education Board or any corporate or other organization or individual in any way associated with it, either directly or indirectly, or contributed or tendered by any corporation or individual other than such as may be contributed by State, county, or municipal agencies, except by act of Congress authorizing the same. Any person violating any or either of the terms of this proviso shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not less than six months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, as the court may determine.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, my reason for presenting this amendment to the pending bill is because of the activities that have been indulged in through the Bureau of Education by agencies which seem to me to be inimical to the education of the youth of this country. A little over a year ago I introduced, and there was passed through the Senate, a resolution calling upon the secretaries of the different executive departments for information showing what funds were contributed by either the Rockefeller Foundation or the Carnegie Foundation to the activities of the several bureaus of this Government. There was a reply from each one of the departments—from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, the Department of the Interior; in fact, from all the departments of the Government—and the reply in every case in answer to that resolution was, in substance, that there were no moneys being received from either the Carnegie Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation for the work of those several departments or their bureaus.

Now, that reply from the Bureau of Education was measurably true. It stated a part of the truth, but it did not state all of the truth. Acting upon information that I have since received, I find that while it may be true that there is no money being received from either of these foundations directly, yet moneys are being paid in the way of salaries to individuals who are in the employ of these different corporate agencies, and they are at the same time nominally employees of the Government of the United States, because they are also on the pay roll of the United States at salaries of \$1 per annum. In other words, the main salaries are paid by those who I claim ought not to have anything to do with the education of the children of this country. I know not from whence the money comes for these different salaries.

When my attention was directed to the fact that that resolution stated the truth only in part, I prepared another resolution, more searching and direct in its terms, and it, too, was passed by the Senate. A reply has just come from the Bureau of Education, to which the request was alone directed this time. The reply, Mr. President, shows a condition of things that this Government ought to crush now and put an end to methods that ought to be followed only by the Government of the United States. If any individual or corporation wants to contribute money to the Bureau of Education or to the Agricultural Department, or to any other department of the Government, there is no reason in the world why the consent of Congress should not be received as a condition precedent to the acceptance of these or any other gifts.

I presume the attention of the Senate has not been called to the report that just came in. It has been printed by the Appropriations Committee, to whom the report was referred.

Mr. OVERMAN. When was it referred to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It was referred to the Committee on Appropriations on the 19th of January. Probably it ought to have gone to the Committee on Education and Labor, but it went to the Appropriations Committee.

It will appear from this report, Mr. President, that there are innumerable persons on the pay roll of the Bureau of Education acting in different capacities where the salaries paid by the Government of the United States are \$1 per annum and where the salaries paid by outside agencies run up as high as six, eight, and ten thousand dollars per annum.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to know, if the Senator can furnish me the information, why a man getting \$10,000 is put on the Government pay roll at \$1. Can the Senator give me any information as to that?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I am frank to say that I have not had the opportunity to give the subject the investigation to which it is entitled since the report came in, because I have been engaged all the time with the Military Affairs Committee; but my own impression is that the persons named in the report have, to some extent, the benefit of the franking laws through the Bureau of Education.

Let me illustrate what might well happen: Some great educator of this country, who may be ever so highly respected by our people, writes a thesis on some great educational subject that may be very near to the hearts of the American people, and yet he has no way of getting it before the people except as he may be able to pay to get his literature distributed, or in so far as he may be able to get the press to publish it; and yet one of these pets of the Bureau of Education, Mr. President, may get his answer to it, or his own view, before the American people through the franking privilege. This may not be done directly, but ways may be and are devised to accomplish it, as I shall hereafter show.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. JONES addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not see how that can possibly be done—I mean, under the law now existing. There is no franking privilege granted to any individual in a bureau or a department, and the only things that can be distributed under the franking privilege are governmental documents, Senate documents, or House documents. Of course if they were made Senate documents or House documents or governmental documents, then of course they could go through the mails free; but in order to do that of course they would have to have the head of the bureau or the head of the department have them printed as department documents.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am going to call your attention now to what has already developed in connection with this matter, in answer to the Senator from North Carolina and the suggestion of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say that it is not done. I am only saying to the Senator that the only way that I can see how it could be done is as I have suggested. I do not say that it has not been done in that way.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. JONES. I was just going to suggest that they take that means of making it a public document or an official document of the bureau, and it not only goes out, possibly, under the Government frank, but also with the apparent stamp of approval of the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it goes out from a Federal bureau.

Mr. SMOOT. Then of course the department itself assumes that it is a Government document, and has it printed as such.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

When I introduced this resolution I began to get letters from all over this country in reference to it and commending my course. I received this morning a letter from an educational institution at River Falls, Wis., as to the methods that were being adopted to corrupt or change the educational methods in vogue, and that have been in vogue for a good many years, and directing them along channels that they ought not to go. Amongst other gentlemen who have written me letters on this subject is Mr. William H. Allen, director of the Institute for

Public Service, City Hall Square, 51 Chambers Street, New York City.

As soon as this resolution was introduced he took up the matter with me. I do not know what relation he may have to any other institution so far as this subject is concerned, and I do not care, but I wrote to him and I wanted to know more, and I am apologizing to the Senate because I have not had time to get to the bottom of this thing. I received a letter from him on the 18th—that was the day before this report was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and the letter was written before the report was printed—and I take the liberty of reading his reply to the Senate, in order to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to this matter. Mr. Allen has had experience in work of this kind, and I am indebted to him for the information which his letter gives and for the suggestions he makes. He says amongst other things:

Very many thanks for your letter of January 12 referring to the resolution introduced by you re foundations and asking for information which I may have with respect to Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, etc.

May I first make a suggestion or two with regard to the resolution itself, namely, that when reviewing the information furnished by the Department of the Interior you have in mind:

1. The franking privileges given to a number of agencies or individuals, as, for example, Prof. Judd, of the University of Chicago—

Now, nobody will ever charge that institution with being entirely free from the Rockefeller influence—

ostensibly to conduct an investigation for the United States Bureau of Education. This has meant in several instances not merely that private individuals have sent out questionnaires without postage cost, but that their reports have been issued by the bureau at public expense, and—which is more important—in the name of the bureau.

So that you see pamphlets and documents emanating from the Chicago University go out with the stamp of approval, as the Senator from Washington says, of the Government on them. That is not right. It ought to be stopped, and it will be when the people understand it.

Mr. OVERMAN. With the Government frank?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes. I am not questioning the integrity of its methods at all. I do not know anything about it; but in the very nature of things no single educational institution in this country ought to be permitted to send out its views with the stamp of approval of the Government of the United States when there are so many other institutions that might not approve of them at all.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that it shall be printed as a departmental document it must of necessity carry with it the indorsement of the department, or else it would not be a departmental document.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is just what I am complaining of—that whenever these pets of the Chief of the Bureau of Education come to him with a document, he can easily find a way to make it a Government publication and give it the franking privilege, whereas some man who happened not to be so well favored by the bureau might knock at the door until doomsday and not have his document receive any governmental recognition, so that it, too, could go out.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator to assume, at least, if not to claim, that these men who receive \$1 per annum compensation from the department are the pets of the department?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Some of them; yes. I make that charge here and now.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. WORKS. Is it not to be presumed that they all are?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; it is to be presumed that they all are.

Mr. WORKS. I am a little in doubt, however, whether this—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator is going to call attention to the amendment itself, will he not wait until I get rid of this matter? Then I shall be glad to have any suggestions made with reference to the amendment. My purpose is to cut out these private activities, and to let the Government itself control the education of the youth of this country in its own way.

Secondly, Mr. Allen calls my attention to matters that I ought to consider and that the Senate ought to consider. He says further:

2. Persons whose salaries are paid from private funds, and whose work is really that of private agencies, have been attached to the

United States Bureau, written letters in its name, etc. Personally, I believe this is an excellent thing, provided there is supervision by the bureau, which will prevent its being exploited.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if the Senator knows whether the stationery that they use is furnished to these people by the Government? The stationery bills at this time are very large, and we have had to increase the appropriations for that purpose to a certain extent. Can the Senator tell me whether or not stationery is furnished these officers who get \$1 per annum from the Government?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know about that. I would not undertake to say. If I were to be permitted to express my personal opinion about this matter, I would say that the whole bureau and its methods ought to be investigated by the Congress of the United States. I think the people of this country ought to know, just as they did in the case of the Agricultural Department, just where these activities come from and who is putting up the money. The Government of the United States is big enough and able to put up all the money necessary to educate the children or to direct the educational institutions as the people may see fit.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. JONES. Does the report that the Senator has set out the names of the persons and the institutions from which their compensation really comes?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I wondered about that, because I had printed in the RECORD of the last session, at page 12028, a compilation that I got from the Department of Education which showed that there were 144 of these special officers.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was not advised of that. I wish I had seen it.

Mr. JONES. This matter was called to my attention, and I wrote to all the departments of the Government asking them to send to me the number and list of names of those who were in their employ at nominal salaries, the balance of their compensation being paid by some one else. That is printed beginning at page 12027 of the RECORD of last session; and under the report of the Bureau of Education they give a list comprising 144 names, giving the names of the individuals and the agency that pays the real salary to them. I did not know whether this report furnished that or not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think it does. I think it furnishes the whole business. I have not read it, but I shall ask to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Let me say here that Mr. Allen had to do, if I mistake not, with the Industrial Commission, and investigated this branch of the subject. I have not had an opportunity to look into it, but I think the Senate will find that there is published in that some of the results of his investigation.

Mr. Allen says:

3. Another kind of service which can do much injury is free service by persons who have influence with the commissioner and who write opinions about educational work for incorporation in the commissioner's report.

Now, note this. This is a reputable man, I assume. I do not know him personally:

Last year I protested against one such case because an admirable piece of work which was nearly 100 per cent successful for eight normal schools in Wisconsin was disparagingly and almost casually disposed of by the United States commissioner, who partially shifted the responsibility by saying it was the opinion of Prof. Judd, of the University of Chicago.

The same professor who has the benefit of the franking privilege in order to send out his effusions to the people of this country. What show has an individual as against such influence as that—a man who is paid \$6,000 a year, and the Government pays him one dollar.

Mr. POINDEXTER. One dollar a year?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir; one dollar a year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the purpose of that one dollar?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suppose it is to give them standing as officials of the Government. I do not know what else it is given for. I want to call attention to the fact that this subject was gone into here a year or two ago in reference to the Agricultural Department. Here was this great branch of the public service honeycombed with these same influences that I am complaining about now. Congress very promptly took the matter in hand, the Senate will remember, and fixed it so that they could not do it unless they did it in some underhand way. To avoid the suggestion which came to us at that time that these particular foundations were doing the work, they have now split up into little subsidiary corporations and are

operating in other ways, so that the original foundations do not appear to be doing the work.

I call attention here to this further remark of Mr. Allen:

Certain influences have been able to get free publication for doctors' theses and speeches. For instance, the United States bureau spent public funds to circulate broadcast a criticism of Charles W. Elliot, which was also circulated broadcast by the General Education Board as one of its occasional papers.

Is that a square deal for an eminent man like Dr. Elliot? He may differ with us all very radically in his theories of education and civic government and everything else; but we ought not to let an individual come in and at the expense of the Government circulate an answer to Dr. Elliot's suggestions published by him as a private citizen. Put them on the same footing. I have no objection to that. If President Judd or anyone else wants to criticize and analyze Dr. Elliot's views, however, he ought not to be permitted to do it as a Federal agent and in what purports to be a document issued under a bureau of this Government.

A great deal of literature is still current—

Says Mr. Allen—

that never ought to have been printed by the United States bureau and ought now to be scrapped; but it is notorious in school circles that a little clique of schoolmen can get anything printed by themselves or protégés which they will offer.

4. Another kind of influence which is perhaps even more serious is the influence of foundations which keeps the United States bureau from protesting against work that is shoddy and unfair. The Maryland survey of last year will, I fear, be highly commended in the next annual report of the commissioner. It has seldom been equaled for shoddy work. Partly because of foundation influence and partly because the United States bureau is living in a glass house. On surveys it is hamstrung when it comes to telling the truth about foundation surveys.

Whether there is any merit in that or not, I do not know. I do not pretend to draw any conclusions with reference to these various contentions; but what I am complaining of is that it is possible to do these things under a governmental bureau.

Mr. President, I shall not take time to read the whole letter, but in connection with the letter I am going to ask to have printed as a part of my remarks the "Memorandum re Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations" furnished me by Mr. Allen. Inquiries brought forth the following facts from the foundations themselves.

Mr. OVERMAN. Why not read it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think it ought to be read, but I dislike to take the time of the Senate to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Memorandum re Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations.]

INQUIRIES BROUGHT FORTH THE FOLLOWING FACTS FROM THE FOUNDATIONS THEMSELVES.

Professors of secondary education have been furnished southern universities—and the same men furnished State departments of education for supervising secondary schools "on the sole condition that the man selected shall be acceptable to us." One case with regard to which a copy of the letter was sent us from the files of the General Education Board is that of the University of Virginia. It was testified, however, that in most instances these men were looked over by the General Education Board. In the case of the States of Maine and New Hampshire a similar condition was made with respect to demonstration work by the Secretary of the Interior.

Other employees have been furnished to State departments of education in the South for elementary inspectors and negro school inspectors. Regarding this different opinions have been written us by southern educators, some of whom felt it restricted the freedom of public officers. Others felt that it had greatly strengthened State work. A western superintendent was offered some help from another private source, investigated among southern colleagues, and decided it would be better to do without the help than to suffer the restrictions that several superintendents reported.

The secretary of the General Education Board stated that he had found it necessary to refuse to settle questions for beneficiaries, i. e., to refuse the crown they wanted to give. In other words, the power of a great foundation is proportionate not to its money or to its giving but to our willingness to bend the knee for money.

The State of Maryland accepted a survey report from the General Education Board which would have been ridiculed and rejected if written by John Smith; in fact, much better summaries of the conditions in Maryland already existed in State records before the General Education Board gained prestige by doing that work. After the report was in a State-wide campaign was conducted that made it all anybody's life was worth to raise a question about the proposition. Then the New York newspapers and others throughout the country were flooded with statements that the survey report had been adopted with untold benefits, etc. Incidentally, among the reasons cited for passing the bill was that the new bill did not interfere with child labor of children 13 years old.

The rich State of Minnesota has not receiving funds from the General Education Board for studying certain phases of teacher-training work. Its university president has been a member of the General Education Board and is soon to come to the Rockefeller Foundation.

The Gary system is being investigated by the General Education Board under conditions which merit investigation. It is generally understood in educational circles that Prof. Cubberly, of California, who was first announced as secretary of the survey, found it necessary to retire because an assistant secretary of the General Education Board was to edit the findings of experts.

If the same kind of a report is made for the Gary system as is made for Maryland, the net result will cost this country hundreds of millions of dollars.

The overwhelming majority of influence in the board of education is exerted by a General Education Board member and paid officer. He circulated petitions, signed chiefly by other foundation members, which introduced a factional fight in the New York school board against an officer who was unanimously elected six months before. He and a paid employee of the Rockefeller Foundation and a principal officer of the Rockefeller Institute for Governmental Research buttonholed board members and fairly intimidated the town into a new presidency and a new policy. As everywhere else, the seriousness of the situation is not in the thing done but in the fact that newspapers, charitable societies, churches, and educators fall in line and applaud.

We think of picking a man as president who is persona non grata to the Rockefellers. So far as possible, they try to pick a man known to be persona particima. How could the situation be anything else, with the whole South under pension from the General Education Board and with lightning apt to strike any private college?

The Rockefeller publicity is very skilled. It announced its intention to give money conditionally. It keeps on announcing its intention until the college earns the money; it then announces that the college has earned the money. A few months later it announces the fact that the college was amongst the many that received money, and finally it announces it every year thereafter and carries the cumulative total, so that the same dollar given away or pledged is published as a new fact year after year. Since we called attention to this last year the publicity distinguishes former gifts from current gifts, but in such a way that most papers print the cumulative total first, and the public forgets the classifications. This same publicity credits Mr. Rockefeller not only with the amounts not given but with the amounts pledged and with the total toward which Rockefeller gifts are pledged. Thus, two years ago this month the General Education Board had headlines through the country "\$119,000,000 given for education," and these headlines were supplied on its own releases. One of its secretaries repeated this in a national magazine. The fact was, up to that time it actually parted with \$10,000,000, of which less than \$6,000,000 had gone for other than colleges founded by Mr. Rockefeller.

In the summary of the General Education Board, 1902-1914, appeared numerous misstatements about its relation to the Department of Agriculture, e. g., that it had given money for the Department of Agriculture because the law did not permit the national authorities to spend money for such purposes. This was contrary to fact, because the department did have the right and did spend the money. In other words, would an investigation show that the General Education Board kept on spending money for farm demonstration work when the Government ought to have done it without its aid, because of the tremendous asset it would prove to the General Education Board to have all of the work in the South credited to the foundation?

A pathetically small amount of information was found at the offices of the General Education Board, which was not equipped to understand the great educational problems it was settling by its gifts of money. The financial and executive control of the foundation was on the part of a small group which had filled up the places vacated by men of national standing, who were first appointed to the General Education Board.

It was not customary for the executive committee to send information to the full board. For instance, the board never saw the summary of its first 13 years until the day when it finally approved the report as written and drafted resolutions commending this report as being scholarly, etc. Although it was stated that the executive board made no recommendations, the records showed that the group at headquarters practically determined the recommendations and allowances of the big-name members who have posed before the country as giving a great deal of time to these educational studies.

Incidentally, although established in the hope of making it a clearing house for givers to education, it was stated that no one else had left money in bequest to the General Education Board and that would-be testators had not sought information.

As to the Rockefeller Foundation, with its one hundred and odd million dollars, it is extensively not going in for education. It has, however, decided to go in for medical education, with its large gift to Chicago. An investigation two years ago shows:

First. The foundation had only three or four clerks to spend \$100,000,000.

Second. Whereas it had promised if given a national charter to keep a clearing house for information, it had actually forgotten all about the promise and the plan.

Third. The former dean of Columbia Law School declared that the Rockefeller charter was illegal because it did not agree with the constitutional requirement that the title state its purpose. The opinion was further expressed that two of its members, ex-President Eliot and Mr. Hepburn, had not been legally elected.

It was brought out clearly that there was nothing under the sun the foundation could not do under its present charter. There is no provision in its charter for public service.

Use of the union label was objected to by the secretary, and a charitable society therefore dropped the label.

One important interference with educational method by Rockefeller and General Education Board is well known, namely, a change of the municipal research program in New York and throughout the country. Certain public-school men wanted to get the scalp of a municipal research director. They got a General Education Board employee. He made a report which contained a number of charges against the educational methods of this New York bureau of municipal research. These charges the bureau's board, consisting of men like Robert Fulton Cutting, G. W. Wickersham, A. Shaw, V. Morawetz, declared and proved unsound, untrue, and biased. While the report was being read aloud by the thorough-going gentleman, Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., telephoned to ask two officers of the bureau of municipal research to meet him at lunch. It was debated whether or not to even go to see him. A lunch meeting was held. Mr. Rockefeller offered \$10,000 a year for five years, and later \$20,000 a year, if the bureau of municipal research would discontinue the educational work in which its trustees declared their belief in answering charges by the General Education Board employee. Instead of resenting the offer, and instead of refusing to consider it until the General Education Board gave evidence that its report was unfair, the bureau of municipal research slunk away, and to this day has never had any acknowledgment of its proof that it has been blaguarded by the General Education Board. It accepted the money, and its whole program for citizen activity and for educating men for public service changed. As a direct offspring of this relation was the contention of the acting director of the bureau at the recent Springfield convention,

that when public officers are in sympathy with a civic body it should publish no facts that would lead the public to criticize or to condemn.

Like the General Education Board, the Rockefeller Foundation is in no real sense a foundation, as the complete control of it is in the hands of a small group in Mr. Rockefeller's personal office. Incidentally, the publicity work for all the Rockefeller Foundation is done by a publicity man, Mr. Ivy Lee, who has no official relation to these foundations and whose publicity work is not submitted to the trustees before going to the publisher.

As to the Carnegie Foundations, there are several which affect college independence. "The gratitude which is a lively sense of favors to come" has given the Carnegie Institution at Washington a great deal of influence. It makes disbursements. Anybody who is not good can not expect to get disbursements.

Analysis will show that though there has been a vast amount of criticism of the institution none of it has been outspoken.

The Carnegie corporation is very quiet as yet. You will remember that it furnished funds for attacking the proposition of the Panama tolls. It represents an enormous influence and has operated very little in the open as yet. There is reason to fear that it has subsidized the publication and advertisement of books by Messrs. Root, Taft, and others which attack modern liberal tendencies in government, and have been rigorously pushed by the Educational Review, of which Mr. Nicholas Murray Butler is editor.

When advertising these reactionary works Mr. Butler has not advertised the fact that he is also officer of several Carnegie Foundations. When attacking numerous educators and applauding the Carnegie Foundation's surveys Editor Butler did not advertise or admit his connection with the Carnegie Foundation.

It is now notorious that the Carnegie pension plan has overreached itself and broken down. Colleges have found their tongues and hearts for the first time in 40 years. A slight investigation shows that while under pension by the Carnegie Foundation the college world has supplied delegated to the foundation responsibilities for studying and settling college questions. By having representatives of State universities on its board the Carnegie Foundation (the same is true of the General Education Board) makes it impossible for these officers to represent their own public.

When a college wants a president almost the first thing it does is to ask the Carnegie Foundation to name somebody. Great public service would be rendered by bringing out this fact clearly.

ATTITUDE TOWARD NATIONAL UNIVERSITY.

Whereas every State university president has been committed in favor of a national university, there is almost a solid line-up of the big private universities against such a public institution. The State university men have done very little to further it; the foundations have not openly opposed; they certainly have not helped, and it is taken for granted that they do not favor.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. This document, a copy of which I hold in my hand, No. 684, is a letter transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior, signed Franklin K. Lane. I find, in looking it over hurriedly, that there are 152 persons listed here—I think that is approximately accurate, perhaps substantially accurate—who are on the roll at \$1 each per annum. That is the salary they are getting from the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. And then the salary that they are getting from other organizations is likewise stated in another column in most cases; not in all cases. So that the Senator's movement, I think, is very well warranted by the facts that have been developed, which show that something ought to be done.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think so, Mr. President, and that is the purpose of this resolution—to stop it. I do not know of any other way to do it except to limit the appropriations that have been made, or are being sought to be made, by this appropriation bill. I think it but fair to state that Mr. Claxton was appointed under a former administration as head of the Bureau of Education.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice that the list contains at least 150 names, and that the private or corporate body by which the money is paid, over and above the dollar paid by the Government, is given in the list; and I do not find the Carnegie Foundation nor the Rockefeller Foundation in the list.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And you will not find it, because, as I said a while ago, that information came from the Agricultural Department on a resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and showed the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations. You do not see these names any more, or at least they are not so conspicuous.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand that the Carnegie and Rockefeller Foundations appropriate the money, say, to the Phillips Academy for the payment of Bernard M. Allen?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no means of knowing, and that was the reason why I said that if my personal views were asked I should say the whole bureau ought to be investigated, and I shall probably move an investigation later; but take this one case now. I suppose there are some cases where the gifts are made by perfectly worthy institutions; but I will call the Senator's attention to the fact that there are men there under the

\$1 annual salary paid by the Government of the United States that are on some of these Carnegie and other foundation boards.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice here Calvin N. Kendall. He receives a salary of \$10,000, and he is the State commissioner of education of the State of New Jersey.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I notice one man here who is a professor in a university in my State. He seems to be getting a salary from somebody here, \$1 from the Government, and also a salary from the State. I was wondering whether that prevails all through here. A great many of them are from universities and colleges. Here is the State agent of rural schools for North Carolina. The General Education Board gives him \$2,500. I notice, however, that one of the professors in my State gets \$2,500, and I was wondering if he got a salary from the foundation fund, and another from the State, and then \$1 from the Government, so that he was paid from three sources?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not undertake to say.

Mr. OVERMAN. Here is Fred N. Scott, professor of rhetoric in the University of Michigan. He seems to be getting a salary from the State, \$4,000 from this fund, and \$1 from the Government.

Here is a county superintendent of schools. Here is the president of the State Normal School of Kentucky. He is getting \$3,600 from this fund. Here is a man from Miami University, and another one from Johns Hopkins. In the case of the University of Virginia, here is a man who is professor of agricultural education there, by the name of Abbey, marked "Z." I do not know what that means. Some of them seem to be getting two and three salaries here.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, that is not the worst part of it. It is bad enough as it appears in this report, but that is not the worst influence. Here are men in educational life, striving to accomplish the payment to them of a pension after their terms have expired; so that we find them not only holding out their capacious paws to the youth of the land, controlling their education, but undertaking to reach the educators who are to be dependent upon them and their nefarious pensions in the future.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KENYON. I was compelled to be out of the Chamber when this matter arose. I should like to ask the Senator how it arises now. Has he offered an amendment to this bill?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am proposing an amendment to the bill. I will send the Senator a copy of it.

Mr. KENYON. I am glad the Senator has done so, and I am glad this matter is being brought to light.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I ask the Senator from Oregon what privilege these gentlemen are entitled to enjoy by reason of thus being upon the salary list at \$1 per annum? What is the reason why they are thus seeking official position, when as a matter of fact they are in the employment of some private individual?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not believe the Senator was here when I read, in the case of the Chicago University, where Prof. Judd of that university is named in the report as getting \$1 per annum from the Government and \$6,000 a year from the university, and some of his work has had the benefit of the franking privilege. That is one case that is reported to me as having had the benefit of the franking privilege. Not only that, but he is using the franking privilege to answer other educators, and getting his literature distributed at the cost of the Government, while the private individuals can not do it.

Mr. OVERMAN. And they are printing their own documents.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They are printing at Government expense the document of Prof. Judd in reply to a communication or an article written by Dr. Eliot. Now, whether we agree with Dr. Eliot or not is aside from this question; but here is a president of a university using the franking privilege under authority of the Bureau of Education, to circulate his views all over the country at the expense of the Government, while Dr. Eliot, I assume, is compelled to do it at his own expense, if he is sufficiently interested in getting his views before the public.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, is there not something still further—that in using the frank and sending the document through the country under the franking privilege, it carries,

to a certain extent in the public mind at least, the indorsement by the Government of these peculiar or particular views?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It goes out as though it were actually an authoritative publication of the views of the Government. It is issued under the authority of the Government, apparently, as expressing the views of the Government officials themselves.

Mr. President, these institutions are like Providence. They "move in a mysterious way their wonders to perform." Now, I am going to call your attention to another activity along these same lines, to show you that they are moving with military precision all along the line, to get control of the education of the children of the land. I venture to say that if you put the educational system of this country in the hands of any particular class of individuals, in two generations they can practically change the form of our Government by educating the children along certain lines which the ideal of democracy would oppose, if the people thoroughly understood the situation.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In that connection I should like to suggest that the framers of the Constitution apprehended some similar danger when they were so careful to legislate against any law establishing religion, and they followed it up by a statute most carefully excluding church control of the public schools of the country. The cult of Rockefeller, the cult of Carnegie, in the viewpoint which they represent in political economy and in government, is just as much to be guarded against in the educational system of the country as a particular religious sect.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think there is any question about it. I do not think any particular set of individuals, whether it be in industrial life, whether it be in railroad life, or whether it be in religious life, ought to have exclusive control of the education of children.

Mr. President, I confess to some feeling about this thing. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] and I graduated from the same institution. It has the historical names of Washington and Lee attached to it. There have been efforts by some individuals, I am informed, to get money for that institution from these sources, and I am entirely opposed to its acceptance. As a matter of fact, I would rather educate my boy in a log schoolhouse built by the taxes imposed upon the people than have him receive an education in a marble palace built and maintained by these people.

Now, let us look at another activity of these distinguished financiers.

Mr. JONES. Before the Senator proceeds to another phase of it, I just want to ask him whether he has ascertained who constitutes the National Kindergarten Association?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am frank to say to the Senator, as I stated a while ago, that I did not have an opportunity to examine this report until the bill under consideration was on the heels of passage. It deserves careful consideration. What has this board got to do with immigration, I may ask?

Mr. JONES. Nothing at all. A large salary is paid by some organization of that kind. It would be very easy, of course, as the Senator suggested a moment ago, to have this foundation represented in organizations of that kind. Here is another organization, the National Kindergarten Association, and then the International Kindergarten Union. Their names are very similar. I should like to know whether any Senator here knows what these organizations are and how they are maintained and where they get their funds.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is the reason why I suggested there ought to be an investigation of the bureau, and I hope in considering it we may do it from a nonpartisan viewpoint, because I feel that there is no politics in it. It may be all right, but it does not look right to me. Now, they commence to take charge of kindergarten schools where little children go to kindergarten so that their mothers or fathers may work during a part of the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Do I understand that the effect of the Senator's amendment would be to abolish altogether this scheme of collaboration?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It abolishes the expenditure of the Government appropriation in connection with appropriations coming from any of these foundations or from any other source than a public source like a State, county, or municipality.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Then I understand it would take off the roll of this bureau the names of all the people who are now listed at a dollar per annum?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That might be the effect of the amendment, and I think that would not be an unmixed evil.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know whether it would be or not. I am trying to ascertain, because the matter is entirely new to me.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will yield to me a moment, I wish to state that it does not cut off the State officials, as I understand the amendment.

Mr. WORKS. That is just what I wanted to call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to—that it did not do that thing and I think it should. But I will pass that for the present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I should like to pass up the question of getting the amendment in proper shape. I am frank to say I made it just as sweeping as I knew how.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to ask the Senator who was responsible for this scheme of collaboration at the beginning?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know. Insidious influences have got not only into the educational life of the United States, but it did get into the Agricultural Department, and I do not know how many other departments it has gotten into.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It was, I suppose, inaugurated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Does the Senator mean Secretary Lane?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Whoever it was.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It started long ago. If you are going to make politics out of it, Mr. Claxton, I think, is a Republican, and was appointed under a former administration.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator is altogether too suspicious. I had not any thought of politics about it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I hope not. It must have gotten in under some Secretary of the Interior, because the bureau comes under him.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It came in under the Department of the Interior?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. With the sanction of whoever happened to be Secretary at that time?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He must have thought at the time it would serve some wise purpose.

Mr. LANE. Not necessarily so.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Not necessarily, but presumptively so; because I think most of our officials may be given credit for honesty of purpose. I should dislike very much to think that any other presumption ought to obtain.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will permit me, my recollection is that it started with the Department of Agriculture. I recollect some amendment which was introduced here on the Agricultural appropriation bill to stop the agents.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will permit me, I agree perfectly that we ought not to have in our public educational matters the predominating influence of private interests. The education of our children ought to be conducted under governmental and public auspices. I agree to that perfectly. But it seems to me that the Senator's amendment is too sweeping, if it destroys this scheme of collaboration altogether, because I can very well see that the influences in many respects might be for good.

Here are in this list over a hundred, somebody, I think, said 150, and on looking over it hastily I should say that the connection of a very large majority of the persons named in the Bureau of Education of the Government would be helpful.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am willing to concede that. I am in accord with the Senator, but we do not know what these influences are or just where this money comes from, except on the surface. I will say to the Senator that some men are on it who are directly connected with the Carnegie Foundation and its boards.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Well, let those men be gotten rid of.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It will take an investigation to find out the ramifications of these different agencies. For that reason my purpose was to restrict the whole business until that could be done. If these agencies are really what the Senator thinks they are, of benefit—and I agree to that in many cases—why can not the Government pay for them?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think the Government should pay for them. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. My purpose, I will say to the Senator frankly, was to stop the whole business, and then if any of these agencies are valuable—and I do not want anybody to infer that I am charging all these colleges with fraud and unfair dealing, but I do know that some of these people are tied up with these foundations and they ought not to have anything to do with the education of our youth in connection with the Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A large majority of them are not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I feel reasonably sure about it. I would not vote upon the theory that they are tied up. Here are various State institutions—the Universities of Virginia and Kansas, the University of my State, the University of Montana, and the universities of these other States.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. One of the gentlemen connected with the University of Virginia is on one of the Carnegie boards. You do not know what the connections are unless you go to work and investigate it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Would it not be better, before we undertake to deal with a question of this importance, to have an investigation and see what the facts are?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think a thorough investigation ought to come later. I will tell the Senator one of the reasons which actuates me, and this has come to me as the result of inquiring into this matter. It comes as a suggestion from Mr. Allen, the director of the Institute of Public Service in New York. I was not authorized by him to print his letter, but I am going to do it, at the possible risk of offense. It was not marked confidential and the public are vitally interested in it. In his letter to me he said:

Apropos foundation influence you probably noticed that the General Education Board has appropriated funds for a test at and by the Teachers College of the Rockefeller board's idea of a "modern school." Will you consider the innumerable ways in which this venture with foundation funds is bound to affect educational standards?

Teachers College—

That is the name of the institution—

Teachers College is part of Columbia University. Yet this experiment is to be directed by a professor from the University of Chicago. On the board of trustees are to be several (four) foundation representatives, including an employee of the General Education Board, a paid employee, and one of its council.

Teachers College is part of Columbia; Columbia wants more money.

That is the way with a lot of these institutions.

Neither Columbia nor Teachers College is free to analyze impartially the proposal which it itself is conducting, even if it felt free to criticize a work of the Rockefeller Foundation. The power of life and death almost is held over school men of the country by the Teachers College and Columbia University. It is practically impossible to get anyone to criticize in the open a venture which starts there.

People who want money from the various Rockefeller foundations consider that the line of quickest access and least resistance is that of applause; so we find overnight a world blindly applauding what many of them disapprove in the hope that their partisanship will find foundation support. Even this is done in a way where, if it fails, it will not be conclusive and the foundations themselves will be "out from under." The blunder can be laid at the door of the Teachers College.

If Congress should pass a law making it impossible for foundations to subsidize other foundations, colleges, charitable agencies, etc., thus compelling foundations to walk in the open and assume responsibility for their own spending, there would be a different initial line up on a proposal like this and an attitude of impartial analysis during the experiment.

That is the reason why I put in the amendment a requirement that whenever these gifts are to be made to the Government of the United States by these institutions or others they must be accepted by an act of Congress. If a proposition came here to present the Government with \$100,000 or \$100,000,000, if it was all right the Congress of the United States would pass an act authorizing its acceptance. It has been done in the case of grants of land to the Government of the United States for military and other purposes where it was free from any question of fraud.

Mr. President, that is all I want. I am perfectly willing to have an investigation, but I want to have this thing stopped until an investigation can be had.

Let me call the attention of the Senate to this: In the Agricultural appropriation act of 1915 this question was discussed on an amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and the Senate concluded to stop the activities of these people. Then there came back from the Department of Agriculture substantially the same sort of report that now comes to us from the Bureau of Education, and after a consideration of the subject this proviso was added to the Agricultural appropriation act that year:

Provided, That the expense of such service shall be defrayed from this appropriation and such cooperative funds as may be voluntarily contributed by State, county, and municipal agencies, associations of farmers and individual farmers, universities, colleges, boards of trade, chambers of commerce, other local associations of business men, business organizations, and individuals within the State.

That amendment in its present form was not made by the Senator from Iowa. It goes too far. I think it has had the effect, however, of cutting out the activities of these people in the Agricultural Department; but it went too far, because these institutions do not deal in the open. They do it underground and through agencies it is hard to uncover. Just exactly as I said, some of the men on this roll are connected with prominent

universities of the country. They are also on the Carnegie board or connected with it in some way and drawing pay.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Oregon has taken up this subject. I have been informed on authority, which I will gladly produce on an investigation of the whole relationship of the Rockefeller Foundation to the Government, which ought to be made, that there are certain colleges in this country that have sought endowments, and the agent of the Rockefeller Foundation or the educational board had gone out and examined the curriculum of these colleges and compelled certain changes to be made in the studies and in the curriculum.

It seems to me that it is one of the most dangerous things that can go on in a Republic to have an institution of this power apparently trying to shape and mold the thought of the young people of the country. The same question arose in the Agricultural appropriation bill. The agricultural colleges then seemed in certain States to be coming under the influence of this organization, and professors who did not teach along the line that they might decree had in some instances been compelled to give up their positions.

I know that great good has been done, of course, along agricultural lines by the Rockefeller Foundation agency in cooperation with the Government, but there is an insidious influence in this thing, there is an unconscious influence all the time in the method by which this work is being carried on, and there ought to be an investigation of the whole subject. Until that time I agree with the Senator from Oregon that it ought to stop. Let us have an investigation of the relationship and work of the Rockefeller Foundation with respect to the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Right along the line the Senator has just stated, I do not recall exactly the circumstances, but they had put down the rating of Washington and Lee University, for instance, a number of years ago, because it was not in the particular class that some of these people connected with the foundation preferred, and I registered a protest with Mr. Claxton. In other words, they can prefer certain of these institutions, giving them a standing before the country, whenever they feel disposed to do so, and can give a college a black eye by simply placing it in a lower category than some of the others.

I think I have said all I care to say about this. I frankly state my purpose is to put this thing entirely out of business, and then it can be investigated, and when we determine what the conditions are we can change it to suit the conditions.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Not having heard of this propaganda before, I am entirely unfamiliar with it. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he is familiar with any of the literature that is being circulated?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have glanced over it occasionally, but not for this purpose. As the Senator can see, I have had only two or three days to look into it, and I have not had an opportunity to get it together.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask whether or not, in obedience to the command or request or plea of any of these boards or organizations, of whatever character they may be, any textbooks have been introduced into any of the colleges as a result of their work?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not prepared to answer the Senator.

Mr. WATSON. In other words, I am trying to find out how far they have carried their work in the various colleges and what the result has been.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That would be involved in an investigation of the whole subject.

Mr. WATSON. I did not know but the Senator had investigated it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; I have not.

Mr. President, I desire to have printed as a part of my remarks the resolution calling upon the Bureau of Education for information and the report thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, such will be the order.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Senate Document No. 684, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session.]
GENERAL EDUCATION BOARD OF THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION AND
CARNEGIE FOUNDATION.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, January 18, 1917.

SIR: In accordance with Senate resolution 307, adopted by the Senate on January 4 (calendar day, January 5), 1917—

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested and directed to furnish to the Senate the following information: The relation, if any, of the organizations known as the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or any other private or corporate enterprise to the work of the Bureau of Education; a statement showing the names and positions of all employees, if any,

of the Bureau of Education whose salaries are paid in whole or in part from funds contributed by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or from any other private or corporate funds or from funds derived from any source other than the Government of the United States; the names and positions of all administrative or other officers, if any, of the Bureau of Education who are in any way connected with the work of the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or any other private or corporate enterprise, and the salaries, if any, received by them from the said Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, or any other private or corporate or other source than the Government of the United States"—I have the honor to transmit herewith the accompanying statement from the Commissioner of Education, which contains all of the data at hand in this department at the present time.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
Washington, January 13, 1917.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reply to Senate resolution 307, adopted January 4 (calendar day, January 5), 1917, I have the honor to submit the following statement:

There is no relation whatsoever of the organizations known as the General Education Board, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Carnegie Foundation to the work of the Bureau of Education. The Bureau of Education has entered into cooperative relations with the Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York City, for the purpose of making a study of negro education in the United States; with the National Kindergarten Association, New York City, and the International Kindergarten Union for the purpose of investigating and promoting kindergarten education; with the National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations for the purpose of promoting education in the home; and with the Committee for Immigrants in America for the purpose of investigating and promoting the education of adult immigrants in the United States. No funds whatsoever are contributed to the Bureau of Education directly by any of the organizations above mentioned. The organizations with which cooperative arrangements have been made are now providing for the Bureau of Education the services of certain employees whose salaries, however, are paid directly to such persons by the several organizations. The persons whose services are thus furnished the Bureau of Education are under the direct supervision and control of the Commissioner of Education and do such work as is outlined for them by the commissioner.

There have been appointed also from time to time a considerable number of special collaborators throughout the United States who are employed in universities, colleges, and normal schools or who hold other educational positions, such as county superintendent of schools, etc. These persons perform only occasional service for the Bureau of Education, and no cooperative arrangements have been entered into by the institutions or other corporate bodies by which they are regularly employed.

The names of the persons employed by the Bureau of Education under the above-mentioned arrangements are appended hereto in two lists. The first list comprises the persons who have their headquarters in the Bureau of Education at Washington, and who devote practically all of their time to the work of this bureau. The one exception in this list is Dr. Willard S. Small, principal of the Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., who has a desk in the Bureau of Education, but gives to the work of the bureau only such time as can be spared from his regular duties. The second list includes the names of special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education, who render only very occasional service to the bureau.

Cordially, yours,

P. P. CLAXTON, Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Names of persons who are employed in the Bureau of Education at Washington, D. C., and whose salaries are paid in part by organizations other than the Federal Government.

Name of person.	Position in bureau.	Salary paid by bureau.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary paid by such body.
Thomas Jesse Jones	Special collaborator	\$1	Phelps-Stokes Fund	\$4,500
Occa Taylor	do	1	do	2,000
Walter B. Hill	do	1	do	1,400
H. H. Wheaton	do	1	Committee for Immigrants in America	2,500
F. E. Farrington	do	1	do	2,400
T. M. Ave-Lallemant	do	1	do	1,500
Martha B. Burzynska	do	1	do	1,200
Paul A. Malone	do	1	do	720
Isabel Malone	do	1	do	600
Marion Berger	do	1	National Kindergarten Association	1,200
Mary L. Allen	do	1	do	520
Almira M. Winchester	do	1	International Kindergarten Union	1,500
Ellen C. Lombard	do	1	National Congress Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations	1,200
Florence E. Frisby	do	1	do	600
Edward J. Ward	do	1	None	None
Henry E. Jackson	do	1	do	None
Willard S. Small	Special agent in rural and industrial education	(1)	Board of Education of the District of Columbia	2,500
C. D. Jarvis	Special collaborator	1	None	None

¹ \$10 per day when employed.

Special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education at a salary of \$1 per annum who render occasional service, with the names of organizations other than the Federal Government, by which additional salaries are paid.

Name of person.	Regular occupation.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary.
Bernard M. Allen	Instructor in Latin	Phillips Academy	\$2,000
Kendric C. Babcock	Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	University of Illinois	5,500
Ben Blewett	Superintendent of schools	St. Louis (Mo.) Board of Education	8,000
A. Maris Boggs	Dean, Bureau of Commercial Economics	None	None
E. C. Branson	Professor, rural economics and sociology	University of North Carolina	2,500
Edward F. Brown	Superintendent, bureau of welfare of school children and executive secretary New York school lunch committee	New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor	3,500
R. E. Cole	Member, council on naturalization	Committee for Immigrants in America	2,500
Nathan P. Colwell	Secretary	American Medical Association	4,000
Mrs. Grace Davis	Field agent	National Kindergarten Association	(1)
May Delahanty	Office secretary	do	1,500
Richard E. Dodge	Editor	Association of American Geographers	200
Milton Fairchild	Chairman, Washington executive committee	National Institution for Moral Instruction (Inc.)	1,800
Jessie Field	Rural and small town specialist	National Board, Y. W. C. A.	1,800
Lloyd I. Friend	State supervisor of high schools and professor of secondary education in West Virginia University	General Education Board, through West Virginia University	2,500
L. J. Hanifan	State supervisor of rural schools	General Education Board	2,500
James F. Hosie	Head of English department, Chicago Normal School	Chicago Board of Education	3,500
Henry Israel	Secretary, county work department	International committee, Y. M. C. A.	2,900
Charles H. Judd	Director, school of education	University of Chicago	6,000
Calvin N. Kendall	State commissioner of education	State of New Jersey	10,000
Charles H. Keyes	President	Skidmore School of Arts, Massachusetts State Board of Education	6,000
Clarence D. Kingsley	Agent for high schools	State Board of Education	2,600
Esther E. Lape	Publicity director	Committee for Immigrants in America	1,800
Bessie Locke	Corresponding secretary	National Kindergarten Association	2,000
N. C. Newbold	State agent, rural schools for North Carolina	General Education Board	2,500
William F. Osgood	Professor of mathematics	Harvard College and Radcliffe College	6,300
Clarence A. Perry	Associate director, department of recreation	Russell Sage Foundation	3,000
Wm. L. Phelps	Professor of English literature	Yale University	5,000
Mrs. Hannah K. Schoff	President	National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations	None
Fred N. Scott	Professor of rhetoric	University of Michigan	4,000
C. Alphonso Smith	Head, school of English	University of Virginia	3,300
Miss Louise Schofield	Clerk	National Kindergarten Association	1,200
David Eugene Smith	Professor of mathematics	Columbia University	6,000
George D. Strayer	Professor of educational administration	Teachers College, Columbia University	6,000
Glen L. Swiggett	Editing proceedings Pan American Congress	None	None
W. K. Tate	Professor of rural education	George Peabody College for Teachers	3,500
A. E. Wagner	Extension professor	Ohio University	2,300
Lenore P. Webster	Housewife	None	None
C. W. Wright	County superintendent of schools	County board of education	1,800
T. J. Coates	President, State Normal School	State of Kentucky	3,600
B. M. Davis	Professor of agricultural education	Miami University	2,500
Edward F. Buchner	Director, College of Courses for Teachers and Summer Courses	Johns Hopkins University	3,500
Jackson Davis	General field agent	General Education Board
Helen M. Heffernan	Chairman, Chicago organization	Illinois Congress of Mothers and Parent Teacher Associations	None
R. H. Powell	President, State Normal School	State of Georgia	2,500
S. W. Straus	S. W. Straus & Co.
W. D. Weatherford	International committee, Y. M. C. A.	3,000
Lucy Wheelock	President	Wheelock Kindergarten Training School	(2)
Wm. H. Maxwell	Superintendent of schools	New York City Board of Education	10,000

¹ \$100 per month when employed.

² Profits.

Special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education at a salary of \$1 per annum who render occasional service, etc.—Continued.

Name of person.	Regular occupation.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary.
R. W. Stimson.....	Agent.....	Massachusetts State Board of Education.	\$3,500
B. W. Torreyson.....	Professor of secondary education.	General Education Board, through University of Arkansas.	3,000
Cyrus C. Adams.....	Geographer.....	University of West Virginia.	
Myron J. Abbey.....	Professor of agricultural education.	George Peabody College for Teachers.	
Carter Alexander.....	Professor of school administration.	State of Oregon.	
J. H. Ackerman.....	President, State Normal School.	American School Peace League.	
Fannie Fern Andrews.....	Secretary.....	State of North Carolina.	
S. G. Atkins.....	President State Industrial and State Normal School.	East Carolina Teachers' Training School.	
Herbert E. Austin.....	Professor.....	County board of education.	
N. R. Baker.....	County supervisor of rural schools.	State Board of Education of California.	
Mary G. Barnum.....	Vice president.....	Indiana State Department of Education.	
Adelaide S. Baylor.....	State supervisor of household arts.	Bradley Polytechnic Institute.	
Charles A. Bennett.....	Professor of manual arts.	Mothers' Congress and Parent-Teachers' Associations.	
Helen T. Birney.....	Michigan Agricultural College.	
George W. Bissell.....	Professor of mechanical engineering.	State of Arkansas.	
James L. Bond.....	State superintendent public instruction.	Southern Conferences for Education and Industry.	
Albert P. Bourland.....	Executive secretary.....	State Department of Public Instruction of Louisiana.	
Cyrus J. Brown.....	Rural-school supervisor.	State of Michigan.	
Ernest Burnham.....	Director, rural-school department, State Normal School.	University of Minnesota.	
Richard Burton.....	Professor of English.....	Minnesota State Department of Public Instruction.	
Mabel Carney.....	Supervisor teacher, training department.	Teachers' Retirement Board of Massachusetts.	
Edmund S. Cogswell.....	Secretary.....	Leland Stanford Junior University.	
R. W. Corwin.....	Physician.....	University of Montana.	
Ellwood P. Cubberley.....	Professor of education.....	University of Texas.	
Margaret C. Curran.....	Chancellor.....	University of Mississippi.	
Edward C. Elliott.....	Professor.....	University of Nebraska.	
A. Caswell Ellis.....	State high-school inspector.	Grand Rapids (Mich.) Board of Education.	
John C. Fant.....	State supervisor of negro schools.	Whitman College.	
Leo M. Favrot.....	Professor of history.....	South Carolina department of public instruction.	
Fred M. Fling.....	Harvard University.	
Fred B. Frazier.....	County board of education.	
Edward A. Freeman.....	Superintendent of schools.	University of Virginia.	
Charles G. Haines.....	Professor of political science.	University of Kansas.	
William H. Hand.....	State high-school inspector.	University of Illinois.	
Paul H. Hanus.....	Professor of education.....	Deer River (Minn.) board of education.	
Marie T. Harvey.....	Teacher, Porter Rural School.	Elizabeth McCormick memorial fund.	
Frank L. Hayford.....	Executive secretary, trustees of Massachusetts training schools.	Wisconsin State Department of Education.	
William H. Heck.....	Professor of education.....	George Peabody College for Teachers.	
Miss Caroline Hedger.....	Florida State Department of Education.	
Edwin M. Hopkins.....	Professor of rhetoric and English language.	North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.	
C. H. Johnston.....	Professor of secondary education.	Bureau of Welfare of School Children.	
George E. Keenan.....	Superintendent of schools.	University of Virginia.	
Sherman C. Kingsley.....	Director.....	Colorado State Normal School.	
Walter E. Larson.....	State inspector of rural schools.	Louisiana State Board of Health.	
Charles E. Little.....	Professor of Latin.....		
George M. Lynch.....	State supervisor of rural schools.		
N. C. Macdonald.....	State rural school inspector.		
Frank A. Manny.....	Investigator.....		
Charles G. Maphis.....	Professor of secondary education.		
W. B. Mooney.....	Professor of school administration.		
Agnes Morris.....	Agent.....		

Special collaborators employed by the Bureau of Education at a salary of \$1 per annum who render occasional service, etc.—Continued.

Name of person.	Regular occupation.	Private or corporate body by which salary is paid.	Salary.
John F. Murray.....	Professor of nature study.	University of Utah.	
Joshua H. Paul.....	High school inspector.....	Minnesota Department of Public Instruction.	
Eugene M. Phillips.....	Birmingham (Ala.) Board of Education.	
John H. Phillips.....	Superintendent of schools.	Charleston (S. C.) Museum.	
Paul W. Rea.....	Director.....	State University of Kentucky.	
McHenry Rhoads.....	Professor of secondary education.	George Peabody College for Teachers.	
Wm. F. Russell.....	Colorado Agricultural College.	
C. G. Sargent.....	Professor of rural and industrial education.	University of North Dakota.	
K. B. Schlaegel.....	Professor of education.....	University of Kansas.	
Charles C. Schmidt.....	Playground & Recreation Association of America.	
James W. Searson.....	Professor of the English language.	County board of education, Colorado.	
Thomas S. Settle.....	Field secretary.....	University of Wisconsin.	
Joseph H. Shriber.....	County superintendent of schools.	North Dakota School of Forestry.	
Charles F. Smith.....	Professor of Greek and classical philology.	Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College.	
Fred W. Smith.....	President.....	Minneapolis (Minn.) Board of Education.	
W. H. Smith.....	Kentucky Illiteracy Commission.	
F. E. Spaulding.....	Superintendent of schools.	Portland (Oreg.) Board of Education.	
Cora Wilson Stewart.....	President.....	University of Florida.	
L. L. Summers.....	Industrial department, public schools.	University of Pennsylvania.	
John A. Thackston.....	State high school inspector and professor, rural education.	Dakota Wesleyan University.	
Harlan Updegraff.....	Professor of school administration.	University of North Dakota.	
S. D. van Benthuyzen.....	Dean of school of commerce.	
N. W. Walker.....	Inspector of high schools.	
Mrs. C. P. Weaver.....	University of Wisconsin.	
Ray H. Whitbeck.....	Professor of geography.	Ohio State Board of Education.	
Henry G. Williams.....	State supervisor of normal schools.	Columbia University.	
Thomas D. Wood.....	Professor of physical education.	
Thos. J. Wooster, jr.....	Student.....	Idaho State Normal School.	
Earl S. Wooster.....	Dean of rural department.	University of Pennsylvania.	
A. Duncan Yocum.....	Professor of education.....	University of Chicago.	
J. W. A. Young.....	Professor of mathematics.		

Mr. WORKS. I wish to suggest to the Senator from Oregon that, in my judgment, he is not going to accomplish by this amendment all he desires to accomplish. I wish to suggest that the following be added to it at the appropriate place:

Nor shall any person, paid in whole or in part by any such corporation or individual for services rendered by him, be employed by the Government or become or remain an officer or employee of the Government.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly willing to have that inserted.

Mr. WORKS. That phase of it, I think, is not covered by the amendment. It simply provides that the Board of Education shall not accept money from these outside sources, and it does not prevent the employment of people who may be paid wholly by the Rockefeller Foundation as some of the institutions of that sort are. I think the Government ought to be kept separate and apart entirely from any outside influence in the matter of education. I think it is a very dangerous thing to allow any of these private institutions to interfere or become influential in the educational work of the Government.

Since I came into the Senate there was a bill introduced providing for the incorporation of the Rockefeller Foundation, a new corporation, for educational purposes. Perhaps it has gone out of the mind of Senators. It was never discussed here except that in a speech I made myself I referred to its provisions, but it actually passed the House of Representatives. Let me call the attention of the Senate to some of the provisions that are contained in that proposed legislation. One of the sections is as follows:

That for the promotion of such objects the said corporation shall have power to establish, maintain, and endow, or to aid others, whether individuals, associations, or corporations, to establish, maintain, and endow institutions and other agencies for carrying on said objects, and

any of them; to purchase, hold, sell, and convey real estate necessary for the said corporate objects, and to erect, improve, enlarge, and equip buildings or other structures necessary or convenient for said objects, or any of them, and to acquire, make, and furnish all necessary or convenient apparatus and other accessories; to employ and aid others to employ teachers, lecturers, assistants, and agents; to donate to any individual, association, or corporation engaged in similar work, money or property, real or personal, which shall at any time be held by the said corporation hereby constituted, subject to the terms of any gift, grant, bequest, or devise by which the said corporation shall have received the same.

And again it was provided—

That the total amount of property held at any one time, including that which is held absolutely as well as that which is held in trust, shall not exceed the value of \$100,000,000, exclusive of increases in the value of property subsequent to its receipt by said corporation.

The bill was so broad in its terms that it provided a corporation that might enter into and control almost every educational institution of the country. It might aid in the employment of teachers, the payment of them, supplying the apparatus necessary to carry on the educational work, and at the time I undertook to say something about the bill before it reached the Senate in discussing another question. It never was taken up in the Senate. But it simply shows the tendency on the part of these people who are attempting to get control of the whole educational work of this country. I think it is a very dangerous tendency.

It is for that reason that I have suggested to the Senator from Oregon that there had better be a provision here preventing the employment by the Government of any people who are under the pay of any of these institutions.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Will the Senator indicate where it ought to go in and I will be very glad to accept the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. While the Senator from California is looking into this matter I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon for information whether it is the fact that any employee of the Bureau of Education is at liberty to prepare any kind of a pamphlet he sees fit and have it printed and circulated under frank. Is there any law which authorizes such a privilege?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know of any law that would authorize these people as agents here to use the franking privilege, but suppose one of them did?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is no law to authorize it; but here comes a document from one of the agencies here. Here is the instance I gave a while ago, cited by Mr. Allen, who has had some experience in investigating these subjects. He says:

The franking privilege is given to a number of agencies or individuals, as, for example, Prof. Judd, of the University of Chicago, ostensibly to conduct an investigation for the United States Bureau of Education.

Suppose Mr. Claxton says: "I want you, Mr. Judd, to investigate a certain particular governmental function"—on immigration or anything that he may want to have investigated. He investigates it as an agent of the Government and Mr. Claxton puts it in—

Mr. WALSH. It then becomes a Government publication, and is issued and forwarded by the Bureau of Education.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; but it is the propaganda of an individual—of Mr. Judd.

Mr. OVERMAN. Some man wants to get his view promulgated, and at \$1 a year he is employed to do it.

While I am on my feet I want to say that I spoke of the professor of a university and I inquired whether he was not getting three salaries—one from the foundation, one from the State, and one from the Government. I find that is not true, that he is getting a salary of \$2,500 as professor at the university, and the Government then is putting him on the roll at \$1 for some purpose. In almost all the colleges and universities of the country there is a roll, and they are getting \$1.

I think the Senator from Oregon is doing a very valuable service to the country. I am sorry he did not bring this matter before our committee so that we could investigate it. We knew nothing in the world about it. I am going to accept the amendment; I shall not object to it, so that the conferees can investigate this matter and have Prof. Claxton before us and explain it. Then it will be in conference and we ought to take such action in conference as is proper. I am glad that the Senator brought it to our attention so that we can take some action. We will investigate it thoroughly if we have the time, and I expect the House conferees to agree with us to do it.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, this is so plain a proposition, to my mind, that it does not seem to call for additional investigation. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon the insertion of what I have already indicated after the word "same" and just before the penal clause in his amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am perfectly satisfied to accept that and make it a part of my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after the word "same," just preceding the penal clause, the following words:

Nor shall any person paid in whole or in part by any such corporation or individual for services rendered by him be employed by the Government or become or remain an officer or employee of the Government.

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

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has made certain amendments to the bill, two of which have been reserved for a separate vote.

Mr. HUSTING. I reserve the right to offer an amendment to section 7.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that section 7 has been reserved for a separate vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the other amendments made as in Committee of the Whole save those which have been reserved.

The amendments were concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The following amendment was reserved for a separate vote, and it will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] reserved for a separate vote the amendment on page 51, lines 6 and 7, after the words "draftsman \$1,500," insert "private secretary for captain commandant, \$1,400."

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand that was reserved for a point of order to be made on it, and according to a ruling of the Chair yesterday it is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Pending a disposition of that, I desire to inquire of the Chair whether House bill 408 was laid before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was laid down and temporarily laid aside. The question is on concurring in the amendment.

The amendment was concurred in.

The SECRETARY. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] reserved a separate vote in the Senate on the amendment on page 117, beginning in line 6, and ending in line 18.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offer the amendment to that amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 117, line 18, after the word "department," it is proposed to insert as a new paragraph the following:

The office of postmaster in each class shall hereafter be a nonpolitical office, and shall be within the classified civil service, and appointments thereto shall be made in accordance with the civil-service rules and, so far as practicable, by promotion, or transfer, upon merit, without regard to politics, from the employees of the Post Office Department, subject to the permanent civil-service regulations and requirements.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, that amendment is in accordance with the recommendation of the Postmaster General, which is found on page 40 of his annual report for 1916. The Postmaster General there states:

The classifying of the position of postmaster of the fourth class has proven so satisfactory that there is every service reason why the classified service should be extended to include the position of postmaster at offices of the first, second, and third classes, and that legislation looking to that end is recommended on page 54 of this report.

He there sets out a draft of legislation containing in substance the amendment which I have offered.

Some time ago I had the matter investigated by the expert of the Bureau of Efficiency as to its effect upon the service, and it was estimated by him and by officials of the Post Office Department, that if the same principles of merit and efficiency were applied to the selection of postmasters and determining their qualifications, as applied in the classified civil service of the Post Office Department, it would not only improve the service, it would not only tend toward a better conduct of the business of the various post offices, but that it would save directly between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000 a year.

During the discussion of an amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], in charge of the bill, the other day, for an examination as to the duplication of work in the various bureaus and departments of the Government, he stated his desire to save \$30,000,000, and so it occurred to me that an amendment upon this section of the bill, in line with the transfer there authorized, to save the small

sum of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 a year would be very appropriate.

Of course, Mr. President, it would make some political difference in the conduct of the administration and of the changing administrations from term to term; but I imagine that it would be a great relief to the President of the United States. I know it would be a great relief to the Members of the House of Representatives, speaking of them not as Members of the House, however, officially, but as individual referees, to whom, under the custom of political patronage, is referred the selection of postmasters in their several districts. I know that it is frequently regarded as a political asset, though it is really a political liability. It is of no advantage politically or governmentally to any Member of Congress in either branch of Congress to have the duty and the power, if we choose to call it so, of selecting postmasters.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will accept the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. POINDEXTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print, in connection with my remarks upon the amendment I offered affecting postmasters, a portion of a message of President Taft of February 26, 1913.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

REDUCTIONS BY ELIMINATION OF SINECURES.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to; and without objection, the amendment made in Committee of the Whole as amended is concurred in.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I think section 7 of the bill is the only remaining one which has been reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Section 7 has been reserved.

Mr. JONES. I suggest the absence of a quorum, if we have reached section 7.

Mr. OVERMAN. I merely want a vote; I do not desire any debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	Hughes	Page	Sterling
Beckham	Husting	Pittman	Sutherland
Borah	James	Poin Dexter	Thomas
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	Pomerene	Thompson
Catron	Jones	Ransdell	Vardaman
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Clapp	Lane	Shafroth	Warren
Culberson	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Watson
Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Weeks
Dillingham	Nelson	Smith, Ca.	Workers
du Pont	Norris	Smith, Md.	
Gallinger	Oliver	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on concurring in the amendments to section 7 as made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The question arises in this way: I understand that those who are in favor of the so-called Smoot amendment will vote "yea" and those who are opposed to it will vote "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. I should like to have the vote taken as it was taken originally. I move to strike out section 7 as amended, and get the vote in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from North Carolina move to strike out section 7?

Mr. OVERMAN. I move to strike out section 7.

Mr. SMOOT. As amended?

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; the original section, and then the vote to strike out will be "yea."

Mr. GALLINGER. I should think the question would be upon concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. OVERMAN. What I suggest will amount to the same thing.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know; but the parliamentary situation is as I have stated it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not see how the Chair could change the rule of the Senate in putting the question.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then, as I understand the Chair, the vote will be as to whether or not we shall strike out the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the reserved question for a vote in the Senate was whether or not the Senate would concur in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole. The amendment made as in Committee of the Whole was, as the Chair understands, to change the House text, and not to strike it out. If the Senate should refuse to concur in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole, then the vote would come on striking out the original paragraph.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Smoot amendment has not been reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question is whether or not the Senate will agree to section 7 as amended by the Smoot amendment, the committee having brought a report here to strike out the whole section. So if the Senate refuses to strike out the whole section, the Smoot amendment will remain in the bill. If the Senate agrees to strike it out, that strikes out the whole section. The question is whether or not the Senate will strike it out. The Smoot amendment is already agreed to; no Senator reserved it for a separate vote; but the question was reserved on striking out section 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] reserved it for a separate vote.

Mr. OVERMAN. No Senator reserved the Smoot amendment for a separate vote, and the question is whether or not we shall strike out section 7 as the committee reported it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not change his ruling, which was that nothing can occur in Committee of the Whole beyond reserving for a separate vote in the Senate whatever may have happened to be the vote in the Committee of the Whole. It happens to have been that the vote in the Committee of the Whole was on what is known as the Smoot amendment, which takes the place of the committee's suggestion, and that must be first voted on. If it is not concurred in in the Senate, then the vote recurs on the committee amendment to strike out the original text.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But suppose it is concurred in?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the Senate will have agreed to just what the Committee of the Whole agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Exactly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But even after the Smoot amendment was agreed to in the Committee of the Whole, the question then arose on the committee amendment, which struck out the entire section as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, Mr. President, if the Chair rules that it did not, I think I will have to appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I say that was the action taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair knows what took place, because the Chair was here. The Chair knows that the Senator from Utah submitted an amendment to the House text. That amendment was agreed to. Thereupon the Chair ruled that the question had to be put on the committee amendment to strike out. It was put and lost. So that the only thing that was reserved as in Committee of the Whole was what is known as the Smoot amendment. That was the only thing reserved for a vote in the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I did not reserve the Smoot amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] reserved it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I reserved the amendment of the committee striking out section 7. Of course if the Senator from Wisconsin reserved the other amendment, that is different; but I did not know that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not say that the Senator from North Carolina had reserved that amendment. This is clearly the parliamentary situation: The vote comes first on concurring in the Smoot amendment. If that is carried, that is the end of it; but if it is lost, then the vote recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, after it is concurred in and becomes a part of the House text, then surely we have the right in the Senate to vote upon the proposition to strike out the House text as amended.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what the Chair has stated.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the very thing I reserved—the amendment to strike out the original House provision. The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, adopted the Smoot amendment to the original text, and, the original text having been amended, then the question recurred upon the committee amendment to strike out section 7. If section 7 is stricken out in the Senate, then there is no need to vote on the Smoot amendment; but if it is not stricken out and the Smoot amendment was reserved we would have to vote on that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may be entirely wrong, and the question can easily be settled by an appeal, but the Chair rules that the vote is on concurring in the amendment made as in the Committee of the Whole, which was the substitution of what is known as the Smoot amendment for the original House text. If the Chair is wrong about that, it is easy for the Senate to settle it. The Chair has no pride of opinion about the matter.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Chair does not rule that we shall be deprived of an opportunity to vote on the committee amendment striking out section 7?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what section 7 does the Senator from North Carolina refer?

Mr. OVERMAN. The last section of the bill, which the committee reported an amendment to strike out. That is what we have been talking about for almost a week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But what does the Senator from North Carolina mean—the House provision?

Mr. OVERMAN. I mean that section 7 came here from the House. If the Chair will examine the bill, he will see the lines stricken through the section. The committee recommended that that section be stricken from the bill. Before a vote was taken on that the Senator from Utah offered to amend the House text, and the House text was amended. Now, the amendment to strike out the whole section is still here.

Mr. SMOOT. That was disagreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. It was disagreed to, but I have reserved it for a separate vote in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator reserved it for a separate vote in the Senate, he is entitled to a vote; but the first vote comes on concurring in the Smoot amendment.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all right. I understood the Chair to say that when the Smoot amendment was acted upon, that would be the end of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What the Chair was trying to make clear was that it is the Smoot amendment we are about to vote upon.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is all right.

Mr. WEEKS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. On yesterday I offered an additional section, against which a point of order was made; and I reserved the right to offer it as an amendment to the Smoot amendment if that were concurred in. If the procedure is followed in accordance with the decision which the Chair has just made, will the amendment which I desire to offer to the Smoot amendment be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the custom which has prevailed since the present occupant of the Chair has been here, at this point it would be proper to offer an amendment to the Smoot amendment. It can be offered now.

Mr. WEEKS. If I do not see fit to offer it now, will it be in order to offer it after action has been taken on the Smoot amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not answer that, because the Chair does not know the language of the amendment; but when the Smoot amendment has been once agreed to as in Committee of the Whole and then concurred in in the Senate, without a reconsideration of the vote whereby it was concurred in, the Chair is afraid the Senator's amendment would not be in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to say that if it is offered after the Smoot amendment is voted on I shall object.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think that the objection will stand; but I will take my chance on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There must be no doubt about what the ruling of the Chair is. So that no Senator may fall into a

misapprehension, the Chair believes that if it is an amendment to the Smoot amendment it must be offered now, and that it can not be offered hereafter as an amendment to the Smoot amendment without a reconsideration of the vote whereby the Smoot amendment may be concurred in; but it may be offered as a separate amendment to the bill in the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment to section 7 agreed to as in Committee of the Whole on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, it will not be necessary to have a yea-and-nay vote on that. I merely want a vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. If that be so, I will withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OVERMAN. We do not want a yea-and-nay vote on the Smoot amendment.

Mr. HUSTING. Mr. President, I had thought of offering an amendment to the Smoot amendment, but upon reflection I think perhaps that the matter that I wished to suggest can be taken care of better in conference than upon the floor of the Senate. I had in mind suggesting an increase of 20 per cent to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum of \$500 or less, 10 per cent to those who receive salaries of more than \$500 and not exceeding \$900, and 5 per cent to those receiving salaries between \$900 and \$1,800. I know that such an amendment would involve a great deal of discussion, and I have no disposition to delay materially the vote upon this bill. I desire to say a few words, however, to indicate why I think the Smoot amendment, at least, should be adopted.

The only fault I find with that amendment is that it does not go far enough. I am aware that I am not entirely in harmony with most of my colleagues on this side; but I can not adopt their reasoning upon this matter. I do not think it is fair to say that because we are living beyond our means therefore our hired help should suffer. I do not think that we are any more justified in denying proper advancement and compensation to Government employees, if such is deserved and needed, than a householder would be justified in refusing to compensate his hired girl because his family was living beyond his income. There have been measures before the Senate and before the other branch of Congress in connection with which millions and millions of dollars could have been saved, and we would not have been obliged to enter the plea that we could not afford to pay our help what they are entitled to receive.

It is said, among other things, that a horizontal raise is unscientific. Well, I do not think it is any more unscientific than the original method of fixing compensation by classes. If we originally fixed a class that would receive a compensation of \$500, another of \$700, another of \$900, another of \$1,200, another of \$1,400, and so on, why can we not horizontally raise the grades for the same reason that we originally fixed them? Not only that, but the manufacturing industries controlled and directed by men who know business, who are supposed to be and probably are the best business men we have in the country, have given their employees a horizontal raise. All the manufacturing establishments that have raised the wages or salaries of their employees have raised these wages or salaries horizontally 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 15 per cent, or 20 per cent; so that we are not out of harmony with the general practice, even in private business, in raising wages horizontally.

The plea that we can not afford to pay employees adequate wages does not come with good grace from a Government that can afford to pay its employees what they are worth. It is said that if you grant a horizontal increase you are giving some a raise who do not deserve it. I presume that all those receiving a thousand dollars a year in compensation do not give the same equivalent for their wage; yet as long as they are in the thousand-dollar class they are treated as though they gave the same equivalent. So if the compensation for the class is raised, even though there are some undeserving ones in the class, we would only be doing what we are already doing now in paying some more than they deserve who are in a certain class.

And why should we hesitate to give a raise to 90 per cent of the employees simply because 10 per cent might undeservedly get the raise? I do not think it is equity—to say that we must keep 90 per cent down because 10 per cent ought not to go up. I think we should give those who deserve it this raise, eliminate the others or put them in a lower class if we do not think they are earning the increased salary. Therefore I do not think that the argument that we should not raise the salaries of employees because a few are undeserving is sound.

Some make the plea that this Government should refuse to pay proper wages to its employees because we have already appropriated too much money. What does this mean? It is conceded that wages are too low. Anybody who lives in Washington knows that a thousand dollars a year does not go very far here. I had not been here very long until I discovered that. I am sure older Senators, who have been here considerably longer than I have, know how far they would get, or how far anyone can get, with a thousand dollars a year in the city of Washington. This is not the cheapest place in the world to live in, as I think everybody will acknowledge who has lived here for any length of time; and yet we have here people who are only getting three, four, or five hundred dollars a year, some who are drawing only six or seven hundred dollars a year—not enough to pay one month's rent for a house of any consequence. You can not rent a house of any consequence here in Washington for less than \$200 or \$250 a month, and the amount of rent ranges all the way up to a thousand dollars a month. So money is needed. It is needed just as badly by the employees of the United States as it is needed by the employees of great corporations throughout the country.

The employees need this increase, and they deserve it. They deserve to get a living wage. Shall the United States Government say that it knows these employees deserve this increase, that it knows they need it, but that the country can not afford to pay them? That would mean that we are withholding from a class of employees money to which they are entitled and which they deserve in order that we may put it into some other enterprise. In other words, we are saddling part of the burden of the Government upon those lower classes, and asking that they shall be deprived of a raise in their wages in order that we may spend the money to which they are justly entitled for other governmental purposes. In other words, we want to saddle the burdens of government upon our employees. I do not think that is generous, and I do not think that it is just.

This country is rich enough to pay its employees what they deserve. If we want economy, let us not economize at the bottom; let us economize at the top. There are bills coming in here for river and harbor improvements, for flood control, and other things of that kind that will carry appropriations running up into the hundreds of millions of dollars in the final analysis. Let us cut off a few millions from these bills if we are going to adopt them, or let us postpone these matters a few years if we do not want to abandon them, and let us pay the employees of the Government that which they are entitled to. Let us not appropriate all the money that we can, to the last dollar that we shall be able to raise here in this country, and then at the last moment say to our employees: "We have spent all the money we have, and therefore you will have to stand for it. This burden will have to rest on you alone."

I do not think the great Democratic Party ought to put itself in this attitude of withholding from the masses of the people a just wage. How can we, with consistency, call upon the great manufacturing establishments and transportation lines of this country to treat their employees justly, when we, by a poor and bad example, go the other way? Can we say with consistency to the railroads and the manufacturing establishments: "Here, you must not work your men more than eight hours a day; you must pay them a living wage, a minimum wage," when at the same time we are so preaching, we are practicing the other thing? If we deny a raise to these employees instead of going before the country with a good example, we can only go before the people with a good precept and a bad example.

The Democratic Party, especially, has been the champion of the working classes. I hope to see it continue to be such; but let it start at home. Let us treat these men and women justly who are working for the Government. Let us not talk about the flag, and tell them to love the flag, and love their country, when the country over which this flag flies treats them so niggardly. You can not get them to love a country if it does not show some love for them; and I say this Government, in dealing with its own employees, should set an example to the country of how employees should be treated, so that precept and example and practice will go hand in hand.

I hope sincerely that not only the Smoot amendment will be retained in this bill and be adopted but that the conferees of the House will insist upon the raise provided for in the House bill, so that the raise of wages will cover all those classes mentioned in the House bill. It is only just and fair, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will come to see the matter in this light.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now the question recurs on the committee amendment to strike out, reserved for a separate vote in the Senate.

Mr. BRYAN. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. CLAPP (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when his name was called). As I have already stated, I am paired with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the last roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. SAULSBURY (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). Has the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WADSWORTH (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. In his absence, I will withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Has the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. HUSTING. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is paired with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and I therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON]. He is not in the Chamber, and I must therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. CATRON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND] and vote "nay."

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am paired for the day with the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay"; and I understand that if the Senator from Florida were here he would vote "yea."

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK] with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]; and

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—24.

Ashurst	Hughes	Randsdell	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	James	Reed	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Lewis	Saulsbury	Thomas
Bryan	Myers	Shafroth	Tillman
Culberson	Newlands	Sheppard	Vardaman
Hardwick	Overman	Shields	Walsh

NAYS—33.

Borah	Clapp	Husting	Lodge
Brady	Cummins	Kenyon	McCumber
Broussard	Curtis	Lane	Martine, N. J.
Chamberlain	du Pont	Lee, Md.	Nelson
	Gallinger	Lippitt	Norris

Oliver	Pomerene	Thompson	Works
Page	Sherman	Warren	
Pittman	Smoot	Watson	
Polindexter	Sterling	Weeks	

NOT VOTING—39.

Brandegee	Gronna	Lea, Tenn.	Smith, Md.
Chilton	Harding	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Clark	Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Stone
Colt	Hollis	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Dillingham	Johnson, Me.	Owen	Swanson
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Townsend
Fernald	Jones	Phelan	Underwood
Fletcher	Kern	Robinson	Wadsworth
Goff	Kirby	Simmons	Williams
Gore	La Follette	Smith, Ariz.	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after section 7, the following:

Provided, That from the date of the approval of this act and during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the increase of pay provided for in this section shall apply and be paid to the employees to whom the said section refers. The appropriation for this purpose shall be immediately available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to make the same point of order that was made and sustained to this amendment when it was offered in Committee of the Whole. No estimate has been made for it; it adds a new item of appropriation; and it is an increase of an appropriation already made.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the proposition as it came from the House was general legislation. The point of order had been made against it in the House, and I understand it had stood. The proposition offered by the Senator from Utah, which has been adopted—

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator whether he offers this as a separate amendment, or as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. WEEKS. I offer it as an amendment to the amendment that has just been adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Then I must make the additional point of order that the right to do so was not reserved in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator is mistaken about that; I did reserve in Committee of the Whole the right to offer it in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already ruled on that proposition—that if it was an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, the point of order would be sustained by the Chair. If it is offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, the point of order is now sustained.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, just one observation. I did not offer the amendment to the Smoot amendment before the vote which was just taken, because I did not care to take the responsibility of jeopardizing that amendment, which I think is extremely important to the people who are to be benefited by the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Utah. I think as a result my amendment is now in a hopeless parliamentary situation, which I greatly regret. I can not understand Senators who are willing to vote, as the majority did vote in this Chamber last fall, to increase the pay of men who are receiving twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hundred dollars a year and yet are willing in times like these, when these people must be suffering, to refuse to raise their pay to take care of the conditions as they exist to-day.

This failure to do so, it seems to me, is a reflection upon the humanity of the Senate. We must know, every Senator must know, that these people are underpaid, or at least many of them are. What kind of citizens can we have or expect to have who are paid only \$480 under the living conditions of to-day? These are starvation wages; and the talk so frequently indulged in here about friendship for the laboring man is all leather and prunella when we refuse to raise the pay of people who are receiving starvation wages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still in the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

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

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. BRYAN, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that a motion?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 18453.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Arizona that he ask unanimous consent to again temporarily lay aside the unfinished business and take up the Indian appropriation bill. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] is out of the Chamber.

Mr. ASHURST. I make that request, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has asked unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 18453) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be read for committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 2, line 7, after the words "Indian lands," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$105,000," and in line 17, after the date "nineteen hundred and fourteen," to insert "*Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate and report to Congress his conclusions on the merits of the claim of the Indians of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon to additional land arising from alleged erroneous surveys of the north and west boundaries of their reservation as defined in the treaty concluded June 25, 1855 (12 Stat. L., 963). For the purpose of conducting this investigation the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such surveys or resurveys as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act," so as to make the clause read:

For the survey, resurvey, classification, and allotment of lands in severalty under the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. L., p. 388), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians," and under any other act or acts providing for the survey or allotment of Indian lands, \$105,000, to be repaid proportionally out of any Indian moneys held in trust or otherwise by the United States and available by law for such reimbursable purposes and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be used for the survey, resurvey, classification, or allotment of any land in severalty on the public domain to any Indian, whether of the Navajo or other tribes, within the State of New Mexico and the State of Arizona, who was not residing upon the public domain prior to June 30, 1914: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, etc., on page 3, line 18, after the date "1910," to strike out "\$235,000" and insert "\$240,300," so as to read:

For the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, purchase and use of irrigation tools and appliances, water rights, ditches, lands necessary for canals, pipe lines, and reservoirs for Indian reservations and allotments and for drainage and protection of irrigable lands from damage by floods, or loss of water rights, including expenses of necessary surveys and investigations to determine the feasibility and estimated cost of new projects and power and reservoir

sites on Indian reservations in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910, \$240,300, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914, and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the construction, repair, and maintenance of ditches, reservoirs, and dams, etc., on page 4, line 7, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$244,700" and insert "\$250,000," so as to read:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended on any irrigation system or reclamation project for which specific appropriation is made in this act or for which public funds are or may be available under any other act of Congress; for pay of one chief inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, \$4,000; one assistant inspector of irrigation, who shall be a skilled irrigation engineer, \$2,500; for traveling and incidental expenses of two inspectors of irrigation, including sleeping-car fare and a per diem of \$3 in lieu of subsistence when actually employed on duty in the field and away from designated headquarters, \$3,200; in all, \$250,000.

Mr. THOMAS. May I inquire of the Senator having charge of the bill why the appropriation of \$244,700 was increased by the committee to \$250,000?

Mr. ASHURST. The increase is \$5,300. The Committee on Indian Affairs believed from the statements made by the commissioner that that sum is adequate and proper and that the House did not appropriate a sufficient sum. It is \$50,000 less than the estimate. That is the only statement I have to make.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator of course knows the estimates are always large enough to cover possible contingencies. The fact that the estimate was \$300,000 on the face of it of course makes a prima facie case, but I think that the appropriation made by the House for the construction, repair, and maintenance of bridges, reservoirs, and dams is sufficient and the amendment of the committee increasing it to \$250,000 is more than enough. I object, therefore, to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask for a vote.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate amendment be not concurred in.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 13, after "\$150,000," to insert:

Provided, That automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in introducing intoxicants into the Indian country in violation of law, whether used by the owner thereof or other person, shall be subject to the seizure, libel, and forfeiture provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

So as to make the clause read:

For the suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors among Indians, \$150,000: *Provided*, That automobiles or any other vehicles or conveyances used in introducing intoxicants into the Indian country in violation of law, whether used by the owner thereof or other person, shall be subject to the seizure, libel, and forfeiture provided in section 2140 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the item of appropriation for the relief and care of destitute Indians not provided for, etc., on page 4, line 24, after the word "sanatoria," to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$400,000"; so as to read:

For the relief and care of destitute Indians not otherwise provided for, and for the prevention and treatment of tuberculosis, trachoma, smallpox, and other contagious and infectious diseases, including transportation of patients to and from hospitals and sanatoria, \$400,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill if this increase of \$50,000 is due to an increase in the sick roll among the Indians or the development of conditions which show that in previous years there was not enough money appropriated to take care of them?

Mr. ASHURST. In reply to the Senator from New York, I will state that the estimate of the department was the sum of \$400,000, and that within the past three or four years—I may say within the past six years—a very strenuous effort has been made to relieve the Indians from tuberculosis and trachoma, diseases with which they apparently seem to be peculiarly afflicted. In the judgment of the committee such excellent work has been done and so many of the tribes are being relieved from the ravages of these dread diseases that this seemed to be a most worthy and indeed a necessary appropriation, and we thought the whole sum of \$400,000 is necessary. A system of small hospitals, sometimes accommodating 15 or 20 patients, has been constructed throughout various portions of the United States, and that system is meeting with great success, far superior to that met by the large hospitals.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for the relief and care of destitute Indians not provided for, etc., on page 5, line 8, before the word "herein," to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$400,000," and in line 16, after the name "Oklahoma," to strike out "\$20,000; Fort Lapwai sana-

torium, Idaho, \$40,000; Laguna sanatorium, New Mexico, \$17,000; Mescalero hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Navajo sanatorium, New Mexico, \$10,000; Pima hospital, Arizona, \$10,000; Phoenix sanatorium, Arizona, \$40,000; Spokane hospital, Washington, \$10,000; Sac and Fox sanatorium, Iowa, \$30,000; Turtle Mountain hospital, North Dakota, \$10,000; Winnebago hospital, Nebraska, \$15,000; Crow Creek hospital, South Dakota, \$10,000; Hoopa Valley hospital, California, \$8,000; Jicarilla hospital, New Mexico, \$8,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, \$8,000; Indian Oasis hospital, Arizona, \$8,000," and insert "\$30,000, \$5,000 of which shall be immediately available; Fort Lapwai sanatorium, Idaho, \$40,000; Laguna sanatorium, New Mexico, \$17,000; Mescalero hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Navajo sanatorium, New Mexico, \$10,000; Pima hospital, Arizona, \$10,000; Phoenix sanatorium, Arizona, \$40,000; Spokane hospital, Washington, \$10,000; Sac and Fox sanatorium, Iowa, \$30,000; Turtle Mountain hospital, North Dakota, \$10,000; Winnebago hospital, Nebraska, \$15,000; Crow Creek hospital, South Dakota, \$10,000; Hoopa Valley hospital, California, \$10,000; Jicarilla hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, \$8,000; Indian Oasis hospital, Arizona, \$10,000," so as to make the proviso read:

And provided further, That out of the appropriation of \$400,000 herein authorized, there shall be available for the maintenance of the sanatoria and hospitals hereinafter named, and for incidental and all other expenses for their proper conduct and management, including pay of employees, repairs, equipment, and improvements, not to exceed the following amounts: Blackfeet hospital, Montana, \$10,000; Carson hospital, Nevada, \$10,000; Cheyenne and Arapahoe hospital, Oklahoma, \$10,000; Choctaw and Chickasaw hospital, Oklahoma, \$30,000, \$5,000 of which shall be immediately available; Fort Lapwai sanatorium, Idaho, \$40,000; Laguna sanatorium, New Mexico, \$17,000; Mescalero hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Navajo sanatorium, New Mexico, \$10,000; Pima hospital, Arizona, \$10,000; Phoenix sanatorium, Arizona, \$40,000; Spokane hospital, Washington, \$10,000; Sac and Fox sanatorium, Iowa, \$30,000; Turtle Mountain hospital, North Dakota, \$10,000; Winnebago hospital, Nebraska, \$15,000; Crow Creek hospital, South Dakota, \$10,000; Hoopa Valley hospital, California, \$10,000; Jicarilla hospital, New Mexico, \$10,000; Truxton Canyon camp hospital, Arizona, \$8,000; Indian Oasis hospital, Arizona, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 17, after the word "therewith," to strike out "\$1,550,000" and insert "\$1,650,000," so as to read:

For support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for, for other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, \$1,650,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of deaf and dumb or blind Indian children.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to strike out:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, \$400,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *Provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

And to insert:

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, \$625,000, of which at least \$200,000 shall be used for the construction of new schoolhouses: *Provided*, That of this amount \$300 may be expended for the purchase of a perpetual water right and right of way across the lands of private individuals, for the purpose of running a pipe line from a certain spring or springs located near the Sisseton Indian Agency buildings, South Dakota, to said buildings, the purchase of such water right to include sufficient land for the construction of a small cement reservoir near such spring or springs for the purpose of storing the water so acquired: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500 of the amount herein appropriated may be used for the acquisition on behalf of the United States, by purchase or otherwise, of land for a site for the Mesquakie Day School, Sac and Fox, Iowa: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of general construction work in the Indian Service, and that not to exceed two of such employees may be assigned to duty in the Indian Office from time to time when their services, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, are necessary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service who are furnished quarters necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amount for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senate committee has agreed upon an increase of \$225,000 over the appropriation made by the House for this purpose. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what the appropriation for this purpose was last year?

Mr. ASHURST. The appropriation for this same purpose last year amounted to \$400,000. I will try to explain as briefly as I may the origin and purpose of this raise.

During the discussion before the Committee on Indian Affairs it was developed that there are in the United States something over 17,000 Indian children without school facilities, there being in one State, to wit, the State of South Dakota, some 1,250, there being in the State of Arizona some 7,500 Indian children without school facilities, there being in the State of New Mexico some 3,500 without school facilities. This item and another item in the bill somewhat related to it were the subject of a vast deal of discussion, and the committee felt that the Government owed it, if not by treaty at least in morals, as an obligation to these various tribes, to give the Indian children the benefits of an education.

It would require an appropriation of about \$15,000,000 to provide ample school facilities for those Indian children who are not now equipped with school facilities. Manifestly the committee could not add \$15,000,000 in one bill and at one session of Congress, but the committee did think this would be a forward moving step, that it would be a very excellent starting point to make a gradual increase in the appropriations for school buildings.

Whether the state of the Public Treasury at this time will warrant the additional expenditure is a matter that must address itself to the sound discretion of each individual Senator, but nevertheless, the stubborn fact remains that there are some 17,000 Indian children at this time without adequate Government or other school facilities.

That explains the reason for this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator how many children of school age there are among the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. What is the question?

Mr. THOMAS. What is the approximate aggregate number of Indian children in the United States of school age?

Mr. ASHURST. Who are not provided for?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the total.

Mr. ASHURST. Who are in school?

Mr. CURTIS. There are about 40,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator how long this lack of provision for the 17,000 children has existed?

Mr. ASHURST. It has always existed; that is, there have always been, I presume, a large number, ranging from ten or twelve to fifteen or sixteen thousand children of school age without school facilities.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course, there has always been a large number who had no school facilities.

Mr. THOMAS. I presume as long as we make appropriations there always will be, but I wish to ascertain whether this is an exigent situation or one which has been in existence for some time from year to year.

Mr. LANE. If the Senator will allow me, I will answer by saying that in nearly every treaty the Government made a solemn agreement with the Indians that they would furnish these schools, and they have not done it. In some cases the treaty is probably 50 or 60 years old, and the Government has failed to keep its pledge.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, Indian treaties, generally speaking, are kept only when it is necessary to make large appropriations for the purpose. We have expended, I think, in the last 20 years nearly \$250,000,000 from the Treasury for the purpose of educating and civilizing our Indian population, and they are hardly much more educated and civilized than when we began this system of appropriations. I believe that we should keep our treaty obligations, of course, and particularly with the helpless tribes of Indians; but as this does not seem to be a matter which has presented itself as an emergency between the time of the making of the last appropriation and the present time, I question the expediency of adding \$225,000 to this item now.

The Senator having the bill in charge suggests that whether in view of the condition of the Treasury we should do it now is for the Senate to determine. I think it is not only for the Senate to determine but also for the committee to have determined. I do not believe that the condition of the Treasury has much to do with our actions in making appropriations anywhere. The situation of the Treasury is a matter of after consideration. Some time ago a reported leak from the State Department resulted in a great sensation consequent upon the loss on Wall Street and in the other exchanges of the country of large sums of money by a lot of gamblers. The House is now, I believe, in the throes of an investigation, the purpose being to determine the origin of that leak. We have so many leaks from the Treasury, however, and so many men and women armed with drills and hammers engaged in the delectable work of

making as many more leaks as possible, it seems to be taken as a matter of course, it produces neither sensation nor an investigation. The leaks are so many and so numerous that the bottom of the Treasury now resembles a sieve or a watering pot more than anything else. I presume it will drop out very soon for lack of sufficient material in the bottom to hold the scattered pieces together.

Seriously, Mr. President, I do not believe at this time we should make these largely increased appropriations either in this or any other appropriation bill.

This bill as it comes to us from the House carries a total appropriation of \$10,625,956.67. The total appropriations by the committee are \$12,435,144.05, making a total increase of \$1,809,187.38. The decrease by the Senate committee is \$3,000, making a total net increase over the appropriations of the House of \$1,806,187.38. Of course, Mr. President, we know that a million dollars is of but little consequence in a modern Government appropriation bill. However, these constant accumulations amount to a good deal for the taxpayers of the country to bear in the end.

I shall therefore move to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out, beginning after the word "there-with," on line 3, page 8, "\$625,000, of which at least \$200,000 shall be used for the construction of new schoolhouses," and to insert in place thereof the figures "\$400,000," being the amount the House appropriated.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, like the Senator from Colorado, I believe in economy, and I think that the people at this time expect and deserve careful consideration to be given to the moneys that we expend. I am going to give the Senator an opportunity to put into force his argument in favor of economy. If the Senator will change his amendment to one striking out about every other item in the bill but this one he will save about eight or nine million dollars, and will have done an act of personal kindness and justice to the Indians. This is one of the valuable items.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator mean to strike out all other appropriations in the bill, whether made by the House or by the Senate committee?

Mr. LANE. It makes no difference who made them—all these general appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to understand the Senator. Does he mean all the amendments?

Mr. LANE. No; all the bill, with its eight or nine million dollars, practically none of which is for the benefit of the Indians. I am going to offer a substitute to cut them off, and I will give the reasons when I do so.

Mr. THOMAS. I want to assure the Senator that I will join him in that most heartily, particularly in view of the assertion he has just made that all these items of appropriation are of no benefit to the Indians.

Mr. LANE. They are not. It has been proven that a majority of them—I will not say all, but 99 per cent of them—are of no benefit to them.

But I want to state to the Senator that when he made the statement that we have appropriated, say, \$250,000,000 for the education of the Indians, a gratuity appropriation in the past, he forgot to mention that at the same time we have taken away from the Indians, absolutely deprived them of, probably \$250,000,000 worth of property and we owe them a debt in regard to the schools and it is long overdue.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I think it is a great deal more than that. It began with the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers on Plymouth Rock.

Mr. LANE. Likely enough, but whatever else we did in the past we solemnly agreed to educate and erect a schoolhouse and furnish teachers for every 30 Indian children. We have done nothing of the kind. I think the obligation of the Government to the Indian children is greater than any other. I believe that one item is worthy of support and should be supported and the money should be appropriated. You can take this bill as a whole, however, and go through it and strike out item after item, amounting in all to millions of dollars, without harming the Indians and you will also save the money to the people.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator from Oregon whether his wholesale criticism of the appropriations contained in the bill are due to his conviction that the moneys thus provided for are diverted to other purposes?

Mr. LANE. They are not for the benefit of the Indians, but for the payment of salaries to the whites who manage the affairs of the Indians, with no benefit to the Indians whatever, as a rule, and many times with the loss of millions of dollars to them.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, let me ask the Senator whether the same fate does not await the amendment to which my amendment is directed?

Mr. LANE. I think the amendment ought to be amended so as to put the management of the Indian schools and other affairs in the hands of the Indians themselves.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt they would learn quite as much as they have learned or would be likely to learn under the civilizing and uplifting influences of the Indian management.

Mr. LANE. I think if the Senator from Colorado fully understood the conditions and had gone through them carefully, he would agree with me in my opinion about these matters.

Mr. THOMAS. I do agree with the Senator there.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record, without reading, a list containing the names of teachers, compensation allowed, location of schools, and the average attendance of all the Indian schools in the United States. This is taken from House Document No. 1457.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, location of school, and average attendance of each school, payable from "Indian schools, support, 1916."

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
ARIZONA.				
Camp McDowell day school.	McDowell	27	Hans B. Klingenberg	\$720
Salt River day school.	Scottsdale	52	William L. Johnson	840
Lehigh day school.	Mesa	20	Donie H. Dutton	690
Camp Verde day school.	Camp Verde	22	Edward E. Palmer	795
Clarksdale day school.	Clarksdale	25	Vacant	720
Colorado River boarding school.	Parker	85	George W. Migh	720
			Edward E. Horn	810
			Callie M. Graham	630
			Vacant	720
			Sylvia Worstell	600
Fort Apache boarding school.	Whiteriver	205	Malcolm G. Vernon	600
			Nellie M. Unger	600
			Ernest R. McCray (principal)	1,000
Cibecue day school.	do	25	John B. Peters	780
Canyon day school.	Fort Apache	30	Vacant	720
East Fork day school.	Whiteriver	38	Ward C. Cramer	775
Havasupai day school.	Supai	22	Vacant	720
Kalbab day school.	Moccasini	12	Mabel C. Crosby	720
Leupp boarding school.	Leupp	65	Anna Sheridan	780
			Vacant	690
			do	900
			do	630
			do	600
Moqui boarding school.	Keams Canon	34	James W. Buchanan	840
Chimopovy day school.	Toreva	34	John W. Drummond (principal)	1,000
Polacca day school.	Polacca	99	Lena Langford	720
			Vacant	630
			do	600
			do	1,000
Second Mesa day school.	Toreva	67	George L. Leaming (principal)	600
			Ethel D. Platz	600
			Ruby Seaver	600
			Vacant (principal)	1,000
Oraibi day school.	Oraibi	67	Grace Griffith	600
			Zoe H. Bailey	600
			Emory A. Marks (principal)	1,000
Hotavilla-Bacabi day school.	do	31	Vacant	600
			Carrie E. Fenton	600
			Mamie Dauberman	600
			Sadie E. Evans	810
Navajo boarding school.	Fort Defiance	132	Christine Spreier	600
			Jennie O'Connor	630
			Maude McCafferty	600
			Joseph A. Garber (principal)	1,200
Chin Lee boarding school.	Chin Lee	105	Stella E. Laughlin	690
			America J. Secombe (kindergarten)	630
			William J. Wells	600
Luki Chuki day school.	Gallup	14	Ralph S. Hicks	840
			Myrtle E. Hicks	600
			John E. Wetenhall	1,000
			Vacant	600
Tohatchi boarding school.	Tohatchi	145	do	660
			Ethel M. McConnell	600
Cornfields day school.	Cornfields	21	Ella Burton	840
			Taylor P. Gabbard	1,200
			Cora M. Hall	720
Pima boarding school.	Sacaton	222	Zena R. Monroe	600
			Mary E. McNair	600
			Dorothy Schellhase	660
Maricopa day school.	Phoenix	36	Jean O. Barnd	795
Gila Crossing day school.	do	33	Sam S. Essary	795
Casa Blanca day school.	Sacaton	46	Martin R. Chadick	720
Blackwater day school.	Blackwater	30	Edna L. Plake	770
Pima Agency day school.	Sacaton	22	Wilma Love	720

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, etc.—Continued.

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
ARIZONA—continued.				
Santan day school.	Santan	23	Mary Noyes	\$780
Chiu Chu day school.	Sacaton	8	Marvin B. Clark	840
Cocklebur day school.	do	8	Herman O. Whiting	720
Gila Bend day school.	Gila Bend	7	Daniel B. Linderman	770
CALIFORNIA.				
Bishop day school.	Bishop	53	George Simmeral	840
			Mrs. Herbert Foster	600
Big Pine day school.	Big Pine	17	Leonidas L. Goen	795
Independence day school.	Independence	20	Annie Starr Hayes	795
Pine Creek day school.	Round Valley	14	H. C. Weston	720
Campo day school.	Campo	20	Ruth E. Boyd	750
Likely day school.	Likely	15	Sarah R. Hacklander	770
Alturas day school.	Alturas	11	Barbara K. Ivan	745
Lookout day school.	Lookout	9	Oscar B. Colley	720
Fort Yuma boarding school.	Yuma	137	James Madison	750
			Agnes B. Waite	630
			Ada E. Lavander	600
Cocoph day school.	do	13	Vacant	830
			Charles A. Freeman	750
Hoopa Valley school.	Hoopa	154	Grace Mortsof	600
			Agnes R. Wilhelm	600
			Ora M. Salmans	900
			Salvadora Valenzuela	300
			Melvin D. Swain	720
Pala day school.	Pala	18	Vacant	720
Capitan Grande day school.	Lakeside	13	Ray R. Parrett	720
			John F. Chambers	770
La Jolla day school.	Valley Center	10	Adolph R. Stolz	720
Rincon day school.	Rincon	10	Annie P. Gorman	600
Round Valley day school.	Covelo	30	Edwin Tabor	720
Upper Lake day school.	Upper Lake	20	Eva L. Schnell	720
Ukiah day school.	Ukiah	19	Minnie Tillson	600
Manchester day school.	Manchester	6	Thomas M. Games	750
Cahuilla day school.	Cahuilla	10	Vacant	630
Mesa Grande day school.	Mesa Grande	14	Lydia Spicer Piesse	780
Volcan day school.	Santa Ysabel	15	Frank E. Brennan	720
Tule River day school.	do	16	Edmund J. Bryant	720
Auberry day school.	Auberry	19		
Burrough day school.	Burrough	20		
COLORADO.				
Ute Mountain day school.	Towaoc	20	Elizabeth L. Smith	690
Southern Ute boarding school.	Ignacio	58	Albert B. Reagan (principal)	840
			Ottilla A. Reagan	600
Allen day school.	do	14	Joseph D. Turner	810
			Vacant (principal)	1,400
			Jessie M. Pinkerton	600
Fort Hall boarding school.	Fort Hall	126	Grace M. Jackson (kindergarten)	600
Kamiah day school.	Kamiah	13	Nellie S. Guyer	780
Kootenai day school.	Bonnars Ferry	27	Merritt S. Fisher	720
IOWA.				
Fox day school.	Toledo	19	Carl Stevens	750
Mesquakie day school.	Tama	21	Nellie M. Sherwood	780
Sac and Fox Sanatorium.	Toledo	57	Eta J. Snell	660
KANSAS.				
Great Nemaha day school.	White Cloud	10	Mary I. Dupuis	600
MINNESOTA.				
Birch Cooley day school.	Morton	12	Robert H. C. Hinman	720
MICHIGAN.				
Bay Mills day school.	Bay Mills	21	Chester C. Pidgeon	1,000
MONTANA.				
Fort Belknap boarding school.	Harlem	61	John W. Lydy (principal)	1,300
			Alta R. M. Lenardson	660
Lodge Pole day school.	Lodgepole	18	Clara I. Goodfellow	745
Milk River day school.	Harlem	18	Vacant	600
			Edward J. Peacore (principal)	1,200
Fort Peck boarding school.	Poplar	90	Mary B. McDougal	690
			Elizabeth Stratton (kindergarten)	600
Fort Peck day school No. 1.	Culbertson	16	David A. Hiebert	720
Fort Peck day school No. 2.	Brockton	15	Sarah A. Myers	720
Fort Peck day school No. 3.	Oswego	12	Walter Riesbol	720
Fort Peck day school No. 4.	do	22	Reid B. Winnie	720
			Maurice W. Cooper (principal)	1,000
Tongue River boarding school.	Lame Deer	51	William D. Kingsley	600
			Fern D. Davis	630
Birney day school.	Birney	32	Ralf E. Cherrick	750
Lame Deer day school.	Lame Deer	24	Elizabeth M. Cherrick	630
			John B. Batson	700
			Marion C. Olmsted (principal)	1,000
Blackfeet boarding school.	Browning	121	J. Edwin Levings	720
			Ruth A. McNulty	690
			Joseph S. Krzykwa	600
Old Agency day school.	Family	28	Wesley D. Helm	600
Heart Butte day school.	Heart Butte	24	Alden J. Van Campen	600

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, etc.—Continued.

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
NEVADA.				
Fallon day school.....	Fallon.....	11	Margaret A. Bingham.....	\$745
Lovelocks day school.....	Lovelocks.....	14	Vacant.....	720
Fort McDermitt day school.....	McDermitt.....	47	(George H. Beaman..... Della Beaman (kindergarten).)	745 600
Mospa River day school.....	Mospa.....	13	H. Loran Hess..... Elizabeth A. James.....	780 690
Nevada boarding school.....	Wadsworth.....	64	Anna Rintelman (kindergarten).	630
Wadsworth day school.....	do.....	13	Vacant.....	600
Walker River day school.....	Schurz.....	24	Hattie W. Hazen.....	720
Western Shoshone day school.....	Owyhee.....	21	Leonidas Swalm.....	840
Western Shoshone day school No. 2.....	do.....	21	William H. Pfeifer.....	840
Western Shoshone day school No. 3.....	do.....		Vacant.....	840
NEW MEXICO.				
Jicarilla boarding school.....	Dulce.....	103	Paul A. Walter..... Josephine R. Walter..... Louise B. Thompson..... Katherine Ferguson..... Vacant.....	1,000 730 600 600 720 720
Mescalero boarding school.....	Mescalero.....	88	Annella B. Thomas (kindergarten).	720
Acomita day school.....	Cubero.....	38	Otilia Kessel.....	720
Encinal day school.....	do.....	18	James C. Waters..... Maude E. Marshall.....	745 600
Isleta day school.....	Isleta.....	98	Vacant..... Grace Wyland.....	720 600
Laguna day school.....	Laguna.....	39	Agnes A. Morrow.....	720
Mesita day school.....	do.....	28	James G. Wilds.....	720
Paguete day school.....	do.....	64	Samuel E. Beahm..... Estelle M. Beahm.....	720 600
Paraje day school.....	Casa Blanca.....	29	Fred W. Canfield.....	720
San Felipe day school.....	Algodones.....	45	Paul D. J. Dennis.....	840
Seama day school.....	Seama.....	30	Emma Dawson.....	840
McCarty's day school.....	Laguna.....	24	Alma H. Peole.....	600
Cochiti day school.....	Pena Blanca.....	18	Nettie Cook.....	775
Jemez day school.....	Jemez.....	59	Mary M. Boyle..... Mary Stephania Schramme..... Olive I. Davis..... Hattie E. Drake..... Robert E. Johnson, principal.	680 690 600 720 1,100
Pueblo Bonito boarding school.....	Crownpoint.....	133	Katherine R. Walters..... Walter L. Bolander..... Lucy I. Balfe..... Mary E. Dissetta..... Mrs. Henry H. Kramer..... Ruth Ferguson..... Robert J. Warfield..... Alice G. Dwyer..... Nellie N. Peery..... Benjamin S. Bothwell..... Ernest H. Hammond.....	600 720 745 840 625 625 720 840 500 720 1,400
Placitas day school.....	Dixon.....	19	Emma Lomas.....	900
San Idelfonso day school.....	Idelfonso.....	14	Vacant.....	720
Santa Domingodayschool.....	Domingo.....	57	William J. Davis, principal.	900
San Juan day school.....	Chamita.....	38	Mary E. Smith.....	720
Santa Clara day school.....	Espanola.....	27	William L. Johnson..... Chester B. Risher..... Minnie I. Etzweiler..... Vacant..... Glenn E. Isaacs, principal.	840 600 600 600 900
Taos day school.....	Taos.....	61	Lovey L. Hunsinger..... Grace V. Haas..... Mary Teter.....	800 600 600
Sia day school.....	Sia.....	14		
Day school inspector.....	Albuquerque.....			
San Juan boarding school.....	Shiprock.....	179		
Aneth boarding school.....	Aneth.....			
Toadalena day school.....	Crozier.....			
Zuni boarding school.....	Blackrock.....	113		
Zuni day school.....	do.....	139		
NORTH CAROLINA.				
Birdtown day school.....	Birdtown.....	16	Fernando G. Tranbarger.....	720
Snowbird Gap day school.....	Robbinsville.....	12	John A. Hyde.....	270
Little Snowbird day school.....	Andrews.....	9	J. Fowler Hyde.....	270
Big Cove day school.....	Swaney.....	10	Mary W. Thompson.....	270
NORTH DAKOTA.				
Fort Berthold boarding school.....	Elbowoods.....	41	Paul Lotter, principal..... Rossana Rufner..... Jessamine E. Hodgson..... Lee E. Osgood.....	840 540 480 625
Fort Berthold day school No. 1.....	do.....	12		
Fort Berthold day school No. 2.....	do.....	18	Lewis W. Page.....	750
Fort Berthold day school No. 3.....	do.....	20	Chas. W. Hoffman.....	750
Turtle Mountain day school No. 1.....	Belcourt.....	31	Theodore J. Klaus.....	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 2.....	do.....	26	Wellington Salt.....	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 3.....	Laureat.....	16	R. N. Clark.....	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 4.....	Belcourt.....	35	Earl R. Hall.....	745
Turtle Mountain day school No. 5.....	Dunseith.....	12	Norris D. Richey.....	745

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, etc.—Continued.

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
OKLAHOMA.				
Cantonment boarding school.....	Cantonment.....	74	Lucius C. Gibson..... Luelle J. Harwood..... Jennie C. Brown..... J. E. Shields (principal)..... Jerdine Bonnin..... Anna Brace Bowman..... Dorothy Hudgins (kindergarten). Charles Eggers (principal). Eva Eggers..... Tollie Pfister..... Nellie M. Mooney..... Roger W. Bishoff (principal).	\$840 600 600 1,100 780 690 750 1,300 600 600 630 1,200
Cheyenne and Arapaho school.....	Darlington.....	128	Flora A. De Lay..... Iva L. Burdick..... Isabel J. MacRoy (kindergarten). J. G. Pressly (principal)..... Marcia K. Sherry..... George Buckland..... Vacant..... Isadore Ricklin (principal) Nettie Taylor..... Annie Dietz (kindergarten).	750 600 600 1,200 600 720 600 1,000 530 530
Fort Sill boarding school.....	Lawton.....	170	Vacant..... Jesse W. Smith (supervising principal). James H. Odle (principal). Paph Julian..... Helen M. Coiville (kindergarten). Mattie Ewing Pruitt..... Dora Porterfield..... Louise Strange (kindergarten). William H. Ross (principal). David W. Gilliland (principal). Clara D. Allen..... Naomi Pacheco (kindergarten). Roxanna Smith..... Gertrude Lobdell..... Inez Hudson..... Blanche A. Giltner (kindergarten). Fred M. Lobdell (principal). Joseph E. Mountford (principal). Robert E. Manion (principal).	1,200 1,200 900 720 690 600 810 720 900 900 810 600 600 600 630 900 1,000 900
Rainy Mountain boarding school.....	Gotebo.....	141	William H. Haebarger..... Clyde B. Miller..... Helena B. Farrand..... Ross J. Ferguson..... John L. Richards..... Fannie H. Delzell..... Leslie J. Risley..... Henry F. Markisatum..... Arendia G. Eldridge..... Robert R. De Boe..... Walter E. Baker (principal). Ella Baker..... Ransom C. Boeklewiec.....	750 600 600 1,000 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600
Riverside boarding school.....	Anadarko.....	105		
Anadarko boarding school.....	Mount Scott.....	124		
Kiowa Agency.....	Anadarko.....			
Ponca boarding school.....	Whiteagle.....	93		
Red Moon school.....	Hammon.....	21		
Seeger boarding school.....	Colony.....	84		
Seneca boarding school.....	Wyandotte.....	125		
Shawnee boarding school.....	Shawnee.....	97		
Pawnee boarding school.....	Pawnee.....	73		
Sae and Fox boarding school.....	Stroud.....	60		
OREGON.				
Klamath boarding school.....	Klamath Agency.....	74		
Modoc Point day school.....	do.....	11		
Yainax day school.....	Bonanza.....	12		
Klamath day school No. 1.....	Chiloquin.....	17		
Klamath day school No. 2.....	Yainax.....	7		
Klamath day school No. 3.....	Paints Camp.....	14		
Siletz day school.....	Siletz.....	28		
Upper Farm day school.....	do.....	11		
Warm Springs school.....	Warm Springs.....	94		
Sinnasho day school.....	Sinnasho.....	13		
SOUTH DAKOTA.				
Springfield boarding school.....	Springfield.....	57	Josephine A. Hilton.....	600
Yankton boarding school.....	Wagner.....	78	Edith A. Kennon..... Ada C. Bush (kindergarten). John F. Thompson (principal).	690 600 900
UTAH.				
Goshute day school.....	Ibapah.....	32	Amos R. Frank (superintendent). Elizabeth M. Molineux..... William J. Merz.....	1,000 720 840
Shivwits day school.....	Santa Clara.....	15		
Skull Valley day school.....	Iosepa.....	10		
WASHINGTON.				
Colville day school No. 1.....	Covoda.....	13	Vacant.....	720
Colville day school No. 3.....	Nespelem.....	27	George E. Peters.....	780
Colville day school No. 4.....	Daisy.....	23	Victor H. Johnson.....	720
Colville day school No. 5.....	Nespelem.....	22	Otis Melon.....	780
Colville day school No. 6.....	Daisy.....	16	Oscar Swindle.....	720
Colville day school No. 7.....	Jerome.....	3	Elvin W. Heninger.....	720
Colville day school No. 9.....	Keller.....	21	George Houser.....	750
Skokomish day school.....	Union.....	15	Henry F. Lenz.....	840
Queets day school.....	Taholah.....	12	Chester A. Ballard.....	840
Taholah day school.....	do.....	44	John H. Hulbert.....	840
Neah Bay day school.....	Neah Bay.....	55	George A. Simms..... Goldie M. Simms.....	750 600

List showing names of teachers, compensation allowed, etc.—Continued.

School.	Location.	Average attendance.	Name of teacher.	Salary.
WASHINGTON—continued.				
Quilteute day school.....	La Push.....	43	Fred D. Keene.....	\$780
			Edyth Keene.....	690
Spokane day school No. 1.	Lott.....	17	Frank B. Allison.....	750
Spokane day school No. 2.	Chamokane.....	21	Harry C. Norman.....	780
Spokane day school No. 8.	Springdale.....	11	Roger Gorman.....	720
			William N. Sickles (principal)	1,200
Tulalip boarding school.	Tulalip.....	149	Mary Prall.....	720
			Nina M. Hurlburt.....	690
			Francis M. B. Emerson.....	600
			Esther L. Newlove.....	600
Swinomish day school....	La Conner.....	15	Lucy A. Case.....	720
Lummi day school.....	Marietta.....	14	Mary Moores.....	720
Port Gamble day school....	Port Gamble..	19	August Harman.....	840
Jamestown day school....	Dungeness.....	12	Archie M. Taylor.....	840
			George B. Haggett (principal)	1,200
Yakima boarding school..	Fort Simcoe...	120	Isabelle B. Haggett.....	720
			Mellie E. Dohse.....	660
			Mary L. Leader.....	540
Kalispell day school.....	Cusick.....		Charles E. Inman.....	720
WISCONSIN.				
Lac Courte Oreille day school.	Reserve.....	37	Xavier Grany.....	625
			Agnes Rietz.....	475
			Allace S. White.....	630
Lac du Flambeau boarding school.	Lac du Flambeau.	125	Bessie Peters.....	600
			Nora Grimstad.....	600
			Lucy P. Hart.....	720
			Cleo List.....	600
Oneida boarding school...	Oneida.....	149	Alice Cornelius.....	660
			Lena Ludwick.....	600
Red Cliff day school.....	Bayfield.....	26	Seraphica Reineck.....	675
			Martina Cleveland.....	810
Wittenberg boarding school.	Wittenberg...	120	Esther A. Gunderson.....	750
			Myrtle A. Eickhoff.....	630
WYOMING.				
Arapahoe day school.....	Arapahoe.....	22	Robert H. Knox.....	720

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 9, line 15, after the word "employment," to insert:

Provided further, That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid and be available for reexpenditure.

So as to make the clause read:

For collection and transportation of pupils to and from Indian and public schools, and for placing school pupils, with the consent of their parents, under the care and control of white families qualified to give them moral, industrial, and educational training, \$72,000: *Provided,* That not exceeding \$5,000 of this sum may be used for obtaining remunerative employment for Indian youths and, when necessary, for payment of transportation and other expenses to their places of employment: *Provided further,* That where practicable the transportation and expenses so paid shall be refunded and shall be returned to the appropriation from which paid and be available for reexpenditure. The provisions of this section shall also apply to native Indian pupils of school age under 21 years of age brought from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the item of appropriation for the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, etc., on page 19, line 11, after the word "Indians," to strike out "\$425,000" and insert "\$500,000," so as to read:

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons, and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians, \$500,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I should like to make one more effort to reduce these appropriations. I trust that the Senate committee amendment which has just been stated will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I shall occupy but a moment, as I do not desire to take up the time of the Senate. The amount of the estimates for this item was \$500,000. This appropriation is for what might be called an industrial item. It is regarded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as one of the worthy items to be used for the purpose of training and teaching an Indian how to make a white man of himself. If the Senator from Colorado, however, thinks that the sum of \$500,000 is too much, I hope he will not object to a slight increase of the appropriation. If the Senator finds himself unable to vote for the whole sum, why not let us have an increase, say, to \$450,000? I think this is a worthy item, and I think the hearings which were held before the committee disclosed that the sum proposed to be appropriated will not be frittered away, but that the present appropriation for the same purpose is being used rather jealously and in a proper way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, of course I am not impugning the good faith of the chairman of the committee. I know he thinks that all of these are worthy items, or he would not have presented them here. I am also aware that the purpose of this increase is as stated. Let us read it and see what it is. It is as follows:

For the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments and to educate Indians in the proper care of forests; for the employment of suitable persons as matrons to teach Indian women and girls housekeeping and other household duties, for necessary traveling expenses of such matrons; and for furnishing necessary equipments and supplies and renting quarters for them where necessary; for the conducting of experiments on Indian school or agency farms designed to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, grains, vegetables, cotton, and fruits, and for the employment of practical farmers and stockmen, in addition to the agency and school farmers now employed; for necessary traveling expenses of such farmers and stockmen and for furnishing necessary equipment and supplies for them; and for superintending and directing farming and stock raising among Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. If the distinguished Senator will yield to me a moment, I desire to suggest that he will be able to see upon reading the hearings that this is supposed to be, that it is intended to be, and I wish to assert that it is, for the specific benefit of the Indians in training them for industrial life. I hope, therefore, the Senator will withdraw his opposition and will let the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt it will be agreed to, whether I withdraw my opposition or not.

Mr. ASHURST. Would the Senator be content to let the amendment be agreed to appropriating \$450,000?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not care to split the difference, Mr. President. If my objection is sound, it should be sustained; and if it is not sound, it ought not to be compromised.

The Senator from Arizona suggests that the purpose of this appropriation is to make a white man out of an Indian. Well, Mr. President, if the surplus in the Treasury was equivalent to the threatened deficiency I do not believe it would accomplish that. This appropriation has a most familiar sound. It has been in all the appropriation bills for the past four years and the Indians seem to know no more about preserving living and growing timber on their reservations now than when these appropriations began, and I think that when it comes to educating Indians in the proper care of forests the probabilities are that they could teach their teachers much more capably than the teachers would be expected to educate them.

There is no question, Mr. President, about the humane purpose involved in this and in other similar appropriations. What I object to is their increase at this time when we are obliged, if we will exercise the commonest elements of business prudence, to live within our income. Instead of doing that, Mr. President, I observe no tendency in that direction upon either side of the Chamber. Senators talk in favor of economy and in favor of retrenchment, but, as I said the other day, it is impossible to pick the place to begin.

The thoughtless appropriations which we make here are the cause of our present financial embarrassment. We are going ahead, all oblivious of the time when pay day shall arrive and when we must either confess our inability to meet our obligations or go further into debt by the issuance of bonds. I am opposed to it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, in the item of appropriation for the purposes of preserving living and growing timber on Indian reservations and allotments, etc., on page 11, line 6, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "shall" and insert "may," and in line 10, after

the word "stockmen," to strike out "herein provided for," so as to read:

And provided further, That not to exceed \$25,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be used to conduct experiments on Indian school or agency farms to test the possibilities of soil and climate in the cultivation of trees, cotton, grains, vegetables, and fruits: *Provided, also,* That the amounts paid to matrons, foresters, farmers, physicians, and stockmen shall not be included within the limitation on salaries and compensation of employees contained in the act of August 24, 1912.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 20, before the word "warehouse," to strike out "two" and insert "three," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase of goods and supplies for the Indian Service, including inspection, pay of necessary employees, and all other expenses connected therewith, including advertising, storage, and transportation of Indian goods and supplies, \$300,000: *Provided,* That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be used for the maintenance of or to exceed three warehouses in the Indian Service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 15, after the word "exist," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$10,000," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of judges of Indian courts where tribal relations now exist, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, after "\$135,000," to insert: "*Provided,* That not to exceed \$5,000 of this amount shall be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For pay of special agents, at \$2,000 per annum; for traveling and incidental expenses of such special agents, including sleeping-car fare, and a per diem of not to exceed \$3 in lieu of subsistence, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, when actually employed on duty in the field or ordered to the seat of government; for transportation and incidental expenses of officers and clerks of the Office of Indian Affairs when traveling on official duty; for pay of employees not otherwise provided for; and for other necessary expenses of the Indian Service for which no other appropriation is available, \$135,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed \$5,000 of this amount shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 22, after the word "crops," to strike out "\$300,000" and insert "\$450,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the purpose of encouraging industry and self-support among the Indians and to aid them in the culture of fruits, grains, and other crops, \$450,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available, which sum may be used for the purchase of seed, animals, machinery, tools, implements, and other equipment necessary, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, to enable Indians to become self-supporting: *Provided,* That said sum shall be expended under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for its repayment to the United States on or before June 30, 1925: *Provided further,* That not to exceed \$50,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended on any one reservation or for the benefit of any one tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 10, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$300,000," so as to make the clause read:

That not to exceed \$300,000 of applicable appropriations made herein for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of superintendents, farmers, physicians, field matrons, allotting, irrigation, and other employees in the Indian field service.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. President, we come to an increased appropriation of \$100,000.

For the maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of superintendents, farmers, physicians, field matrons, allotting, irrigation, and other employees in the Indian field service.

The House appropriated the sum of \$200,000 for that purpose. Let me ask the chairman of the committee—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, this is not an appropriation; this is simply an authorization on the part of the department to use a certain sum already appropriated, or appropriated in this bill, for a specific purpose, to wit, the repair and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles. It authorizes the utilization of a certain appropriated sum for this purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the fact is that the effect of the Senate committee amendment is to allow the expenditure of \$100,000 more than the House provided "of applicable appropriations" for motor-propelled and other vehicles. Now, let me ask the Senator if that can not be dispensed with at present?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in reply to the very able Senator, I will read from page 8 of the report of the committee as to this item:

PURCHASE OF VEHICLES FOR INDIAN SERVICE.

No appropriation is carried in this paragraph, and it is necessary because section 5 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropria-

tion act for 1915 prohibited the bureaus of the Government from purchasing passenger-carrying vehicles without first obtaining permission and authority of Congress. (See 38 Stat. L., p. 508.) It is now more expensive to maintain vehicles and provide feed for animals than in former years, consequently \$300,000 is allowed instead of \$200,000, as was granted last year, and the Secretary is granted authority "to exchange automobiles in part payment for new machines used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged." A number of automobiles have been in service for a long time, and it is more expensive to keep them in operation than to exchange them and buy cheaper and lighter machines. In the current law \$50,000 instead of \$30,000 is allowed this year for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, as there are not a sufficient number of machines to provide for the physicians, matrons, and superintendents.

Mr. THOMAS. In other words, Mr. President, the superintendents, the farmers, the physicians, the field matrons, and the other paraphernalia of employees whose business it will be to expend these appropriations, are to be given \$100,000 more this year for automobiles and other vehicles than was allowed last year, upon the theory that the cost of living is higher now than it was then.

This is the last objection that I am going to make to this bill. If the Senate sees fit to vote for this amendment under existing conditions, which I have reiterated here so often that I have no doubt it accounts largely for the empty seats that I see before me, I am through, so far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I think the Senate is entitled to the following information. I read from page 92 of the House hearings:

During the fiscal year 1915-16 the Indian Service, by reason of legislation by Congress, was prohibited from purchasing any form of passenger-carrying vehicles. There were on hand in the Indian Service at that time 118 automobiles and 739 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, as reported to Congress, for the use of approximately 6,000 employees. By the appropriation act for the present fiscal year we were permitted to expend not to exceed \$30,000 of the total amount available in the act for the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles, and \$15,000 for the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles. With these sums there have been purchased 70 automobiles and 112 horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles.

These vehicles are used in conveying children to and from school and in transporting physicians and matrons over the reservation. That is all I care to say about it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I should like to say that this item has some merit in it. I think it could be trimmed; but there is actual need for the use of some of these vehicles. I think the Senator from Colorado will agree with me that a physician located in the middle of a reservation, perhaps 20 or 30 or 40 miles from its borders, when called to attend emergency cases and respond to calls coming at the same time from different directions, particularly in cases of childbirth, should have an automobile. Women have died for lack of proper medical attendance upon the reservations in such cases; some within the last year, I have been informed. It is cruel and wrong not to provide for a proper conveyance in such cases. The physician should be given a Ford or some cheap machine, and the matrons should also have some means of transportation. The superintendents are required to go over the reservations, and they are entitled to conveyances to take them about, though perhaps they would not make as much use of them for that purpose as they ought to do. The farmers do not need them so badly, but there is an actual need for these vehicles in some instances, and the item is a worthy expenditure to that extent.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I would not intrude into this discussion at all were it not for the threat just made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], that unless some attention was paid to his objections as to this particular item he might retire from the Chamber altogether and leave this particular bill to the tender mercies of its friends.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I was not aware that I had threatened the Senate at all; I did not intend to do that. I merely wished to express my conviction that further objections were useless, since it appears that, as the legislative bill was no place for economy to begin, neither is the Indian appropriation bill any place for economy to begin. So I concluded, after this amendment, that I would retire, not from the Senate Chamber but from the position of objector, and wait until the next appropriation bill came up, to see whether I could discover that mysterious thing that seems to be nonexistent—a place for economy to begin.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not leave the Chamber. I think his statements are very frank and

manly, and I hope he will not desist from making objections merely because they happen to be overruled.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I will take the liberty of saying to the Senator from Colorado that if he is going to play the rôle of a saver of public money, he must not be so easily discouraged. I have acted in that capacity on a number of occasions and devoted a good deal of time to trying to save the public money. The Senator will encounter a great many disappointments and a great deal of discouragement; but one of the first things he must learn is to distinguish between authorizations and actual appropriations of money.

As I understand the facts with reference to this item, the money has already been appropriated; it is available; and every penny of it can be spent for horses and wagons.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I understand the distinction, of course, between appropriations and authorizations. I also fully understood the statement of the chairman of the committee that this was a provision for the expenditure of an appropriation previously made; but why should we increase an appropriation previously made beyond the amount which has been expended in past years, there being no emergency that I have yet been able to perceive for the increase?

Mr. HUGHES. I think I can explain that to the Senator. I did not think he understood it. As the law now stands, this money would have to be spent for horses and wagons. They could spend it all for horses and wagons, but there is a statute which prevents them from spending it for automobiles. They would rather have automobiles than horses and wagons. Automobiles are more economical than horses and wagons.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will look at the amendment, it provides for the expenditure of this money for horse-drawn vehicles as well as for motor-propelled vehicles; and, as I understand it, this amendment is necessary if any part of this money is to be expended either for horse-drawn vehicles or for automobiles.

Mr. HUGHES. I think not. It is only necessary—

Mr. THOMAS. Not to exceed \$15,000 is to be used for the purchase of horse-drawn vehicles and not to exceed \$50,000 for the purchase of motor-propelled vehicles.

Mr. HUGHES. There is a statute which would prevent them. As the law now stands they could not spend this money for motor-operated vehicles, because at one time in a spasm of virtue, of so-called economy, Congress rose in its wrath and said that certain gentlemen were riding around in automobiles who ought not to be riding around in automobiles, and solemnly enacted into law a restriction upon various officers of the Government and various departments of the Government which operated to prevent them from purchasing automobiles.

Mr. THOMAS. I fully agree with the Senator that if the expenditure is to be made, the automobile is the better vehicle.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the only thing we are deciding here. We are giving them authority which this official says he ought to have because of the cheaper operation of automobiles.

Mr. THOMAS. But while the money which is to be expended under this provision will be ostensibly used for the purposes recited in the amendment, as stated by the Senator from Oregon, like the other appropriations, the chances are that it will be diverted from its real purpose and expended in other directions.

Mr. HUGHES. I hope the Senator will stay and continue the scrutiny of these items, for if he is diligent and faithful in the performance of that duty, he will probably save the people of the United States \$150,000 or \$200,000 this afternoon. Surely that is worth while.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I doubt it. I do not believe that.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator refused to accept the compromise of \$50,000 awhile ago, and I simply shuddered at the nonchalance with which he waved away the offer of the chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. I refused to accept it, but that did not prevent the chairman of the committee from suggesting to the Senate the substitution of the sum mentioned by him in place of that which the bill then contained.

Mr. HUGHES. The chairman will not do that now.

Mr. THOMAS. I still say that if my objection was good, it was good in toto. If it was not good, it should not have prevailed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was on page 14, line 18, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$30,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to read:

Provided, That not to exceed \$15,000 may be used in the purchase of horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed \$50,000

for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and that such vehicles shall be used only for official service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may hereafter exchange automobiles in part payment for new machines used for the same purpose as those proposed to be exchanged.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 6, after the word "prescribe," to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$100,000, said amount to be immediately available and to remain available until expended," so as to make the clause read:

For reimbursing Indians for live stock which may be hereafter destroyed on account of being infected with dourine or other contagious diseases, and for expenses in connection with the work of eradicating and preventing such diseases, to be expended under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, \$100,000, said amount to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$15,000 of this amount may be used in reimbursing Indians for horses killed previous to the passage of the act of May 18, 1916, for which they have not heretofore been reimbursed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 14, after the word "sold," to insert "to the highest bidder," so as to make the clause read:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to cause to be sold, to the highest bidder, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, any tract or part of a tract of land purchased by the United States for day school or other Indian administrative uses, not exceeding 160 acres in any one tract, when said land or a part thereof is no longer needed for the original purpose; the net proceeds therefrom in all cases to be paid into the Treasury of the United States; title to be evidenced by a patent in fee simple for such lands as can be described in terms of the legal survey, or by deed duly executed by the Secretary of the Interior containing such metes-and-bounds description as will identify the land so conveyed as the land which had been purchased: *Provided*, That where the purchase price was paid from tribal funds, such proceeds shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the respective tribes of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 4, to strike out:

That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall have the power to authorize any superintendent, clerk, or other employee in the Indian field service to administer oaths and take acknowledgments in connection with matters pertaining to their official duties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 9, to insert:

Hereafter, for the purpose of reducing the expense of enforcing and administering the several statutes conferring or imposing duties upon the Secretary of the Interior, he shall have authority from time to time to make designations of not to exceed five special agents employed by the Creek Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma to investigate cases brought or to be brought in behalf of said tribe, or members thereof, to administer oaths, of which designations the courts of the United States shall take judicial notice. Any such agent so designated is hereby empowered, in the discharge of the duties imposed upon him, to administer to, or take from, any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit whenever such oath, affirmation, or affidavit is for use in any prosecution or proceeding under investigation by such persons. Any such oath, affirmation, or affidavit administered or taken by or before such agent shall, when offered or used in any court of the United States, have like force and effect as if administered or taken by or before the clerk of such court, without further proof of the identity or authority of such agent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 4, to strike out:

That the following provision of the act approved March 11, 1904 (33 Stat. L., p. 65), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights of way across Indian lands for the conveyance of oil and gas, to wit: "No such lines shall be constructed across Indian lands, as above mentioned, until authority therefor has first been obtained from, and the maps of definite location of said lines approved by, the Secretary of the Interior," be, and the same hereby is, amended to read as follows: "No such lines shall be constructed across Indian lands, as above mentioned, until authority therefor has first been obtained from the Secretary of the Interior."

And insert:

That the following provision of the act approved March 11, 1904 (33 Stat. L., p. 65), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant rights of way across Indian lands for the conveyance of oil and gas, to wit: "No such lines shall be constructed across Indian lands, as above mentioned, until authority therefor has first been obtained from, and the maps of definite location of said lines approved by, the Secretary of the Interior," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Before title to rights of way, applied for hereunder shall vest, maps of definite location shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That before such approval the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, grant temporary permits revocable in his discretion for the construction of such lines."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Arizona and New Mexico," in section 2, on page 19, line 16, after the word "purposes," to insert "and for the installation of pumping machinery"; in line 22, after the word "land," to insert "\$25,000"; and in line 24, after the word "structures," to strike

out "\$15,000" and insert "in all \$40,000"; so as to make the clause read:

For the construction and repair of necessary channels and laterals for the utilization of water in connection with the pumping plant for irrigation purposes and for the installation of pumping machinery on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., as provided in the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 273), for the purpose of securing an appropriation of water for the irrigation of approximately 150,000 acres of land, \$25,000; and for maintaining and operating the pumping plant, canals, and structures, in all, \$40,000, reimbursable as provided in said act, and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 20, after the word "Indians," to strike out "on the Navajo Reservation, \$25,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

For continuing the development of a water supply for the Navajo Indians, \$30,000, to be immediately available, reimbursable out of any funds of said Indians now or hereafter available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, after "\$175,000," to insert:

Provided, That the water diverted from the Gila River by said diversion dam shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Indian lands of said reservation and to the private and public lands in said county in accordance with the respective rights and priorities of such lands to the beneficial use of said water as may be determined by agreement of the owners thereof with the Secretary of the Interior or by a court of competent jurisdiction: *And provided further*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said diversion dam and other works and rights shall be divided equitably by the Secretary of the Interior between the Indian lands and the private and public lands in said county; and said cost as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522); but the construction charge as fixed for the private and public lands in said county shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of an act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, approved August 13, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 686); *And provided further*, That said project shall only be undertaken if the Secretary of the Interior shall be able to make or provide for what he shall deem to be satisfactory adjustments of the rights to the water to be diverted by said diversion dam or carried in canals, and satisfactory arrangements for the inclusion of lands within said project and the purchase of property rights which he shall deem necessary to be acquired, and shall determine and declare said project to be feasible.

So as to make the clause read:

For completing the construction by the Indian Service of a diversion dam and necessary controlling works for diverting water from the Gila River at a site above Florence, Ariz., \$100,000, to remain available until expended, the total cost not to exceed \$175,000, and for beginning the construction of the necessary canals and structures to carry the natural flow of the Gila River to the Indian lands of the Gila Indian Reservation and to public and private lands in Pinal County, as provided in the Indian appropriation act approved May 18, 1916, \$75,000, to remain available until expended; in all, \$175,000: *Provided*, That the water diverted from the Gila River by said diversion dam shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Indian lands of said reservation and to the private and public lands in said county in accordance with the respective rights and priorities of such lands to the beneficial use of said water as may be determined by agreement of the owners thereof with the Secretary of the Interior or by a court of competent jurisdiction: *And provided further*, That the construction charge for the actual cost of said diversion dam and other works and rights shall be divided equitably by the Secretary of the Interior between the Indian lands and the private and public lands in said county; and said cost as fixed for said Indian lands shall be reimbursable as provided in section 2 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 522); but the construction charge as fixed for the private and public lands in said county shall be paid by the owner or entryman in accordance with the terms of an act extending the period of payment under reclamation projects, approved August 13, 1914 (38 Stat. L., p. 686); *And provided further*, That said project shall only be undertaken if the Secretary of the Interior shall be able to make or provide for what he shall deem to be satisfactory adjustments of the rights to the water to be diverted by said diversion dam or carried in canals, and satisfactory arrangements for the inclusion of lands within said project and the purchase of property rights which he shall deem necessary to be acquired, and shall determine and declare said project to be feasible.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 16, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to purchase lands and water rights, with improvements, for the use of the Navajo Indians located on the public domain of Arizona, \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 21, to insert:

For the construction of two bridges over the Little Colorado and Canyon Diablo Rivers near the Leupp Indian Agency, Ariz., \$42,500, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 24, to insert:

That so much of article 2 of the agreement with the Indians of the San Carlos Indian Reservation concluded on February 25, 1896, accepted, ratified, and confirmed in the act approved June 10, 1896, reading "and that said money shall be paid to them in cash from time to time as the same shall become available, pro rata, share and share alike, to each man, woman, and child of the tribes now living upon and entitled to the privileges of the said reservation," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read, "and that said money, as the same becomes available, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, be paid to or expended for the benefit of the Indians entitled thereto in such manner and for such purposes as he may prescribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "California," in section 3, page 24, line 17, after the word "employees," to strike out "\$42,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 3. For support and civilization of Indians in California, including pay of employees, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 20, after the word "Indians," to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$25,000," so as to make the clause read:

For the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California, including improvements thereon, for the use and occupancy of said Indians, \$25,000, said funds to be expended under such regulations and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the chairman in charge of the bill how many Indians in California are still homeless? My inquiry is prompted by the recitals on page 24, beginning with line 18, where \$25,000 is appropriated for the purchase of lands for the homeless Indians in California.

Mr. ASHURST. I can furnish the Senator with that information, I think, in just a moment.

Mr. THOMAS. We have been appropriating money for homeless Indians in California ever since I have been here, and the more money we appropriate the more homeless they seem to be.

Mr. ASHURST. I wish first to say in a general statement that the California Indians have never been treated with that degree of legislative equity with which they ought to have been treated. Answering the Senator's question directly, there are now 2,782 homeless or landless Indians in the State of California.

Mr. THOMAS. Can the Senator inform me how many there were a year ago or two years ago who were homeless? The amount named seems to be the equivalent of the Democratic majority out there. [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHURST. Well, that is very substantial. With the permission of the Senate and the indulgence of the Senator, I will read from page 135 of the House hearings the figures regarding the purchase of lands for landless Indians in California.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the amount appropriated was \$10,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Which year was that?

Mr. ASHURST. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1917. That is the year we are now in.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. ASHURST. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, \$10,000 was appropriated.

The following is an analysis of the expenditure:

Land purchased, \$15,217.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. The table at the top of page 136 gives the Senator the information he desires.

There were purchased prior to 1913, under the appropriations of 1906 and 1908, 6,420 acres for 38 bands of Indians. There were 3,291 members of those bands.

There were purchased subsequently thereto, under the acts of 1914, 1916, and the joint resolution of 1915, 1,317 acres for 14 bands, the members of the bands being 863 in number.

The next purchase was 685 acres for 9 bands, comprising 617 members.

Mr. THOMAS. I am obliged to the Senator for his information. I notice, however—

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I am sure the Senator thinks these homeless Indians ought to have lands, and I am sure the Senator would much rather the Government would buy lands for them than to lease them some Government lands, would he not?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, I do not object to giving the homeless Indians lands; but my curiosity is aroused, whenever these appropriations come in regular succession, as to how many Indians have been furnished homes and how many still remain homeless.

Mr. MYERS. But my idea is that the Senator would prefer a sale to leasing lands to them, would he not?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, certainly. I want to do anything at any time that will get title in the public lands out of the Government of the United States, even if the title is conferred upon Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, this will do that. As I said before, there are now 2,782 homeless and landless Indians in the State of California.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think the Senator from Montana sees the purpose of my inquiry. What amazes me is that these Indians continue to be homeless; and I venture to predict that 10 years from now we will still be appropriating money for homeless Indians.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator should bear in mind that when we entered upon the policy of purchasing lands for homeless Indians in the United States there were nearly 8,000 of them.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know anything about it except what the Senator tells me. I am glad some of them have been provided for.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator from Kansas pointed out the number that have been supplied with lands in years gone by.

Mr. THOMAS. But as the Indians decrease in number the appropriations increase in amount.

Mr. ASHURST. I think this will be the last year that this appropriation will be necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator think that?

Mr. ASHURST. I think this will be the last appropriation that will be necessary to purchase lands for homeless Indians in California.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is a young man. I think his head will be as gray as mine before these appropriations cease to appear in the appropriation bills.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Arizona proposes to furnish them all homes by this appropriation. There will be no further homeless Indians in California.

Mr. THOMAS. As suggested by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES], when the last homeless Indian is provided with a home in California the probabilities are that we will begin to furnish homeless Indians with homes in New Jersey. [Laughter.] Now may I ask if the increase to \$25,000 in this bill is also due to the high cost of living?

Mr. ASHURST. The high cost of land.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 4, after the word "allotments," to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

For reclamation and maintenance charge on Yuma allotments, \$40,000, to remain available until expended and to be reimbursed from the sale of surplus lands or from other funds that may be available, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 3, 1911.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 12, after "\$3,500," to strike out "in all, \$21,700" and insert "for new school building, \$12,000; in all, \$33,700," so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California, including pay of superintendent, \$18,200; for general repairs and improvements, \$3,500; for new school building, \$12,000; in all, \$33,700.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to ask if the Indian children at the Fort Bidwell Indian schools are now in any kind of a school building, or are they being taught in any way?

Mr. ASHURST. I will ask the Senator to consider page 140 of the House committee's hearings, from which I am going to read. The commissioner stated as follows:

We are asking for a new school building, \$12,000; dairy farm, \$5,000; making the total \$33,700. Last year we had an appropriation of \$21,800. I offer for the record the following justification for that estimate:

Indian school, Fort Bidwell, Cal.

Fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, amount appropriated..... \$18,200.00

Fiscal year ended June 30, 1916:	
Amount appropriated.....	20,500.00
Amount expended.....	19,315.74
Unexpended balance.....	1,184.26

Analysis of expenditures:	
Salaries and wages.....	10,878.78
Transportation of supplies.....	295.03
Telegraph and telephone service.....	7.88
Subsistence supplies.....	1,962.46
Dry goods, wearing apparel, etc.....	2,034.28
Forage.....	173.00
Fuel, illuminants, lubricants, etc.....	1,458.86
Educational, stationery, and office supplies.....	283.14
Medical supplies.....	155.95
Implements, vehicles, tools, etc.....	339.06
Sundry supplies, equipment, etc.....	1,649.76
Miscellaneous.....	77.54

Total..... 19,315.74

Mr. SMOOT. That does not answer my inquiry.

Mr. ASHURST. I will give the information.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senate committee made an amendment to the provision appropriating \$12,000 for the Fort Bidwell Indian School, California, for a new school building. Can the Senator tell me why they want a new school building or—

Mr. ASHURST. The estimates of the department call for the same, and the statement made by the assistant commissioner was to the effect that such a building is necessary. I have not the printed hearings before me.

Mr. SMOOT. In the past they have had sufficient room for educating those Indian children, have they not?

Mr. ASHURST. Let me answer the question by reading what the assistant commissioner said, if the Senator please:

The new construction work required at this school will include a new school building. This is an urgent need, the one now in use being an old building used as a hospital when the United States troops were stationed there. A building large enough to provide two or three classrooms and an assembly hall is required.

That is the language of the assistant commissioner.

Mr. SMOOT. We have just passed the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. The Senator will notice that the Committee on Appropriations cut everything out of that bill that could be cut out. They allowed no increases, as appeared in the estimates for all the departments. As I said last night, if the Committee on Appropriations had yielded and granted what the gentlemen of the departments and bureaus had asked for, the bill would have been increased nearly \$3,000,000.

Mr. ASHURST. I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to ask the Senator from Arizona if he does not believe that under the conditions of the Treasury today, with, I understand, six hundred and odd million dollars to be raised by the issuing of bonds and the imposition of additional taxes upon the American people, the Indians at the Fort Bidwell School could not get along for another year with the buildings that they already have?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not believe it. The committee has taken care to eliminate buildings in every place. The committee has used the most scrupulous care, and in a dozen instances has declined to appropriate for new sanitary buildings. If I remember correctly, these buildings in California, the schools being isolated, were about the only ones the committee did allow; and they seemed to appeal to the committee with some force, because the appropriation was asked for last year and denied. It is an urgent necessity on these two reservations.

Mr. SMOOT. It was denied last year; and has any real harm come to the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. The necessity is greater.

Mr. SMOOT. Would any harm come to the Indians by a refusal to grant the request this year?

Mr. ASHURST. The necessity is greater this year. They are not given proper and adequate facilities for the housing and instruction of the school children. The necessity is very great.

Mr. SMOOT. This very question was presented to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House. They pleaded with the House to put in this provision. The House did not think it was necessary, and therefore withheld it.

I recognize, Mr. President, that it is a very unfortunate item to begin to try to economize on when the question of education is involved, but I do not know where we are going to begin to economize. Every item we bring up it seems to me that that is not the proper place to begin.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I think we shall have to advertise for a place to begin. I do not know how else we will be able to discover it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the House had this proposition presented to them and presented in the very language that was read by the Senator having the bill in charge, and after considering it and holding hearings upon it decided that the Indians could get along another year. I believe the Senate ought to agree with the House, and I believe this item ought not to be allowed.

Mr. LANE. I would suggest one thing to the Senator which may have influenced the committee's action in regard to this particular school, a fact which was brought to the attention of the Senate committee and not the House committee. A short time ago, a few weeks ago, three or four little children—girls aged from 8 to 12—ran away from the school. One of them was found the next day, or a day or two afterwards, frozen to death, and one or two others had their feet frozen so badly they had to be amputated. It must be an awful place, or an awful management of children, and the fear of punishment dreadful, when little children 8 to 12 years old would go out on the hillside and prefer to die by freezing rather than to go back and face the tender mercies or comforts of such a home as that.

It may be possible that that had an influence. It does influence me. I did not vote for it, for I rather suspected perhaps it was the treatment which they received from their guardians, but the statement of the fact in an excerpt taken

from the papers and publications might have influenced the committee to be a little overgenerous. The condition of the Indians all over the United States is miserable. I am going to offer a substitute to clean this business out if possible.

Mr. SMOOT. The very next paragraph provides for a new school building at Greenville Indian School. I wish further to say that I do not believe a school child, because of the character of the building, would go out and freeze to death. The treatment might be such that a child would rather die than go back.

Mr. THOMAS. The child may have run away, just as children do at times, for no particular reason.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to know if the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Utah agree about this matter.

Mr. THOMAS. We are holding an inquest.

Mr. LANE. I think the Senator is mistaken. I know he is mistaken, if he thinks that the surrounding conditions, with good sanitation, with pleasant surroundings and agreeable and comfortable rooms, when compared with moldy, damp, cold, and dreary ones, will not influence a normal child, Indian or white, either to stay or run away when the opportunity presents itself, and that it would go and perhaps even freeze to death rather than return. There are some of those buildings in bad condition, many of them throughout the country, some of which I have seen, and one could not blame the child. I do not say that there may have been a certain rule of discipline which the child dreaded so that until too late it would stay out rather than return. There is more in the bill than appears on the surface, and not to its credit.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the building occupied to-day for school purposes at Fort Bidwell, Cal., was a hospital used by the Government of the United States, and it does seem to me—

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I was going to ask, inasmuch as apparently this is controverted, that it may go over until to-morrow, and that the reading of the bill be resumed.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to vote. I want to vote on it.

Mr. ASHURST. Let it go over until to-morrow, and it can be investigated further. I wish to go on with the other items in the bill for half an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). Is that course agreeable?

Mr. SMOOT. All right; but I want the next item, for the Greenville Indian School, to go over.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, there is no reason why this item should go over. The committee considered it with a great deal of care. Many of these buildings have been condemned as insanitary and unfit. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that I objected to many of the proposed increases, but after I heard the statement from the Indian Office and from the men who are thoroughly acquainted with the conditions in this particular school I was satisfied that this increase should be made.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not read all the testimony that was given to the committee in the House, but the testimony read by the Senator having the bill in charge said nothing in relation to the sanitary condition of the school.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator there was a great deal of discussion about this particular school. The Senate committee hearings have not yet been printed, or at least I have no copy.

Mr. ASHURST. The hearings will be available in the morning, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. GRONNA. I am sure the committee was justified in increasing this appropriation, and I am quite sure that when the Senate knows the facts it will not strike out the appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, if we take up the average rural school in the United States, it would hardly meet the approval of the United States Senate as a perfectly suitable school. I have not any question but that the Indian school at this place as it now stands is up at least to the average rural school.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. I think this is a time for us not to add anything that is not absolutely necessary. For myself, while I am here I expect to vote against these increases. I regret very much that the Committee on Indian Affairs has added a million or more dollars to the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Nearly \$2,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Nearly \$2,000,000. The policy elsewhere has been to cut down our appropriations rather than increase them. If there is any reasonable way to get along with-

out these increases, I think we ought to vote them down and in addition try to find a place to make some reduction in the House appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish simply to suggest to the Senator from Georgia that this is an old abandoned fort. There are about 20 buildings there, and many of them are in a very bad condition. The Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs informed the committee at the Senate committee hearings that many of them are in an unfit condition for use and urged that this building was needed perhaps more than any other in the service.

They are entitled to some credit. The committee will remember that we had this item up a year ago when it was costing two hundred and fifty-odd dollars per capita to educate the children at Fort Bidwell. Under the arrangement this year they propose to carry it on for \$167. I think that makes a pretty good showing for the office. It is a reduction of nearly \$100 per capita. I believe the showing that was made before the Senate committee justified an appropriation for this new building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the understanding that the Fort Bidwell and Greenville Indian Schools amendments shall go over?

Mr. ASHURST. Let them go over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will go over.

Mr. THOMAS. It is the understanding that the paragraph, beginning in line 14 down to line 18, inclusive, goes over also?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that both may go over.

Mr. THOMAS. Let them both go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, they will go over.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand the other was not read.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 17, after "\$3,500." to strike out "in all, \$21,700" and insert "for new school building, \$9,000; in all, \$30,700," so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of 100 Indian pupils at the Greenville Indian School, Cal., including pay of superintendent, \$18,200; for general repairs and improvements, including laundry equipment, \$3,500; for new school building, \$9,000; in all, \$30,700.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 23, to insert:

For beginning the enlargement and improvement of the irrigation project upon the Torres Indian Reservation, Cal., for the irrigation of approximately 3,000 acres of Indian land, in accordance with the plans and estimates submitted by the chief engineer in the Indian Service and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, \$25,000, to remain available until expended and to be reimbursed to the United States in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided*, That the total cost of said irrigation project shall not exceed \$150,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if this money is to be reimbursed to the Government?

Mr. ASHURST. It is. If the Senator will pardon me I will read from page 15 of the hearings, being the information the committee had on the subject:

Appropriation, \$25,000; estimate, \$25,000; not allowed by House. The Torres Indian Reservation is in the Coachella Valley, Cal., at the head of the Salton Sea, and some distance northwest therefrom. The locality is generally below sea level, on the eastern edge of the San Jacinto Mountain Range, in Riverside County, Cal. There has been no previous appropriation by Congress. The Indians, numbering about 210, are known as Cahuillas. The area of the contemplated project is 4,200 acres. The source of water supply is from wells and it is proposed to sink some large wells which will enable the Indians to compete with the whites who have taken up alternate sections, the reservation having been set aside after the railroad land-grant selections had been made.

This is reimbursable, and the total limited cost of the project will be \$150,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know whether the Indians have a fund at present in the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. ASHURST. They have not at this time.

Mr. SMOOT. How is it to be reimbursed? By payment by the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. By payment from year to year as they earn money from the produce and crops they sell.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no provision here for that, but simply that it is to be reimbursed. It may be in 50 years or in 100 years.

Mr. ASHURST. That language is used invariably in the Indian appropriation bill. It really is to be done in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, for this reason: Some tribes have repaid the whole sum in one year. Others do not repay with the same alacrity

that they promised. It is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate rules and regulations as to when and in what manner and in what sum the money shall be repaid.

On the irrigation projects the white men have repaid in 20 years. I assume that the same time, say 20 years, will be given to the Indians. I do not wish to express a personal opinion, but I think this is a worthy appropriation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator say that there are only 120 Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. There are about 210 of these Indians.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are giving them in the proportion of about \$700 to an Indian.

Mr. ASHURST. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia will pardon me, we are not giving it to them.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We are appropriating it now, and we have got to raise it by taxation or by some sort of a revenue system. I do not know how we are going to raise it.

Mr. ASHURST. We are going to advance \$25,000 this year and pledge the Government to advance the other \$125,000 in the future. I am sure the Indians will repay this sum with the same promptness and with the same alacrity and with the same fidelity that the white men repay the sums they have had for similar projects out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to ask the Senator from Arizona what we are going to advance it from? From the deficit?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand there is not anything in the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the deficit we will have next year?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Of course, if we have any money left after we spend 40 times this sum for unnecessary battleships and armor plate I think we might as well give it to the Indians as anybody else. But I rose for the purpose of asking the Senator if this tribe of Indians have any money in the Treasury at all?

Mr. ASHURST. They have no money. They simply have a reservation and it is a checkerboard affair. Private parties own certain sections and the Indians own alternate sections. They are in a very warm climate and one which is very arid, but there is good land and good soil there which will produce crops in great abundance if the water is turned upon it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. This is a loan by the Government to those Indians for the purpose of irrigating and improving their land?

Mr. ASHURST. That is it exactly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Have those Indians up to date been self-sustaining?

Mr. ASHURST. They have never within my knowledge had a dollar or a particle of assistance from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desire to submit that this proposition involves practically no expenditure on the part of the Government. The Indians are the wards of the Nation. The Nation now becomes the backer of the Indians. They have no other means by which they may develop the otherwise fertile land which, when water is applied to it, becomes highly productive. This contemplates a loan practically of \$25,000 this year for the beginning of the work, and that the Government shall be surely reimbursed as that land will be made fertile by the application of water.

I think we have a duty to our wards; in the chancery court it was regarded as the highest duty; and to abandon them to a State where they can not by their industry help themselves is an abandonment of a trust. I think that in the increased values by taxation this money will ultimately come back, even if there were no direct repayment, to the Government—not only to the Federal Government, but to the State government—by increasing the natural wealth, with the assistance of irrigation, of the whole country.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] talks of wars. The nations are involved in war for the purpose of acquiring territory, and here by peaceful methods we propose to acquire territory, for it is none the less the acquisition of territory when we reclaim it from the desert. So, from whatever point it is viewed, I think that this is a very wise appropriation even at a time when there is a deficit in the Treasury.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I understood the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs to say that these Indian lands were in a kind of checkerboard situation, alternate sections being owned by private parties. Is there any water available for these lands in the hands of private parties?

Mr. PHELAN. Water in that region is derived from wells, as I understand.

Mr. ASHURST. This whole region is below sea level, being near the Salton Sea, and, as Senators know, many years ago land grants were made and the alternate sections have been acquired by the Indians.

Mr. JONES. Is it proposed to irrigate the Indian land by wells?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. About how deep do they have to go to get water sufficient for irrigating purposes?

Mr. ASHURST. Let me read from the report of the committee. I will give the Senator a statement in reference to that matter in a moment.

Mr. PHELAN. We have in California the lowest land in the United States, and we also have the highest land. In the neighborhood of this valley, I think the land is 120 feet below the level of the sea, and we have in Mount Whitney the highest mountain in continental United States outside of Alaska. Having that low land, the only means of getting water upon it, as it is a desert and there is no rainfall, is by the sinking of wells.

Mr. JONES. I suppose that private parties have irrigated the land, which, of course, would indicate about how deep they would have to go.

Mr. ASHURST. Reading from page 144 of the House committee hearings, I find the following:

The irrigation work here proposed is to supply eventually about 4,200 acres of very fertile desert land in the so-called Coachilla Valley in southern California. The Indian reservation at this point consists of alternate sections of land caused by the fact that the reservation was set aside after the railroad land grant had been made. This has permitted white settlers to occupy the railway land and has caused extensive water development upon the white lands, reducing the flow of the small artesian wells drilled some years ago for the Indians to such a point that they are no longer of use for irrigation. It is proposed to drill large wells and install pumping plants of the same type which are very successfully used by the whites on the adjoining land and distribute the water through impervious pipe lines in order to preserve to the greatest extent possible the valuable water supply. The fact that the ground-water plane of the deep wells proposed will either be just about the surface of the ground, or even above it, makes the expense of pumping comparatively light, and the development which has already been made by the white people previous proves the value of the proposed work, which will permit the industrious Indians of this reservation to become entirely self-supporting.

Mr. JONES. Where do these Indians now live?

Mr. ASHURST. They live near by on the land, notwithstanding its extreme aridity.

Mr. JONES. I know these lands are desert lands, and I suppose if they were not irrigated the Indians could not live on them and that they were probably living somewhere else.

Mr. ASHURST. They are nomadic in a way; they roam about from place to place, but for a large part of the time they live on these lands, notwithstanding their extreme aridity and lack of water.

Mr. JONES. Does the department hope that these Indians will themselves cultivate the land or will the land be leased to white people for the benefit of the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. It is the hope and expectation of the department that the Indians themselves will raise crops on the land.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator from Arizona will pardon me, I will say to the Senator from Washington that the Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs stated that it was the intention of the department to divide the land into 10-acre lots and for the Indians themselves to cultivate the land.

Mr. JONES. How many acres do each one of these Indians have?

Mr. ASHURST. There are 4,200 acres in all.

Mr. JONES. How many acres does each Indian have as an allotment?

Mr. GRONNA. They have no allotments whatever.

Mr. JONES. Do they have no allotments at all?

Mr. GRONNA. No. This is simply land which has been bought for them; these Indians are on the land, and it has been divided.

Mr. JONES. Is it proposed to allot to each of these Indians a particular tract?

Mr. GRONNA. About 10 acres.

Mr. JONES. That would take up all the lands of the reservation, so that there would be no land left to sell to anybody.

Mr. GRONNA. That is correct.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, of course I have not very much hope of the Indians themselves cultivating this land, but I do know what irrigation does for land of this character. If the lands can be irrigated for the sum of money that is provided in this bill, as the Senator from California has said, it will be money well invested. I hope the Indians may be induced to cultivate the land to some extent at any rate.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Washington that these Indians now have a reservation of 20,800 acres, 200 acres of which they are farming by irrigation, and this project will cover 4,200 acres more.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is now nearly half past 5 o'clock. May I ask the Senator from Arizona if he would be willing to adjourn at this time?

Mr. ASHURST. If that is desired, and there is no objection, I will move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I withhold the motion.

Mr. MYERS. Before that motion is put, may I not be recognized to ask unanimous consent—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to know whether the amendment last discussed has been agreed to?

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That amendment has not been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been agreed to.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. Just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unfinished business will be laid before the Senate.

Mr. ASHURST. I object for a moment. I thought I heard an expression to the effect that the item was not agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. That does not mean that it was disagreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; not at all. We simply have not acted on it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, one of the assistant doorkeepers has just notified me that there is to be a resolution come over from the House, announcing the death of a Representative, and that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] desires to present resolutions. If that be the case, I hardly think that we ought to adjourn for a few moments, but that we should wait a while to see if the resolution comes over. I do not know whether it is desired to have an executive session or not.

Mr. ASHURST. We can proceed with the bill until the resolution comes over.

Mr. JONES. Why can we not proceed with the bill for half an hour?

Mr. MYERS. Then I withdraw my request that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 26, after line 9, to insert:

That section 3 of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 712), entitled "An act for the relief of Mission Indians in the State of California," be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to authorize the President, in his discretion and whenever he shall deem it for the interests of the Indians affected thereby, to extend the trust period for such time as may be advisable on the lands held in trust for the use and benefit of the Mission Bands or villages of Indians in California: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause allotments to be made to the Indians belonging to and having tribal rights on the Mission Indian reservations in the State of California, in areas as provided in section 17 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 859), instead of as provided in section 4 of the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 713): *Provided*, That this act shall not affect any allotments heretofore patented to these Indians.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator please explain just what that means?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, this legislation was incorporated at the request of the Interior Department, and the Interior Department submitted the following letter addressed to the chairman of the committee dated May 10, 1916:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 10, 1916.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On January 17, 1916, I invited attention to the urgent necessity of a law to authorize the extension of the trust period on lands patented to various Mission Indian bands in California. As a result Senate bill 4765 was introduced to amend the act of January 12, 1891 (26 Stat. L., 712), so as to authorize the President to extend the trust period on lands patented to the Mission Bands or villages of Indians in California whenever he shall deem it for the interests of the Indians.

As the trust period on approximately 10,000 acres of these trust lands will expire in September, 1917, it would be desirable if we could obtain this legislation during the present session, rather than try to procure the required authority at the following short session—

This was asked for at the last session—

These are tribal lands, and the Indians should not be permitted to have unrestricted control over their disposal. I shall be pleased to see favorable action taken on Senate bill 4765.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

HON. HENRY F. ASHURST,

Chairman Committee on Indian Affairs,

United States Senate.

In other words, these trust patents are about to expire, and it is not believed wise, judicious, or proper to permit the Indians to alienate the land. That is the very thing that we want to avoid.

Mr. SMOOT. The lands have not yet been alienated by the Indians?

Mr. ASHURST. No; they belong to the Indians in commonalty.

Mr. SMOOT. This is merely designed to extend the trust period to prevent alienation?

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that ought to be done if the Indians are not capable of handling the lands themselves.

Mr. ASHURST. That is the situation, and I hope the proposed legislation will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It does not involve any appropriation, does it?

Mr. ASHURST. No appropriation is involved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not object.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Now, I ask that the Indian appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. SMOOT. The resolutions, as I understand, have not come over from the House as yet.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The resolutions are not here, and we can agree to the next amendment, as it is a reduction.

Mr. ASHURST. I thought the resolutions had come over and was about to be presented. That is why I asked that the bill be laid aside. I now ask that the reading of the bill be proceeded with.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 27, after line 5, to insert:

That the last proviso of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition and sale of lands known as the Klamath River Indian Reservation," approved June 17, 1892, reading: "*Provided further*, That the proceeds arising from the sale of said lands shall constitute a fund to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the maintenance and education of the Indians now residing on said lands and their children," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read:

"*Provided further*, That the proceeds arising from the sale of said lands shall constitute a fund to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for the maintenance and education of the Indians and their children now residing on said lands and for the construction of roads, trails, and other improvements for their benefit."

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I was not present when that amendment was considered in the committee, or I would have insisted on an amendment to it. I have asked the Assistant Secretary if that fund could not be paid per capita to the Indians to improve their allotments. I should like to have the amendment go over, and I will offer an amendment to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator that this amendment be passed over?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, under the head of "Florida," in section 4, page 27, line 23, after the word "education," to strike out "\$8,000" and insert "\$5,000"; so as to make the clause read:

SEC. 4. For relief of distress among the Seminole Indians in Florida, and for purposes of their civilization and education, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can not understand that amendment. It seems to be a reduction of \$3,000.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; and it has been agreed to.

Mr. ASHURST. Startling as it may seem, that expresses the action of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask if there are any other such surprising things in the bill?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not wish to injure his health by shocking the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. This is the only oasis of decrease in a desert of increase.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 28, after line 22, to insert:

IOWA.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to expend for the benefit of the Indians entitled thereto, the sum of \$10,334.96, together with the interest which has or may hereafter accrue thereon, remaining in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi Tribe of

Indians of the State of Iowa, from the sum of \$42,893.25 transferred to the credit of those Indians under the provisions of the act of June 10, 1896.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That does not involve an appropriation, as I understand, but simply allows the Indians to use a part of their funds?

Mr. ASHURST. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I have nothing further to say about it.

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

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was, on page 29, line 17, after the word "improvements," to strike out "\$2,000; in all, \$16,860," and insert "\$4,000; in all, \$18,860," so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of 80 Indian pupils at the Indian school, Kickapoo Reservation, Kans., including pay of superintendent, \$14,860; for general repairs and improvements, \$4,000; in all, \$18,860.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I think we ought to accept the amount for repairs at the Kickapoo Indian school provided by the House. They allowed \$2,000, and I do not think we ought to double that amount. We ought not to go through this bill merely increasing the allowances the House has made. If the House has in this one instance been a little economical, I think we ought to follow it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is it the desire of the Senator that this amendment be passed over?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I do not ask that it go over, but I am opposed to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for a division.

Mr. ASHURST. Just a moment. Before the division is had, I wish to say that the committee gave this matter careful consideration, and at all times the committee had in view the condition of the Treasury. This is one of the increases made by the committee that would seem to be worthy and necessary. This appropriation was not increased merely for the purpose of making an increase or suggesting an amendment. The hearings before House committee and the hearings before the Senate committee convinced the committee, and I think all the members thereof, that this item, an increase of \$2,000, was proper, expedient, wise, and just.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if it is not true that a good deal of the work of the committee was done before they realized the fact that there was an absolute necessity for our spending for the fiscal year 1917-18 nothing that we were not obliged to spend and that the policy of economy and retrenchment was essential? I do not say that if we had a bulging Treasury, with all the money we needed, it would not be a good investment, but what I am objecting to is to spending any money anywhere that it is not absolutely necessary to expend during the fiscal year 1917-18.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, at least one member of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs realized when that committee was in session that we were facing a very large deficit. I do not think the committee was oblivious of that fact, nor does it seem to me that a bulging Treasury would justify unwarrantable appropriations.

The Indian situation presents this condition, and I should like the Senator from Georgia to consider it: When we were doling out rations and annuities to a large number of Indian tribes it took very little money to administer Indian affairs. The Government finally adopted the policy of individualizing the Indian, taking him out from his tribal condition, and as far as possible and as fast as possible making the individual Indian a self-sustaining being. It has been no easy problem; it has been a problem beset with difficulty; it has been a problem accompanied by many, many mistakes; but it does involve, and it will involve from year to year for some time to come, an increased expenditure. It costs more. When you try to make the Indian self-sustaining, when you have to have a larger personnel for administration to help guide and lead the Indian, when you begin to irrigate his land for him, when you begin to buy feed and machinery and stock for him, it is bound to cost more.

The Indian Committee went over this bill, and went over it carefully. Of course it is within the province of Senators to criticize it. It is within the province of Senators to express surprise that the Indian Committee may have reduced, here and there, an item in this bill; but I do not feel that the attitude that is taken toward the committee is exactly fair. It is perfectly proper, and I am finding no fault with that on the part of any Senator or group of Senators, to reject these items. But

to say, as I have heard on the floor this afternoon, "Let us strike this; let us go for this," without waiting one moment to hear a justification for an item, it does seem to me, if I may be pardoned for the expression, is hardly the proper way to deal with a question where we have taken a people without their consent and placed them in the attitude of wards, we assuming the attitude of their guardians.

It may be that some items here could be deferred, although I think every item that has been increased is justified upon the principle either that buildings have reached the point where decay has set in, and the continuance of decay is not economy, or that postponing additional help to the Indians is not economy, and falls short of our duty to them.

Whatever is done I do hope that the consideration of this bill will not be proceeded with in a spirit which does seem to me, if I may be pardoned the expression, to be hardly the spirit with which to approach the consideration of a bill which involves our attitude not toward our equals, not toward our constituents, but toward a people that we hold as wards, we occupying the position assumed by ourselves of guardians.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am quite sure that when the Senator from Georgia has the information as to why the increase is made, he will not object to it. The Senator from Georgia was one of the Members of this body who made it possible for the white child to get a vocational education. This amount is requested for the construction of a building to instruct the Indian boy in shopwork, and for physical training, indoor training, which is necessary in that climate on account of the inclement weather. I am quite sure that the Senator from Georgia will not object to it. It is absolutely necessary, as was shown to the committee by the Indian Office.

WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in order to preserve the parliamentary status, I ask that the consideration of the Indian bill be discontinued at this time, and that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, that will be done. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. TILLMAN. I move that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE FINLEY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. DAVID EDWARD FINLEY, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted resolutions of the House thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolutions of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. DAVID EDWARD FINLEY, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

In accordance with the foregoing resolutions the Speaker appointed as the committee on the part of the House Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. LEVER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, Mr. WHALEY, Mr. RAGSDALE, Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina, Mr. MOON, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. BELL, Mr. BARNHART, Mr. BLACKMON, Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, Mr. MANN, Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. KAHN, Mr. BRITT, and Mr. WASON.

Mr. TILLMAN. I send to the desk the following resolutions and ask that they be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 331) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. DAVID E. FINLEY, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of six Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join a committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER, under the second resolution, appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. FERNALD.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I move, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 27, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 26, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou from whom all blessings flow, humbly and reverently we bow before Thee and acknowledge our indebtedness and most devoutly pray that our gratitude may blossom into a fuller service to Thee and our fellow men; that thus we may lift ourselves and those with whom we come in contact into a purer atmosphere; that our religious energy may not waste itself in hollow forms and ceremonies, but become a living, vitalizing force under the divine leadership of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3526. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes" approved December 17, 1914;

S. 5504. An act for the relief of Louis Blanchette, alias Lewis Blanchard, alias Louis White;

S. 2292. An act to acquire the manuscript of Charles Chaillé-Long, containing an account of the unveiling of the McClellan Statue;

S. 5974. An act for the relief of Ellen B. Walker;

S. 391. An act for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand stamp patents, or otherwise;

S. 2704. An act for the relief of Albert L. Ream;

S. 4620. An act for the relief of James B. Smock;

S. 4915. An act for the relief of Oliver C. Rice;

S. 6698. An act for the relief of Edward L. Keyes;

S. 2512. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of West Virginia;

S. 2461. An act authorizing the appointment of Dr. Bert R. Huntington as first lieutenant, Medical Corps, United States Army;

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to grant the free use, for military drill, of rifles to duly accredited camps of the Sons of Veterans Reserve;

S. 4500. An act to incorporate the World's Sunday School Association;

S. 6737. An act for the relief of A. J. Lowary;

S. 6783. An act for the relief of William F. Carter;

S. 6671. An act to validate the homestead entries of Anna W. Thrailkill;

S. 6730. An act to revoke authority to lease Sibley Island, in the Missouri River, to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.;

S. 3731. An act for the relief of John G. Young;

S. 1579. An act for the relief of Jacob Nice;

S. 6949. An act for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co., and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.;

S. 784. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Belton, Mont., for hotel purposes;

S. 6692. An act to amend section 6 of an act to expedite the settlement of title to lands in the State of California;

S. 6829. An act to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws;

S. 833. An act to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade;

S. 6862. An act for the relief of Amos Dahuff;

S. 5344. An act for the regulation of the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto;

S. 1724. An act to reimburse the First National Bank of Owatonna, Minn., for revenue stamps stolen or lost in transit; and

S. 698. An act for the relief of John L. O'Mara.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 193. An act to provide for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and to prevent the spread of leprosy in the United States.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3526. An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or coca leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes" approved December 17, 1914; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 4915. An act for the relief of Oliver C. Rice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 833. An act to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 6949. An act for the relief of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co., the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway Co., and the St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6862. An act for the relief of Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 6829. An act to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6783. An act for the relief of William F. Carter; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 6737. An act for the relief of A. J. Lowary; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6730. An act to revoke authority to lease Sibley Island, in the Missouri River, to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 784. An act to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Belton, Mont., for hotel purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 698. An act for the relief of John L. O'Mara; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 5344. An act for the regulation of the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 5504. An act for the relief of Louis Blanchette, alias Lewis Blanchard, alias Louis White; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 391. An act for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under joint resolution of July 14, 1870, authorizing the Postmaster General to continue in use in the Postal Service Marcus P. Norton's combined postmarking and stamp-canceling hand stamp patents, or otherwise; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 4500. An act to incorporate the World's Sunday School Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3731. An act for the relief of John G. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5974. An act for the relief of Ellen B. Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 6671. An act to validate the homestead entries of Anna W. Thrailkill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.