

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif., relative to alcoholic liquor traffic; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring more stringent legislation affecting child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring a change in the citizenship laws as they affect women; to the Committee on Immigration.

Also, petition of Napa County Viticultural Protective Association, St. Helena, Calif., urging repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution passed by the California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the Army nurse bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution favoring the establishment of a department of education, by California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution favoring the league of nations by California Federation of Women's Clubs, Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of city commission of Pasadena; Normandie Avenue Methodist Church, Los Angeles; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ceres; Southern California District Lodge Good Templars, Los Angeles; Friends' Temperance Committee, Pasadena, all in the State of California, protesting against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federation of Women's Clubs of California, in favor of enforcement of national prohibition, and protesting against invasion of China by American brewers and distillers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring change in citizenship laws in favor of women, so they will not be secondary to their husbands; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring legislation for prevention of child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Federation of Women's Clubs of California, favoring league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring creation of Federal department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of California Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring granting recognition and rank to nurses in the military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Friendly Circle of Pasadena; Boyle Heights Methodist Church, Los Angeles; Methodist Preachers' Association of southern California; Bethany Baptist Church, Long Beach; Inglewood Methodist Church; Lincoln Avenue Methodist Church, Pasadena; Highland Park Baptist Church; Pilgrim Congregational Church, Pasadena; 27 missionary societies of Long Beach, all in the State of California, against repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REBER: Petition of East Susquehanna Classis, Gowen City, Pa., representing 15,000 people, urging against the repeal of war-time prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Pottsville (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce, opposing repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petitions of Allen & Nugent Co.; H. Jacquin & Co.; Paul L. Phelan; G. Levor & Co. (Inc.); M. Phillips, 1138 Bryant Avenue; M. McClure; E. Leap, 1321 Second Avenue; Daniel Currie, 232 West One hundred and thirty-second Street; A. von Kilch, 224 West One hundred and thirtieth Street; P. J. Dinan, 2194 Valentine Avenue; Edward M. Hanley, 601 West One hundred and seventy-fourth Street; Ed. M. Hanley, 601 West One hundred and seventy-fourth Street; Leo D. Fox, 1048 Kelly Street; G. Megroz, 222 Fourth Avenue; Mack Wolf, 313 West One hundred and twenty-first Street; J. A. Guillaume, 50 West Forty-fifth Street; and H. T. Kramer, 913 Jackson Avenue, all of New York City; and A. V. Wahlberg, 627 Madison Street; S. Williams, 111 Ninety-second Street; V. W. Knutsen, 663 Quincy Street; Elbert Butts, 939 Bushwick Avenue; Philippe Lambert, 7205 Tenth Avenue; and Leo C. Lucke, 1355 Park Place, all of Brooklyn, and all in the State of New York, against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Julius Jorgenson & Son, New York City, asking for repeal of section 905 of revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Woman's Trade Union League of America, for the continuation of the Woman in Industry Serv-

ice of the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of D. Auerbach & Sons, New York City, against continuance of Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Goodfriend Bros., New York, engineers and contractors, and F. C. Barlau, protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of sundry residents of Marcy, N. Y., for repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Herkimer, N. Y., for the repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Slovenian Lodge, No. 282, and St. Joseph's Society, No. 53, of Little Falls, N. Y., for recognition and justice for the Jugo-Slavs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Lyman Shedd and other residents of Bolsters Mills, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George O. Hill and others residing in the towns of Oxford and Norway, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Cecil H. Mitchell and others residing in the town of Byron, Me., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, June 4, 1919.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, June 3, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Harding	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Harris	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harrison	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Henderson	Nelson	Spencer
Brandegee	Hitchcock	New	Stanley
Calder	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Sterling
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Swanson
Cummins	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Page	Underwood
Dial	Kenyon	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Keyes	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	King	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	Kirby	Poindexter	Warren
Fall	Knox	Ransdell	Watson
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Sheppard	Wolcott
Gay	McCormick	Sherman	
Gronna	McCumber	Simmons	
Hale	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. McKELLAR. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHELDS] is absent on important business.

Mr. KIRBY. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on public business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 79) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. WADSWORTH obtained the floor.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to have the amendment read.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, strike out the words "the legislatures of" and in lieu thereof insert the words "conventions in," so that the paragraph will read:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I represent in part a State which has extended the franchise to women residing within its borders. In view of that fact and my decision to vote against the proposed amendment to the Constitution, as I have done upon two prior occasions, I desire to make my attitude clear before the Senate.

No vote of mine cast upon this amendment will deprive any of the electors of the State of New York of any privilege which they now enjoy. The people of that State, as the people of several other States, have decided for themselves, in an orderly and constitutional manner, to extend the franchise to the women. I feel so strongly on this question that the people of the several States should be permitted to decide this matter for themselves that I desire to say that were this amendment, instead of being drafted for the purpose of extending woman suffrage all over the country, drafted for the purpose of forbidding the extension of the franchise to women, I would vote against it.

The Senator from Idaho yesterday discussed the right of the people to settle their own affairs, particularly in matters which were local and intimate. My feelings upon that question are somewhat like his. The people of the several States when they organized their governments and adopted their constitutions delegated certain powers to their legislatures and to their executives. Then they set up their judiciary to see to it that both their legislative and executive departments should keep faith and should not transgress the limits set by the people.

When a society organizes itself to do business, about the first thing it does is to prescribe the qualifications of its voting members, and it is the usual procedure for an organization in the process of formation to prescribe in its constitution that the voting membership shall not be extended or restricted except by a vote of the members of the society. And so the regulation of the franchise in the States, and I think I can say in every State, when they were organizing their governments, was left to the voting members; in other words, the people of those States.

Acting upon that theory and in accordance with that principle, which I believe lies at the bottom of a truly democratic government, several of the States have voted from time to time by popular referendum and have decided to extend the franchise to the women. Many other States have voted in popular referendums and have decided against the extension of the franchise.

Even though one might be opposed on general principles to the extension of the franchise to women, one can not logically object to the people of a great Commonwealth voting upon that question, settling it for themselves, and if they settle it in the affirmative with respect to woman suffrage one can not then logically object, even though one may have voted against it as a citizen of the State. Nor can I see how one can logically object to the application of the principle, even though in its application the people, voting freely and openly, decide that they shall not extend the franchise in this way.

Something has been said in the debate which has thus far taken place upon this amendment as to the popular demand in favor of it all over the country. Some criticism has been uttered by one or more of its advocates against Senators who are opposing it and who have consistently opposed it in times past. An examination of the record of the different States which have voted upon this question does not, I venture to say, indicate that there is any overwhelming popular demand thus far evidenced in the elections.

If my computation is correct, there are at least 30 States of the Union which have either refrained from voting on the question at all or have voted upon it and rejected it. In the States which have voted upon it, if a computation is made of the majorities in favor of the proposition and the majorities opposed to the proposition, we find that the aggregate majorities opposed to the proposition is about 1,300,000 votes, whereas the aggregate majority in favor of the proposition in these referendums amounts to 254,000. So from the standpoint of popular demand it would not seem that the Senate or the Congress should feel itself driven to adopt an amendment to the Constitution which revolutionizes the rule and practice of the American people in regulating the franchise.

Mr. President, it may seem somewhat old-fashioned for a Senator to express his reverence for the Constitution of the United States, his reverence and his devotion not only to its

letter but to its spirit. When one views modern tendencies and the influences that are at work in this country to-day, one is tempted to suggest that now is an appropriate time to rededicate and reconsecrate ourselves to a proper understanding of the letter and the spirit of our Constitution and to a better understanding of its meaning. The tendencies of the day, without any question, are traveling fast along the road which, if followed to its ultimate goal, will mean its destruction or its alteration to such a degree in spirit, if not in letter, that it will be scarcely recognizable. It is now proposed in this amendment, as a part of this tendency which has been so evident in recent years, to take away from the people some of that sense of responsibility the exercise of which is the only safeguard for the intelligent conduct of a democracy and to assume that responsibility at the seat of government.

The central Government is remote, comparatively, and eventually, if this tendency continues, that responsibility will be borne in such a way that the individual citizen will not be able to understand what is going on in the maze and confusion of a great centralized Government.

I assume that a Senator, when discussing this matter, should endeavor to remember that he is a Senator of the United States and not confined in his functions to representing merely the State, and only the State, that sends him to Congress. I assume that it is the function of a Senator to take into consideration the Nation as a whole, to have some concern and to give some consideration to the condition of public contentment and the wishes of the people as a whole.

It is very true, of course, that a Senator elected from a State should exert every influence and power that he can wield to protect his State from injury by Federal legislation, if in his judgment the legislation proposed is unjust and discriminatory against the people of his State. That question does not arise in the discussion or consideration of this amendment, for no Senator who may desire to vote against this amendment is depriving the people of his State of anything which they already possess.

If the people of his State have already voted to extend this franchise, no vote of his, no vote of mine, can take it away; but a vote in favor of this proposal does in several instances impose upon the people of certain States things which they have said they do not want. When that side of the question is presented it seems to me that it is incumbent upon a Senator to regard the Nation as a whole and to give his consideration to the wishes of the people of the States that have expressed themselves freely upon the question at issue.

Mr. President, the conduct of government of a great Commonwealth is of concern to us all, for it is from the governments of the Commonwealths and their constituent parts that this Federal Government derives its inspiration, and which, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said yesterday, provide our schools of political education.

Let us take the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as an example. The people of Massachusetts in their own way, in conformance with their constitution, in the exercise of their undoubted right and privilege, held a referendum on the question of suffrage, and the proposal to extend the franchise to the women of the State of Massachusetts was defeated. It was defeated in every city of the State, in every county of the State, and in every town of the State, and had three votes in the aggregate been changed it would have been defeated in every ward. The people of the State of Maine, by a vote of nearly two to one, defeated woman suffrage; the people of the State of New Jersey, in spite of the interposition of the President of the United States, who is a resident of the State, defeated it by 50,000 majority; the people of Pennsylvania defeated it by a similar majority; the people of West Virginia defeated it in a popular referendum in the approximate proportion of three to one; the people of Ohio have three times defeated it within six years, the last defeat being registered only last year, if my memory is correct, and the last majority against it was over 140,000 votes. The people of Iowa have defeated it; the people of Louisiana have defeated it; and only the other day the people of Texas defeated it. The people of Wisconsin have defeated it, as was referred to yesterday, and there may be some other States which have defeated it which I do not at this moment recall.

Now, the question is, were the people of Massachusetts, the people of Pennsylvania, and the people of Ohio competent to settle that question for themselves or not? There is nothing to prevent them under their form of government from securing the franchise of women if they want it.

There is no tremendous emergency facing the country, no revolution or rebellion threatened which would seem to make it necessary to impose upon the people of these States which have given their verdict upon it something which they have

said, as free citizens, they do not require or desire. Is it unreasonable to ask that they be permitted to continue to govern their own affairs in this respect? Is it contrary to the spirit of American institutions that they shall be left free to decide these things for themselves?

Other States besides those I have named have voted to extend the franchise. The State of Michigan did it but a few months ago; the State of South Dakota did it but a few months ago. No man can logically complain against a system which permits such a practice.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but he has named a number of States where in the not remote past a direct vote has been taken and the people have repudiated this proposition. I wish he would include in that list the State of Missouri, which in 1914 repudiated the proposition by 140,000 votes. I merely want Missouri included.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated at the time that my recollection was imperfect and that there might be other States besides the ones I mentioned which had repudiated the proposition; and I now remember, of course, that the State of Missouri is in that category.

Now, without discussing the merits of woman suffrage as such, the question is simply this: Why is it that this power, resting in the people of this country in their several States, is to be taken away from them and lodged elsewhere? What is the reason? Is the principle faulty? Is it undemocratic? Is it un-American? Does it fail to satisfy the people themselves? I think not. No such contention has thus far been made.

Let us speak frankly. The advocates of this movement—and I do not criticize them for exercising whatever power or influence they may bring to bear or for resorting to whatever device they may find ready at their hand to bring about their purpose—the advocates of this proposal for the extension of the franchise all over the United States through a Federal amendment believe that that is the easiest way for them to achieve their purpose. To them it has become a purely practical question. Regard for the spirit of our institutions does not enter into their discussions. The Constitution of the United States means nothing more to them than that it shall be used as a vehicle to achieve a set purpose; and, being intent upon the purpose, they pick up the instrument and use it. They do not want referendums. They have said so in many of their public utterances.

I am not reflecting upon their intelligence when I describe their reasons. As a matter of fact, I rather admire their skill and resourcefulness in carrying this movement up to this point. They were skillful, and have been skillful, in using the mechanics of the situation, but they have not gone to the people of the country. They have believed—and I think most men in their honest second judgment will agree—that it is easier to persuade a legislature to ratify a proposal of this sort than it is to get the people of a State to do the same thing in a popular referendum. It can be done more quickly and with less expense in the matter of propaganda, and, as was said here yesterday on the floor, the members of legislative bodies—and I do not except the Congress of the United States—are peculiarly susceptible to pressure, to insistent and persistent agitation and propaganda.

There have been instances in this very matter of the extension of the franchise which illustrate that very thing. The people of Ohio on two separate occasions voted down the proposal for the extension of the franchise to women. The year following the second defeat by the people of Ohio the legislature of that State, in the face of the mandate of the people, promptly passed a statute to extend the presidential franchise to women—an exact illustration of how much easier it is to persuade or enjoin a legislature to do something that the people have refused to do. It became necessary for the people of Ohio to repeal that act of the legislature within a few months after it had been put upon the statute books, and they repealed it by popular vote.

My contention has always been with respect to amendments to the Federal Constitution that if an amendment be placed in the Constitution it should command the reverence and devotion of all the people of the country. The discussion here upon the floor yesterday makes it perfectly apparent that in part at least, in a certain section of this country, this proposed amendment will be a dead letter. No pretense is made that it will be lived up to in spirit, and it is the spirit of our Constitution which we, it seems to me, should have some reverence for at this hour.

I have discussed this matter with people from different portions of the country, and I have been surprised upon occasion to

note the frivolous and casual way in which so many people discuss the Constitution of the United States and what it means, and to hear the suggestion made, "Oh, well, you must not take it so seriously as all that; things can be arranged here and there in such a way that it will not be strictly enforced." That is a spirit which is abroad in the United States to-day. That same spirit has been made manifest in the recent discussion of the last amendment to the Constitution which was ratified last winter. To-day there are thousands of people all over the United States who are attempting to contrive ways and means by which the prohibition amendment to the Constitution can be evaded, showing an utter lack of regard for the instrument itself, showing an utter failure to understand that if that instrument is not held sacred by the people of this country, then there is no use of our endeavoring to continue our experiment in self-government.

Unlike the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I voted against the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, because I believed that such a proposal had no place in the Constitution, and, second, because I believed that the people in great and important communities of this country were competent to decide that matter for themselves; and I feared the very thing that is making itself so apparent to-day—a settled determination upon the part of hundreds of thousands of people living in those communities which were not consulted, to evade it, to urge some act of Congress or State legislature under that peculiar provision for concurrent jurisdiction, which in part at least would make a laughing stock of that particular amendment to the Constitution. The danger is, if we go on in this way and deprive the people of important communities of their right to decide these questions which they are competent to decide, which in dozens of instances they have decided to their own satisfaction, that a contempt for the Constitution of the United States will gradually and inevitably spread all over this country. It will be regarded by hundreds of thousands of people as merely a vehicle for the exercise of a will to power upon the part of some group of people who desire to impose their ideas upon another group of people.

Mr. President, I can not blind myself to the fact that this is the tendency of the day; I do not blind myself to the fact that slowly, but surely, not so much by constitutional amendment perhaps, although this is a glaring instance of it, but by statutes passed by the Congress and by statutes passed by the State legislatures, we are whittling away the sense of responsibility of the individual citizen. We are teaching more people every year that the Government owes them a living; we are teaching more people every year that the Government should and can do things which they as individual citizens can do for themselves; we are urging the "easiest way." Scarcely a year goes by but what that tendency becomes more marked, and when we whittle away that sense of responsibility which should live in the breast of the individual citizen and teach him that the Government at Washington, remote as it is and rapidly becoming top-heavy with a bureaucracy, the intricacies of which I challenge any Senator to understand to-day, when we teach him that the Government at Washington, with its so-called bottomless Treasury, can take over, and should take over, all of these functions and duties and that the people of the communities of this country need not be expected to do those things for themselves, that they shall not even be expected to decide as to who shall vote for sheriff or district attorney or county judge, then I say that step by step we are building in this country a paternalistic system such as was the curse of Germany. There was a people, as we all know to-day, 70,000,000 of them, who were educated, one might say, almost from the cradle by the teachers in the schools, educated by the professors in the universities, educated by all their public men, at the inspiration of the autocracy that topped that Government, educated, drilled, coached, guided out of all sense of individual responsibility until they reached the condition where they lost their very souls.

I frankly confess, Mr. President, that I fear this tendency in the United States. I do not want to see it go any further. I know, of course, that there are some things that only a government can do. I know, of course, that every man and every woman who calls himself or herself human wants the burden of the overlaid members of society lightened; and if members of society as individuals, or as volunteers organized in a reasonable way, can not perform that function then it is the duty of government, the protector of society, to perform it. But it seems to me that we might well call a halt. It is not that any one of the statutes or amendments to the Constitution which are proposed is fatal. It is the fact that we pile one upon another, year after year. Some say, "Let us enact the second one because we have enacted the first, and the two proceed along

parallel lines, and therefore the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth are justifiable." But the trouble is, Mr. President, that as we proceed in taking away the sense of responsibility from the people in their communities year after year and decade after decade we do not proceed along parallel lines. The lines of those pieces of legislation slowly converge, and when they reach the point of convergence the citizen will have become the servant and dependent of government instead of being its master; and it is exactly along one of those converging lines that this amendment of the Constitution is proceeding. The people of some 30 States, if this constitutional amendment is ratified, cease being the masters of their government in so far as the franchise is concerned. And that, according to my way of thinking, is contrary to the spirit of our institutions.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, the historical reference which my distinguished colleague [Mr. REED] made to the action of Missouri is true. It was some years old. Perhaps it might be fair to add that the vote of Missouri taken some years ago is hardly a fair indication of to-day, because in the legislature just adjourned both houses were in accord with the granting of suffrage to women in Missouri. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the statement which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] has made is correct; and it exactly illustrates the vice to which I alluded and to which the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has so fittingly addressed himself.

The last time the people of the State of Missouri had an opportunity to vote on this question was in 1914. They defeated suffrage by over 140,000 majority. Since that time they have elected legislatures without any regard to the suffrage question. It never has been made an issue to the people. The last legislature of Missouri, in disregard of the last mandate of the people of Missouri and in defiance of it, passed a statute authorizing votes by women at presidential elections. That exactly proves the case. It demonstrates that legislatures can be handled when the people can not be. It was because of the notorious incompetency of legislatures, and because of the fact that they could be reached by influence and often by sinister means, that the people took from legislatures the right to elect United States Senators and declared that the people alone should exercise that high right. It is because of the fact that legislative bodies very frequently do not represent the sense of the people, that they are very often composed of men grossly incompetent, that protest is now being made against taking away from the people of the State of Missouri the right of settling this question for themselves.

Since my distinguished colleague has seen fit to challenge me to this question, I want to ask him if he is willing by his vote to deprive the people of the State of Missouri of a right to themselves fix the qualifications of the voters within the State which they expressly reserved to themselves in their constitution—to take that power from the people of the State of Missouri and confer it upon a legislature?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, as others have said before me, nothing that I can say, perhaps, can change a vote; but in view of the pending amendment and the vital issues that are now at stake, I should be derelict to duty if I did not enter my protest against the passage of this amendment, which to all intents and purposes is exactly similar to one that has already been passed, the result of which is an illustration of the point that has been made so splendidly by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and emphasized this morning by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

In our dual form of government the principle of its duality is the one that makes it possible for every part of this vast domain of ours to progress as conditions justify. Were we a homogeneous people, were the local conditions, both social, commercial, and industrial, the same, it might be less destructive of the spirit of democracy for us to take the principle that underlies democracy and emasculate it as this will emasculate it. But when the conditions are so divergent, when local conditions throughout the United States are so different, the splendid principle incorporated into the Constitution finds its sanction.

I referred a moment ago to another amendment, incorporating exactly the same principle as this, that was made into our organic law. The fifteenth amendment—but who does not know and realize that the fifteenth amendment, when it was passed, was passed in a moment of heat, passion, sectional strife, and bitterness? There is not a man in America to-day capable of exercising the functions of citizenship but that recognizes that that amendment, passed when and how it was passed, jeopardized the civilization that you and I represent in a section of our country. The alien population amongst us was not like it

was in other States. Even if the franchise had been granted to them in other States, their fewness of number made it possible for those States to absorb them without danger to their civilization.

But unlimited franchise in certain other States would have deluged and destroyed with a horde of ignorance and incompetency the civilization that it had taken all of these years to build up and perfect. It placed a burden upon those States that has eclipsed every other, and that has been the main cause of the retardation of the progress of the South. It has caused that section, in every line of endeavor and in every line of work, to be retarded, because unless there was a united front to this menace the absolute submergence and destruction of our social and political edifice was threatened. So that the work of the South for years has been not one of the unified attention of the people to constructive work but one of unified operation to avoid the greater danger.

Now, I want to appeal to some of my southern colleagues. We contended that the passage of the fifteenth amendment was a crime against the civilization of the white men of America. Those on the other side, when sanity reassumed its dominion over the minds of men, recognized that fact. We busied ourselves with the passage of such laws as would minimize the disastrous effect of unlimited suffrage to the Negro in the South. Be it said to the honor of those who were in position to enforce it that, recognizing the evils that would grow out of the unlimited franchise as provided in the fifteenth amendment, they acquiesced in silence to such laws as we passed to minimize its evil effects; and be it said to their honor that they did so because they recognized, as we recognize and as the world recognizes, that local conditions there have to be met by such laws and such acts as will protect and preserve the civilization that characterizes the white man.

That was your reason, founded as it was in justice and in righteousness. Those men from the South who are sitting here to-day, who are going to vote for the ratification of this amendment or vote to submit this amendment to the people, by that vote ratify and confirm the fifteenth amendment, because I maintain to-day that there is no difference whatever between the fifteenth amendment and the proposed Susan B. Anthony amendment. The Susan B. Anthony amendment is the fifteenth amendment with the insertion of one word alone, namely:

The right of a citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex.

Those of us from the South, where the preponderance of the Negro vote jeopardized our civilization, have maintained that the fifteenth amendment was a crime against our civilization. Now, when a southern man votes for the Susan B. Anthony amendment he votes to enfranchise the other half of that race, and ratifies, not in a moment of heat and passion, what we have claimed was a crime, but in a moment of profound calmness and sectional amity he votes to ratify the fifteenth amendment and give the lie to every protestation that we heretofore have made that the enfranchisement of the Negro men, unlimited, was a crime against white civilization. When Senators and others of the North, East, and West viewed conditions calmly the fifteenth amendment did become a dead letter, and infinitely better that it should become a dead letter than that the civilization of the South should be destroyed and in its destruction jeopardize the civilization of America.

Here is exactly the identical same amendment applied to the other half of the Negro race. The southern man who votes for the Susan B. Anthony amendment votes to ratify the fifteenth amendment. Senators on the other side have acquiesced in silence when in desperation we passed such laws as would nullify the disastrous effect of the fifteenth amendment. Southern Senators voting for this amendment puts them without excuse to still further withhold their hands.

I can understand how a man from the West or a man from the East, viewing it strictly from his own local impression, might get the idea that we ought to extend it to all, but those of us from the South who have seen the evil effect upon our section of country from this menace—worse than poverty, worse than retarded commercial and industrial growth—those of us who have seen the very sanctity of the fireside and the sacredness of womanhood jeopardized, can not vote for this amendment without once again making possible all these evils that we have for weary years combated and overcome. How southern Senators can vote to turn loose upon the South another era similar to that through which we have passed I can not understand.

Not only that, Mr. President, but I have heard it flippantly remarked by those who propose to vote for this amendment, "You found a way to keep the Negro man from voting and you will find a way to keep the unworthy Negro woman from voting."

We found the way because of the recognition on the part of our colleagues on the other side that it was their blunder, perhaps, that had deluged the South or made it possible for the South to be deluged by an alien and unfit race.

We had their moral support in maintaining the civilization of the white man of the South. Can we appeal to them after to-day if southern men vote to ratify the fifteenth amendment? When the clamor comes to you now from that race, that they demand that they shall be recognized, what excuse will you have when southern men vote to ratify it? You of the other sections have said, and said rightly, that in spite of the fifteenth amendment, let the South work out its own salvation and we will give our brethren of the white race our support. Now, if your brethren of the white race of the South vote for an amendment which ratifies the previous amendment, what support can we hope from these other sections? I warn every man here to-day that when the test comes, as it will come, when the clamor for Negro rights shall have come, that you Senators of the South voting for it have started it here this day for reasons it is not necessary for me to try to state.

The other features of this proposed infraction and destruction of the Constitution of the United States have been given ably. No man would attempt to gainsay or deny that democracy means the vote of the people under the sensible restrictions that the people themselves in their local statutes see fit to impose. The very conditions that might arise in the State of Utah might make it impossible for Utah to rise and progress with a certain condition of franchise enforced upon her by Washington. Left alone to adjust her own internal affairs through her franchise, she might rise to a point where it would be perfectly proper for that franchise to be extended. The splendid principle of our dual form of government was never better illustrated than in the condition of the South and the condition of the East and the West.

I say, when we have taken from the several States the right to modify, qualify, and determine their franchise, the sovereignty of the State in every other particular has ceased to be; we shall all be living in a centralized Government; there will be nothing else left.

Local self-government presupposes the right to meet local conditions by peculiar local franchise law. If there were no other remedies, there might be an argument for us to come to the Federal Government to extend this franchise; but where each State has the right to extend the franchise in whatever manner it deems best, for my State to come and ask that Massachusetts, Montana, and California shall take charge of the affairs in my State, because the voters in my State are incompetent to determine what is best for them, is to make a statement that is proof that democracy has passed.

Mr. President, I am not going to take up the time of the Senate any further on this question. All the legal phases of it, and all the democratic phases of it, have been discussed; but I felt that I would not do my duty if I did not warn southern Democrats—southern white men—that this day they solemnly ratify what they have for the last 50 years denounced as the crime of the century. We protested against the act that incorporated into our organic law the right of an alien and ignorant race to be turned loose upon us, and it numerically in the majority. When you vote for this amendment to-day, you vote to ratify it, and say to those who enacted that amendment that they did not make a mistake but that you are now ratifying it.

Let me repeat, the Susan B. Anthony amendment provides that the franchise shall not be denied on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex, and if it was a crime to pass the fifteenth amendment, why is it right to pass this amendment? If it was a crime to enfranchise the male half of that race, why is it not a crime to enfranchise the other half? You have put yourselves in the category of standing for both amendments, and when the time comes, as it will come, when you are to meet the result of this act, you can not charge that it was a crime to pass the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

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

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I have been listening to the very positive statement made by the Senator from South Carolina, and I have felt like not making any interruption, even for the purpose of asking a question. However, I have finally concluded that unless something be said at this juncture it will go to the people of the State of South Carolina and other Southern States that the remarks just made by the Senator from South Carolina have been universally accepted here in the Senate.

I do not want to provoke any discussion of the subject, but I do want at this time to protest most earnestly against the

construction which the Senator from South Carolina has placed upon this proposed constitutional amendment. If I am able to read the English language, the amendment does absolutely nothing more than to prevent discrimination in the franchise on account of sex. I think it requires an extreme imagination for one to draw any inference or to fabricate any argument to the effect that the passage of the amendment is a reaffirmation or re-adoption of the fifteenth amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Does it not extend suffrage to female Negroes?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is true; but the Senator knows that the fifteenth amendment was directed to a class of people only, and this amendment is intended to liberate the women of the entire country, the millions of white women of the country. It is to operate upon them and is not confined to the black women of the South.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But it includes them.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; it includes them.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly. I said it did not differ from the other. You went specifically after the Negro men in the fifteenth amendment. Now you go specifically after the Negro and white women in this amendment. By thus adding the word "sex" to the fifteenth amendment you have just amended it to liberate them all, when it was perfectly competent for the legislatures of the several States to so frame their laws as to preserve our civilization without entangling legislation involving the women of the black race. You simply have amended the fifteenth amendment by adding the Negro women. When we could have had all the white women vote by State action, you want to add the Negro women by Federal action. That is what you have done, and that is what I am protesting against.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That, I take it, is the Senator's construction, and, of course, I do not expect to convince him, but I want the statement to go into the Record that in my judgment this amendment is entitled to no such interpretation.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. There is no use to quibble about what is the language of the amendment. When it says that there shall be no restriction of the suffrage on account of sex, it means the female sex, and means the millions upon millions of Negro women in the South.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, may I ask my colleague if it is not true that the legislature of our State meets every year?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. DIAL. Is it not also true that at the last session of the legislature no request was made to submit this question of woman suffrage to a vote of the people of the State?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senators representing the South and the splendid advocates of our dual form of Government representing other States on the other side can see their way clear to vote for the Underwood amendment and let this matter be submitted to the people. If South Carolina, the State that I in part represent, shall be given the privilege of calling a convention to elect delegates for that convention specifically charged with the purpose of deciding this question there will be no mistake made. It will be put squarely before the people of the State of South Carolina. I really have no fear of what my legislature would do. I know the women of my State pretty well, and I am quite sure that if they had wanted suffrage, with all the dangers and evils that it would entail, they would have said so. But they have resolutely refused to be stampeded by a few hysterical propagandists or propagandesses, I do not know which is the proper term. They have refused to be stampeded, and a vast majority of our women are opposed to opening this Pandora's box of evils and threatening once again the civilization of that State and other States with similar conditions.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that those of the South who for some reason or other have committed themselves to this destructive proposition will at least have the grace, in the moment of our passage into the unknown, to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in the statement that I make to the Senate upon this question. I heard quite a large portion of the speech made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday. I was then called from the floor on business, and I did not hear the latter part. I see that it is withheld from publication in the Record, so that I am unable to read it, but, so far as I heard it, I entirely agree with his views upon this matter.

The Senator from Idaho comes from a State that has for years had woman suffrage. I come from a State which has never had it. The legislature of my State has just declined to submit to the people of the State a constitutional amendment providing for it in that State. There is no way of ascertaining, so far as I have been informed, what the sentiment of the

voters of my State is upon that question other than the individual opinions that people may entertain upon the question. From information that I have received—and I think I have been in pretty close touch with the sentiment of the State—I believe that a vast majority of the present voters of the State who are men are opposed to woman suffrage in the State of Connecticut. I believe that a vast majority of the women of the State are opposed to woman suffrage in the State of Connecticut. I am absolutely certain that a vast majority of both the women and the men of Connecticut are opposed to Congress and three-quarters of the other States of the Union telling them what the qualifications of the electors of the State of Connecticut shall be.

However that may be—and that, of course, I admit is a question of opinion about which I have stated mine, and others are welcome to theirs—I am opposed to putting in the Constitution of the United States a provision which will force the ideas of Congress and three-quarters of the States, if three-quarters of the States concur with the ideas of Congress, upon that State and their ideas of what the qualifications of the electors of the other quarter of the States shall be. I believe that this country has become prosperous and great and strong by the exercise of home rule and the people of the different localities in this country minding their own business and, by minding it, developing a capacity to manage it. I may be wrong about that. It may be that the various localities of this country should transfer all the powers which the States which formed this Union reserved to themselves to the Federal Government here in Washington, but it is contrary to the biological and physiological laws of the world that we will get stronger by abandoning the exercise of these functions than we would be by exercising them. It contradicts the laws of history and experience.

Mr. President, in my judgment the framers of the Constitution designed that instrument to be the broad charter of our liberties and the definition of our form of government. They never expected the use of the process of amending the Constitution to be prostituted to putting a lot of police regulations, ordinances, and laws into the Constitution of the United States. They left the police power and the rules which should govern the inhabitants of this country in their respective subdivisions in the hands of the people who were to be affected by those rules. They wisely thought that the people in a country differing in climate, population, habits, and historical traditions could better administer their own affairs in the far-removed sections of the country in accordance with their local traditions and ideas than they could be administered by the fiat of a body sitting in the city of Washington. They wisely thought that the Senator from South Carolina and his colleague were better adapted to say what was for the best interests of the people who elected them, and to whom they are responsible, than the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from New York, and vice versa. I think the Senators from South Carolina will agree that the Senator from New York and myself from my State are better qualified to state to this body what sort of laws are best adapted for our section of the country than the Senators from South Carolina would be. If that were not so, there would be no sense in having Senators of the United States required to be residents of the States which they pretend to represent here.

Now, Mr. President, we have come upon this situation in this country: Our southern brethren suddenly, owing largely to a local condition, go crazy about prohibition, largely because they do not want the Negroes in their States to indulge in alcoholic drinks. Not satisfied with passing their own laws upon that subject, they come here and vote to jam a prohibition amendment into the Constitution of the United States and make other States—

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POINDEXTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Does the Senator from Connecticut regard the adoption of the prohibition amendment by 45 States as conclusive evidence that it is a local and southern proposition?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I regard it as a violation of the principle about which I am talking, and I say that you Senators voted to perpetrate that which I regard as an outrage upon the States that do not want it. It does not make any difference whether 45 or 47 States wanted it. The great Empire State of New York, with about 10,000,000 people, does not want it; it never had a chance to say so; but because your States want it and certain other States want it for their States, you think that you ought, in the Constitution of the United States, the fundamental law of the land, to force your views upon the Empire State of New York without its consent, except by the consent of the legislature, which is managed by the prohibition lobby.

You may think that is democracy. I do not. I think it is tyranny. I think it is tyranny, because I do not think that class of subjects was ever designed by the framers of the Constitution to be put into the Constitution of the United States. I think they regarded them as rules and local laws to govern the people in their respective localities as they wanted to be governed. Having established that principle, however, you find it rather difficult to refuse to put this woman suffrage amendment into the Constitution of the United States, and because certain States have adopted woman suffrage and desire it you think it is your duty to impose your notions upon that question upon States which do not desire it and to which it is not adapted, provided you can get three-fourths of the States to concur.

Mr. President, if this process is to be continued, if the people of this country want to be governed in their local customs, to be told what they are to eat and what they are to drink and how much, and when they are to go to bed, and what language they are to use, and to be regulated in every move they make in their daily lives and in their personal habits by a constitutional amendment in the United States Constitution that can never be got out except by a two-thirds vote of each branch of Congress and then a vote of three-fourths of all the State legislatures in addition, you have made a set of police regulations of the Constitution of the United States, and, as the Senator from New York has wisely warned you, it is a process that is calculated beyond all others to drag the Constitution of the United States into the mire and to destroy all respect for it, because you can not enforce a law or even a constitutional amendment against people who do not believe in it.

If the arguments against this process will not prevail in the case of two such shining abuses of the exercise of this power, simply because you have the power, as are furnished by this woman suffrage amendment and by the prohibition amendment, they will not prevail in other cases where the clamor is sufficiently strong to intimidate people to violate their traditional policies and the historical traditions of their party.

Mr. President, the last expression in national convention of both the Republican and Democratic Parties was opposed to this constitutional amendment. Both political parties declared in solemn national convention, after due consideration, that it was a matter that ought to be left to the several States; while they approved the principle of woman suffrage, they said, if it came, it ought to come through the action of the States. The President of the United States was the first one to say so, but, of course, like every other issue with which he deals, he says the other way, too; and there has not been a single issue of importance before the country, and there will not be during his administration, upon which he would not with equal facility and sincerity take either or both sides. Now, having resided for the last six months in a foreign country, he cables to his subservient idolators here how they shall vote on this constitutional amendment, and they will "come to heel" with due humility, I have no doubt.

Mr. President, if this process goes on of governing this country by constitutional amendment on questions that are not at all of constitutional size or of constitutional quality, I for one say that if the people are to be governed by constitutional amendment in their daily habits and life then it becomes necessary that the people themselves should be consulted about what shall be the constitutional amendments to which they are to bend the knee and have the yoke adjusted to them. Is there anything unfair or unreasonable about that? We know perfectly well that after Congress by a two-thirds majority of both branches has submitted a proposed amendment to the legislatures of the States that, although it has been extorted from Congress on the theory that we need not commit ourselves to it, but simply not obstruct it and pass it along to the legislatures for their action, that immediately we have taken them at their word and dignified ourselves into the honorable function of being a funnel, and funneling things through without responsibility on to the various legislatures of the States which are of so much superior ability and knowledge to us, and then they immediately turn around and say, "Congress, by a two-thirds majority, has set the seal of its approval on this and demands that we act, and is any one State legislature to set its judgment up above that of the great United States Senate and House of Representatives?" Then they use us as the argument in favor of the very thing that we were doubtful about.

It is not a pleasant thing to contemplate that a Senator of the United States, having walked up to that desk before that starry banner, Mr. President, which, thank God, still waves and sparkles back of your chair, and holds up his right hand and takes a solemn oath to support and sustain the Constitution of the United States without equivocation or mental reservation, that the minute an embarrassing question is presented to him

he runs like a dog away from it and says, "I do not know anything about it; but there is a cry in my district that I shall not stand in the way of it; and while I do not believe in it, while I regret it, still it is coming anyway; I do not want to have anybody say that I did not vote for it, and therefore I will sluice it along on to somebody else."

The Senate of the United States was not always composed of men of that backbone and caliber and virility. In the days of Calhoun and Webster and Clay, Senators of the United States were not too proud to think nor too cowardly to stand for their convictions, Mr. President; and there are a few left here to-day, I think, who, mistaken and old-fashioned as they may be, are actuated by the same motives which moved those gentlemen, and sit in the same Chamber, breathe the same air, and have been nurtured upon the same doctrine.

So if we are going on with this sort of thing, putting all kinds of police regulations and ordinances into the Constitution of the United States, for God's sake let us amend the Constitution of the United States so that we can submit to the electors of the States the amendments which we propose to the Constitution. Then we will not have so many propositions for constitutional amendments; but if we do, and they are approved, the people, then, will have no cause of complaint. They have a cause of complaint now, Mr. President, when we are prostituting the Constitution of the United States and using it as a vehicle to accomplish indirectly the destruction of home rule and local self-government and the exercise of the functions which have made free men in this country. When we now initiate a series of acts and constitutional amendments which deal with the things that we men of New England have been used to dealing with in our town meetings, where we carry our sovereignty under our own hats and take orders from nobody—when we put such provisions into the Constitution at the behest of the legislatures of our States, dominated and controlled by a clerical lobby and other kinds of lobbies, highly financed by charitable and mistaken people all over the country, then we are going to kill the American spirit in this country unless we submit these questions to the people themselves.

This is a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people, and they have a right to say what is going into the Constitution of the United States. As I said the other day when I introduced the proposed constitutional amendment which I have pending now, I have provided that whenever Congress in the future shall think it wise it may submit proposed amendments to the electors of the States as well as to the legislatures of the States or conventions to be called therein. Although that proposed amendment has no relation either to the prohibition amendment or to the woman-suffrage amendment, and would not affect them, because, if adopted, it will not be adopted until after they have been acted upon, I hope that the Senate will see the consistency and the logic of the position I take. If we are going to dabble in these local affairs, let us submit them to the people of the localities, and then we will have a contented, submissive, and loyal support of such amendments instead of having them the cause of dissension and disunion in this country.

There is another feature, Mr. President, that was called to our attention by the great Senator from New York when he was a Member of this body—Senator Elihu Root—and that is this: It is easy to conceive that by the process of amending the Constitution three-quarters of the State legislatures might approve an amendment, while the other quarter of the States that are to be governed by it are opposed to it. The other quarter to be governed by it against their will may contain the majority of the wealth and the majority of the people of this country, and so under the boasted democracy and home rule and independent Government in this country you have a situation wherein the minority of the voters and the minority of the wealth of the country are imposing their will upon the majority of the people and the majority of the wealth; and a minority of the people and a minority of the wealth represented under that system can control the financial policy of this country, levy taxes all upon one section of the country, and arrange the bills so that one section shall pay all of the taxes practically. It can be done by scientific jugglery. I do not say that it will work out in that way in every case, but it works nearly enough that way to make it, as the then Senator from New York suggested, the most terrifying portent that is now in the sky against the perpetuity of the Union of American States, for one-quarter of the States of this country will not continue to be governed in that way. It was never the intention of the framers of the Constitution that they should. They were supposed to be governed by a majority of Congress, of course, but they were not supposed to have the process of amendment of the Constitution, which was supposed

to be only amendable as to the fundamental matters of which it treats—it never was supposed that that process would be resorted to to accomplish these ulterior purposes.

Now, to be brief, and in conclusion, I am simply opposed to this amendment because it deprives the States of this Union of the power to fix the qualifications of their own electors who are to vote for their own officers. I think they can do it, and do it better than the Congress can do it. I am opposed to this amendment because it is not demanded by my State. I do not take the view that suffrage, whatever may be its merits, can be better determined by this Congress than it can be by the local States.

I believe that the great majority of the women of this country are opposed to it. When it comes, of course, I know they will exercise the franchise to the best of their ability. I do not think it will make much difference politically. I suppose the women will probably divide as their husbands and fathers and brothers do, and they will divide upon the issues that are presented to them probably about as the men do.

I have deplored from the beginning the dragging of politics into this question. I have regretted the unseemly and undignified haste of political managers to get themselves in front of this woman movement, to claim the credit of getting suffrage for the women. I believe the women will vote as honestly as the men and as intelligently as they can; perhaps they will vote more intelligently than the men do now. I do not look for additional uplifting and purity and the hastening of the millennium by their participation in politics. I think very likely the better of them will soon become disgusted with their associates at the polls, and the practical administration of political affairs, so far as the women are concerned, will be left in the hands of those who are less desirable to manage them; but that is simply my opinion, and I hope I will be a false prophet in that respect.

Mr. President, I have said all I care to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. WATSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Gronna	McLean	Smoot
Beckham	Hale	McNary	Spencer
Brandegge	Harding	Moses	Stanley
Calder	Harris	Myers	Sterling
Capper	Harrison	Nelson	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Henderson	New	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Trammell
Curtis	Kellogg	Nugent	Underwood
Dial	Kendrick	Pheasant	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Philips	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Polindexter	Warren
Fall	Kirby	Ransdell	Watson
Fernald	Knox	Reed	Williams
Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Lenroot	Sherman	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.	
Gay	McKellar	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] on account of illness.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, until the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] made his very interesting speech yesterday, it had not been my purpose to take any part in this discussion; for I am as anxious as any one to reach a vote, and thus finally dispose of the subject, as it undoubtedly will be disposed of on this occasion. I think, however, in view of the argument submitted by the senior Senator from Idaho, which unquestionably impressed his audience as it did myself, something should be said in reply to one or two of its features.

During its delivery I asked the Senator how he differentiated between his position at this time and that taken by him on the occasion of his vote upon the prohibition amendment; and his explanation, if I correctly comprehended him, was that inasmuch as a number of the States had adopted prohibition, and inasmuch as it could not be made effective so long as other States not having adopted it were permitted to manufacture and import alcoholic liquors therein, which neutralized prohibition, it being necessary to enable the States to enforce their laws, and, in the interest of local self-government, that the constitutional amendment providing for general prohibition should be submitted to the States for ratification or rejection, the Senator voted for the amendment.

I have no doubt that this reason was conclusive and controlling with the Senator from Idaho; but I am unable to perceive the

force of that logic which justifies the enactment of a prohibition amendment to the Constitution but which rejects the proposed suffrage amendment. Each of them deals with a subject which was reserved to the States at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. Were it not so, these amendments would be unnecessary. That it is so is most obvious by reference to the general proposition that powers not expressly or by necessary implication delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States, or to the people.

If the argument be a substantial one, it could be made, as I think it has been made, against every amendment hitherto proposed to the Constitution, whether adopted or rejected. Fundamentally, the people of the United States, when conforming to the machinery and the requirements of the Constitution in their action, may incorporate into the Constitution of the United States anything they please. It is a matter of judgment—a matter, if you please, of necessity—in the opinion of that majority which is required to make the fundamental change. Whether it encroaches upon the rights of the States or interferes with local self-government, or abolishes local self-government, is entirely a practical question, and, in my judgment, has nothing to do with the constitutional right and power of the people to amend their organic act as they may see fit.

Prohibition and the suffrage are both matters of local concern; and they will be matters of local concern, subject, of course, to national legislation within the purview of our powers, until constitutional amendments are not only proposed by the Senate and House of Representatives but actually ratified and enforced by a two-thirds majority of the States voting thereon.

Mr. President, when the prohibition amendment was before Congress for its consideration Congress had already solved the problem of interference by legislation—I refer, of course, to the Webb-Kenyon bill, under whose provisions the invasion by one State with its prohibited goods of another State where the prohibition was in effect had been effectually provided against; and I think that at that time the Supreme Court of the United States had sustained the constitutionality of the law. Therefore, conceding the argument of the Senator from Idaho to be perfectly sound, its application in this instance fails, because under the powers of the National Government whereby and in pursuance whereof it could make this regulation, no constitutional amendment to that end was essential. So it would be just as pertinent to offer the same objection to the consideration of that amendment as is offered to this.

I can readily understand, Mr. President, how a Senator who had cast his vote against the prohibition amendment could consistently oppose this amendment upon the ground that it interfered with local self-government; but I am unable to understand the logic which justifies a favorable vote for the one and an unfavorable vote for the other.

I am as much concerned for the integrity of local self-government as any lover of his country can be. I concede all that was said in its favor yesterday by the Senator from Idaho. I am glad that he has become so fervent and capable a champion of that great principle; and I freely admit that never in this country did it stand in as much jeopardy as at present and in the recent past. The right of the people to meet in their separate and several communities and legislate in their own interest and for their own welfare may be said to lie at the very foundation of Anglo-Saxon liberty—a right which should be safeguarded at all times and respected everywhere; a right the disregard or lowering or abandonment of which will, in my judgment, be inevitably followed by all the consequences so eloquently pictured by the Senator from Idaho. But, Mr. President, I am unable to perceive how this amendment, should it become effective through ratification, can affect the principle of local self-government, while that regarding prohibition certainly will; for the right of a man to eat or to drink or to conduct his personal affairs as he sees fit, provided only that he pays the same respect for the right of others to do the same thing, is infinitely more of a subject for local self-government than the right of suffrage.

I do not refer to the moral or police aspect of the subject. This is not the time or place for that, but I assert fundamentally that the one affects local self-government much more than the other.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment. If I had been present when the vote was taken upon the prohibition amendment I should have voted for it, not because I believe it is the best thing for the people, but because I was instructed by the people of my State to do it, and I would have respected that instruction. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I agree with what the Senator has said that the support of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, if a

man acted logically, ought to call for a vote in favor of amending the Constitution with respect to suffrage. And yet, does not the Senator think that this amendment is more of an assault upon the States than the other, because one of the inevitable characteristics and indispensable qualities of a sovereign State is the right to determine who shall hold office within the State, determine the qualifications of electors, and this amendment is a restriction upon the right of a sovereign State to exercise their sovereign power.

Mr. THOMAS. No, Mr. President, I do not. It is unquestionably an invasion, an absorption, if you please, of a right which the States may now, subject to another amendment regarding suffrage, exercise without national interference, except in so far as national elections are concerned. We had at one time a law upon the statute books enacted by Congress and enforced for many years under which at all elections where any national officer was chosen the entire machinery of the election was in the hands of the Federal authorities represented by United States marshals and supervisors. It was a deliberate and unwarranted intrusion into the affairs of the States, but it was a law, nevertheless, within the power of Congress, if it saw fit to do so, to enact. Inasmuch as State elections are constantly narrowing or decreasing in number, so that State officials and presidential electors and Members of Congress are chosen at the same time, there is no reason in the world why, if Congress saw fit to do so, it might not independently of this proposed amendment take charge of and control those elections.

But, Mr. President, whether that be so or not, the time for applying that argument has gone, for there can be no question that in spite of the obstructive tactics of the so-called National Woman's Party, which has prevented the successful submission of this amendment heretofore, the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States are in favor of the amendment. There can be no more significant evidence of the fact than that the vote about to be taken will be confined to no particular section of the country.

Mr. President, a word about local self-government and the dangers which menace it, and I am done. I do not believe local self-government is being directly assailed anywhere. I do not think it will be directly assailed under the provisions of this amendment, which after all only serves to double the vote. I believe that is the only practical consequence of the adoption of the amendment, and those who regard this matter as a subject for political influence will find to their sorrow before they are very much older, for women like men will cast their vote according to their convictions upon political questions and issues as they shall from time to time arise and be considered. Frankly, if I felt that half the people of the country would cast a vote for one particular party, locally or generally, simply because that party happened to be in power at the time the right was conferred, I should vote against the amendment. Such a conclusion is a reflection upon the intelligence and patriotism of womankind. As Democrats and as Republicans, as dissidents from both of the great parties, they will act hereafter precisely as they have acted heretofore, and in national affairs precisely as they have acted in State affairs where the franchise has prevailed.

Mr. President, what is it that is jeopardizing the fundamental principle of local self-government in America? It is largely the indifference of the average citizen to his public duty, largely the desire of the people to escape obligations by transferring them to the National Government, and largely because the States have themselves with regard to certain fundamentals broken down, either in their efforts to enforce the local laws, preserve peace and order, or have been unable to do so. If these conditions continue, as I am afraid they will, then it will make no difference whether this amendment be defeated or whether it be ratified. We must change fundamentally in some things or the old institution of local self-government, of community government, will become a tradition in this country instead of a living fact, as it has been and ought to be.

Mr. President, for the last quarter of a century and more every State in the Union has not only been willing but anxious to exchange its obligations and its powers of local self-government for Federal appropriations; and it would seem that as long as appropriations can be secured for the exercise by the Government of the United States in whole or in part of those duties which rest upon the States fundamentally and primarily, the exchange will continue. I shall not detain the Senate by attempting to enumerate a list of the various duties and powers which the States have passed on to the shoulders of the Federal Government and now feel free to insist that the Government itself shall observe them if they are observed at all. Great combinations of capital in the past have laughed at State laws and restrictions. The enforcement to-day of law and order for the pro-

tection of the individual in his fundamental rights in the States can only be secured, and sometimes not then, by Federal interference.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if it will not interrupt the Senator, does he think the Federal Government has afforded any better protection against the great aggregations of capital than the States?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think it has done so; but that does not affect the soundness of my proposition.

Mr. REED. I am not questioning that at all.

Mr. THOMAS. My proposition is that the States are passing on this duty to the Federal Government, which I think they could more effectively perform if they would do it themselves.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator in that.

Mr. THOMAS. To-day, Mr. President, we are confronted with a measure which clamored for recognition at the last Congress, which proposes that the States shall release themselves from still another burden and require the Government of the United States to assume the duty and bear the expense of educating the people of the country. If there is a phase of the duty of local self-government more obligatory than any other, it is that of the State to educate its citizens and to assume the financial obligations necessary to effectuate that great obligation. Yet Members of this body during the expiring days of the last session and since the commencement of this one have been deluged with letters and petitions from associations and individuals from one end of the country to the other urging them to support the measure creating a new cabinet department and clothing the Federal Government with the duty and authority of educating the children of the country.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I have no doubt it will pass, because it brings Federal money into the various districts of the country, and that is unfortunately regarded as a cure-all for every subject of public discontent.

I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. Has it not been the experience of the Senator from Colorado that many of the movements which look to the extension of the activities of the Federal Government into the States, and to that extent a destruction of the States, emanate from Federal employees who want to extend their authority and aggrandize the Federal Government increase their compensation, and extend their opportunities into the States, and to that extent diminish the powers of the States?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, Mr. President, there is no question that Federal employees, who are now organized, seem to indicate a desire to encourage every movement that increases the number of Federal employees and extends the activities of the Federal Government. That is one of the beauties of civil service in its ultimate stages of development.

But, Mr. President, I do not think it would be fair to place all these measures upon one class of people. Every city in the United States, every community, incorporated or unincorporated, so far as I know, sooner or later comes clamoring to Congress for appropriations for the accomplishment of things that ought to be done at home, and to say that a Federal amendment striking out the distinction of sex in the matter of suffrage is a fundamental blow at local self-government in the face of these conditions is to assume a position which I do not believe can be sustained either by reason or by logic, as it certainly can not be by precedent.

I hope and believe that the good women of this country, who in my State study and therefore understand political questions quite as well as, if not better than, the average man, who regard their enfranchisement not as the grant of a privilege, but as the imposition of a public duty, will be a powerful aid in the restoration as well as the preservation of local self-government and not become a mere numerical addition to our electoral franchise whose influence and whose power will be extended in some other and less laudable direction.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on this question, and shall do so but briefly. My remarks are chiefly provoked by the statements of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that the action of this Congress and the action of the people of the 45 States in the adoption of the prohibition amendment has a tendency to bring the Congress into disrepute and has a tendency to make the people have less regard and respect for the Constitution.

When I heard the statement of the Senator from New York that there were many men in the United States who already now feel aggrieved because of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution, and that they are proceeding to avoid or evade the effect of this amendment, and that such action would

have the effect to bring the Constitution into disrepute with the people of this country, I could not help but think of an instance I remembered from away back yonder in the days of my youth when I used to read the Scriptures more than I do now. I want to read it here now. This has reference to the time when Paul was in Asia, and had preached over there, and his preaching had caused the people of that country to quit worshipping idols. Here is the Biblical account of it:

For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen;

Whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.

Moreover ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made by hand:

So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought, but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth.

And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.

And the whole city was filled with confusion—

And so on.

The adoption of the amendment to the Constitution, complained of by the Senator from New York, interfered with the business of those engaged in this prohibited traffic, as did the preaching of Paul in ancient days with the sale of images of the idol by Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen.

There existed in this country a kind of business that had Government support, a kind of business that had debauched the people of the United States of America; that was entrenched with special privileges; that the people of this country said had existed too long; that such business should be destroyed. The sentiment began to grow in the States, in the counties, in the towns, in the cities, and finally it impressed the Congress of the United States. The people said, "We want the Constitution amended to abolish and destroy this system that has grown up, this special privilege, in which the Government had given the privilege to certain people to debauch with the liquor traffic the other people of the country and call it business. We want it destroyed. We want it destroyed forever, effectually and finally, and it must be done by writing an amendment into the Constitution of our Nation." How did the people proceed to do this?

Sentiment crystallized. It spread and extended throughout the country, and it demanded to be voiced here, and that the opportunity be given for the States to ratify the amendment that should be proposed. They proceeded with the amendment through the Congress of the United States, according to the rules laid down by the Constitution. It came here from these representatives of the people everywhere. Then it was proposed by Congress, two-thirds of the Members voting for it. It was submitted to the States of the Union, and 45 of the 48 States of the Union voted for it overwhelmingly, according to the rules laid down for adopting amendments to the Constitution.

And now the Senator from Connecticut comes upon the floor and says it was in effect a willful interference with the rights of the people of the other States, due to the desire and preference of the South. That is the sort of idea he has about it. The Senator from New York, because the liquor interests' gain has been taken from them, because they have stirred up this confusion or attempted to, because they have attempted to bring the Constitution of the United States into disrepute on account of their gain having been affected, says now you ought to be careful about adopting this proposed amendment lest you increase that sort of feeling, lest you cause it to spread throughout the country. The saloon people and the liquor traffic do not appear to recognize that the world has progressed. They seem to be in the attitude of the man who stood still; and yet they have learned a little, I judge, from the procedure heretofore of people who have been opposed to the traffic.

The other day in Baltimore they attempted to have a great parade, and the papers announced that the antiprohibition committee would regard all keepers of saloons as traitors to the cause who refused to close their saloons during the three or four hours in which the parade was expected to march. They learned that they themselves could not even have a parade and demonstration without closing the saloons, the agencies that all the people have insisted shall be closed for all time.

The Senator from New York thinks we will bring the Constitution into disrepute by adopting an amendment as provided in the Constitution.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has offered this amendment, and he has offered it not to improve the condition but in the hope of defeating the resolution. He is an enemy to the cause. He is not in favor of the proposition of permitting women to vote. He makes no concealment of that fact. He

has not been in favor of it. He is not in favor of it now. He offers this amendment to injure the cause and not to help it. Why should his amendment be adopted? No other amendment of the 17 amendments to the Constitution of the United States has ever been submitted to conventions in the States. It has never been attempted to be done before. It is permitted under the Constitution, yes; but it has never been availed of. It has never been done heretofore, and why should it be employed now on this question, and why should it be proposed by an enemy of the resolution and expected to be indorsed by those who are its friends? I say it should not be done.

Is there any reason to fear that in the United States of America in the adoption of this amendment the people will not have a fair expression of their views about it? Women only vote in comparatively a very few States. The men in all the States vote. They vote to elect members of the legislature, they vote to elect Members of Congress, they vote to elect United States Senators, and they will vote yonder upon this proposition of the ratification of this amendment, which is proposed in accordance with the rules laid down for amending the Constitution.

Can you say it is wrong to amend the Constitution according to the rules laid down for the purpose. If all the people of the country can not be trusted to amend the Constitution according to the rules provided in the Constitution, then is it not time that we have no further amendments? Some of these gentlemen, I believe from the arguments they have made, would be willing and think it better for the interest of the country in future that we have no further amendments to the Constitution, that the people can not be trusted to amend their own Constitution in the way they laid down when the Constitution was made for amending and changing it. That seems to be the idea some of them have.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] inveighed against the degeneracy of the times. He talked about those ancient Senators of great ability and great courage who stood here and took the same oath that these Senators in these degenerate days take. He said they were courageous, that they were patriotic, that they regarded their oath when it was taken. I do not know whether the Senator thinks he is more loyal and more patriotic and more courageous than the Senators who are supporting this amendment or not. He may be more able, but I will not even make any concession on that point.

That is the condition we are confronted with here to-day. No other amendment to the Constitution has ever been proposed in such a way as it is attempted to propose this. It never has been done. All the legislatures in the States are elected by the people. They are sent to their different assemblies representing their people. They will vote on this question, and if you had a convention and elected these representatives for this particular purpose they would be no more representative of the people than they are now. You are attempting here an innovation, so far as that practice is concerned.

As to what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has said, the Senator still seems to be in the unreconstructed period. I live in the South. I have lived under the fifteenth amendment since I was born, practically. It is the law of the land, and what is the use in discussing conditions under which it became so? Where is the harm that shall come to us if hereafter as to one-half of our people who have been denied the right to vote we shall utilize their ability and their judgment in the settlement of questions that affect local conditions and affect national interests? There has been, so far as I am concerned, no good reason urged here to-day at all why this amendment should not be adopted. I did not expect to say anything to-day and would not have done so except for those remarks from the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] that provoked it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, only a few words. I have listened with interest to what the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] has just said. Of course, I am opposed to the pending joint resolution, and have been from the beginning, but that does not affect the question of the amendment to it, as to which is the better way to reflect popular sentiment in its adoption or rejection.

The Senator says that this is an innovation; that he desires to have this amendment adopted along the lines of the Constitution. It is no more an innovation if my amendment is adopted than the joint resolution would be as it stands as originally drafted, because the Constitution itself provides two modes of ratification, and it is left entirely optional with the Congress as to which mode shall be adopted. The Congress can determine that it shall go to the legislatures for adoption or the Congress can determine that State conventions called for this

sole purpose shall pass upon the ratification or the rejection of the amendment.

The Senator from Arkansas says that this amendment of mine is introduced for the purpose of defeating the joint resolution. That is a very candid confession by one of the proponents of the measure. In itself it could not defeat the measure. There can be no question that every State in the Union would call a convention for the ratification or rejection of the amendment if we adopt this method. More than that, if they did not call it, the Federal Congress could call a convention.

But it narrows itself to this, that if a legislature is elected, this, being one of the issues, may become subordinated in many States to other issues. It may become subordinate to the personal equation of the candidates, and men may be elected to vote on this issue who will not directly reflect the mature judgment of their constituents. But if a convention is called for the sole purpose of ratifying or rejecting this measure, then the delegates to that convention will be merely the instrument of the popular will, as the Electoral College is the instrument of the popular will in the election of a President of the United States. When the Senator advances the argument that the adoption of this amendment would defeat the woman-suffrage amendment he concedes in that moment that the popular sentiment in the States is not for the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and that the proponents of the measure dare not submit it to the popular will of the people of America.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I simply want to add a word in connection with the statement just made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. We are already informed through the press that the purpose has taken shape of immediately convening legislatures in extraordinary session to ratify this amendment. Those legislatures were not elected upon the issue of suffrage or nonsuffrage; they were elected upon totally different issues; and now it is proposed that men who were not selected by the people for the purpose of passing upon this issue shall pass upon it before the people even have the opportunity to again elect a legislature.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator suggests that there is a purpose to call the legislatures of the different States to get immediate ratification. Where does the Senator get any such idea? Where is there anything upon which to base such a statement as a fact?

Mr. REED. I will answer the Senator. I have already stated it, if the Senator had been listening. I said it had been repeatedly stated in the press that that is the purpose of the leaders of this movement. I have seen what professed to be quotations by those who have been leaders of the movement. I have generally found that the newspapers have been pretty able to prognosticate the movements to a reasonable extent in the future of the suffrage program. I have just been informed by a citizen of the State of Texas that two of the great papers of Texas are already advocating the calling of the legislature in extraordinary session for the purpose of ratifying this amendment, although the State of Texas by popular vote held within the last few days has defeated suffrage, I understand, the majority amounting to nearly 30,000.

So we may as well understand that it is the purpose of the proponents of this measure to do everything within their power to keep from submitting it in any way to the popular will and to obtain ratification in any manner possible. I expect to hear all of these proponents within the next few months loudly proclaiming their belief in the doctrine that the great people of the country shall in all respects rule. I wish they could bring themselves to an adherence to that doctrine to-day.

The amendment which is proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] does give the people of the States, at least, the opportunity to have a vote on the selection of men to constitute the members of the convention. It will not work necessarily any delay, unless the delay is merely the vote to be attained by the extraordinary methods I have spoken of; that is, extra sessions of the legislatures called to ratify, the members of those legislatures having been elected for entirely different purposes. Why is it that men who claim to be in favor of government by the popular will are not willing to accept this amendment which will afford the people some chance to express themselves? It seems to me there ought to be some Senators here, even from the suffrage States, who are willing to let the people of the States of this Union have the opportunity to cast a vote at least for delegates to a convention that will debate and consider this important amendment to the Constitution.

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

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. I have not been privileged to hear all of the debate upon the resolution under discussion, and the question I am about to ask may have been fully answered in the debate. The question which I desire to submit to the Senator is this: Is there any valid reason why the question of amending the Constitution of the United States, as contemplated in the resolution now before the Senate, should not be submitted to a vote of the people of the States? For myself, if the Constitution is to be amended, I see no reason for denying the people the right to vote upon the proposed amendment. There is no question but what the proposed amendment to the Constitution materially changes the framework of our organic law and commits to the Federal Government authority which now belongs to the States. The proposed amendment is a limitation upon the powers and rights of the States, and likewise is a restriction upon the rights of the people within the States. To deprive them and the sovereign States in which they reside of rights now enjoyed by the States and the people is a very serious matter. If I may be pardoned for further occupying the time of the Senator, I would like to state, because I do not intend to discuss this question, that I can not bring my judgment to approve of the plan to amend the Constitution of the United States to grant woman suffrage through the Federal Government. While I have for many years been a believer in woman suffrage, and earnestly advocated within my State the right of women to vote, and urged that in the State constitution they should have the same political rights as men, I have always entertained the view that the question was one for the States to determine for themselves. This has been the view of all Democrats and those who believed in our form of government: The proposition now is to overturn the principles held sacred for so many years, and to further intrench upon the prerogatives of the States and the reserved rights of the people. Under our form of Government the States alone have the right to determine the qualifications of electors. If States may not ordain their own constitutions and determine their own domestic and internal affairs, this Republic will soon be destroyed. We often speak of the "sovereign States of the Union," and the Supreme Court of the United States has referred to the States as "indestructible." One of the indispensable attributes of State sovereignty is the power to determine who shall hold office within the State. An elector is an official, and therefore an elector holds an office within the State. To deprive the States of the right to say who shall vote and who shall hold office is an abridgment of the rights of the State. It seems to me that this proposed amendment is along the lines of centralization, which, if persisted in, will lead to disastrous consequences. However, I am in the unfortunate situation of being unable to vote in harmony with my convictions. I represent, in part, a sovereign State; and the mandate of my party and the people of my State requires that I vote for the submission of an amendment to the Constitution providing for woman suffrage. It is a matter of sincere regret to me that I am compelled to support a proposition by my vote which is so repugnant to my conceptions of the rights of the States, and, indeed, the rights of the people themselves, and which will prove to be a dangerous precedent and a continuing menace to the peace and welfare of this Nation. However, I rose merely to propound the question which I have submitted to the Senator, and not to argue the question so ably discussed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. The only reason I have heard was the one advanced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], who, as I understood him—

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. REED. I was trying—

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator stated he could not understand why the proponents of this measure insisted on the amendment being adopted regularly, as all other amendments to the Constitution have been adopted.

Mr. REED. I did not make any such statement.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator made a statement practically to that effect.

Mr. REED. No; I did not make any such statement in effect.

Mr. KIRBY. The question I want to ask is, Is it not a fact that all of the other 17 amendments to the Constitution have been adopted by being submitted to the State legislatures? Is it not true that a single amendment has never been proposed

otherwise? If that is true—and it is—then why does the Senator wish to oppose it in this case and insist on an innovation?

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. I shall vote for the amendment to the Constitution permitting women to vote. I do not think, however, that the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] is entirely warranted—that it necessarily follows that I shall vote to deprive the people of my State or of any other State of the right to express their opinion on the subject. I shall therefore vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there are now pending two questions which have been propounded to me. I want to answer them in the order in which they were asked. The question was propounded by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] what reason has been advanced for denying to the people of the States an opportunity to express their desires with reference to this amendment? In answering that I have to say that the only reason I have heard advanced—but I have not been here during the entire debate—was the one brought forward by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], which was that it would work delay, and his further reason that the method now proposed to be pursued is the method that has been pursued in adopting all other constitutional amendments.

The other questions propounded to me were those just asked by the Senator from Arkansas, which embraced the idea I have already expressed as coming from him, namely, Is it not true that all other amendments to the Constitution have been submitted in the same manner in which it is proposed to submit this pending amendment? All of the late amendments to the Constitution have been so submitted; but whether always that has been the rule I am not prepared to say. I confess to some little embarrassment when I must say that I can not answer with certainty.

Mr. KIRBY. They all have been.

Mr. REED. I think they all have been.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator asked me a third question—Why should there be a different method followed here?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves that point will he yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want to say to the Senator from Missouri that we have been admonished by him and by other Senators to remember the teachings of the fathers and to guide and govern our actions by their practices and their teachings. Immediately upon the adoption of the Constitution there were at least 10 amendments submitted when the method was new. Those amendments might very properly have been submitted to a convention called in each State, for there was a large number of them; but my recollection is that the fathers chose the other system. We have followed that system invariably down to this time. Does not the Senator think that that is a good reason why we should continue to do so?

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, first let me answer the Senator's statement. I have frequently said in this Chamber that I have great regard for the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution and that I did not believe that those policies of government which they had inaugurated and under which we had lived and by virtue of which we have become the greatest nation of the world ought to be disregarded and treated lightly or set aside without mature deliberation, and all of that I reaffirm. But as to questions of policy of government, such questions as the Monroe doctrine, such questions as the United States keeping herself free from entangling alliances, to all of these ancient doctrines my distinguished friend and those who are with him have turned aside their faces. Now, the Senator comes to me and asks me, on a mere matter of procedure, not a matter involving the principle itself, that we should be bound by the procedure they took.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri again yield?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do not understand that that is the position taken by the Senator from Missouri. I understand his argument is that it is a fundamental right of the people of the States in a referendum to decide this matter, rather than that it should be decided by the legislatures of the States. I

do not understand that the Senator has heretofore argued that this is a mere matter of choice between two procedures. I understand his argument to be that it is a question of substantive right of the people to pass upon these questions. I called his attention to the fact that we are pursuing the policy that was pursued by the fathers, for obviously they thought it was the better policy. Now, the Senator seems to think that at the present time, at least, the policy of the fathers is not the one we ought to follow.

Mr. REED. Oh, I do not think anything of the sort in the sense that the Senator puts it. There are really two questions presented here: One is, Shall the people of the States be deprived of the right, which they have reserved in their constitutions, to determine the qualifications of the voters of their respective States—shall that right be taken away from them by a Federal amendment? Upon that I answer that it ought not to be taken away, first, because to take it away is violative of the very genius of our dual system of government, a government by independent States and by a central nation at the same time. Upon that we have the wisdom of the fathers, for they so wrote the law. We have the experience of the country and we have the principle of government that the people of every State ought to have the power to name their own electorate, especially when that electorate is voting only on local affairs, and that when the Federal Government comes in, contrary to the wisdom of the fathers—to which the Senator from Montana now appeals for the first time in many months and which he has been assiduously denying all along—and proposes to deprive the people of the States of the right they have reserved in their constitutions to themselves to change the qualification of voters, that is an impingement and an impairment of the very structure of our Government. Now, that is the first question. But when you come to the question how that Constitution shall be amended, the particular form to be followed is a matter of procedure and is not a matter of principle, except that you may follow a procedure which will be calculated to deny the people a right or calculated to extend to them a right.

It is true, I believe, that in the past we have followed the method of submission to the legislatures, but it is also true that when the fathers wrote the Constitution they provided two methods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am calling the attention of the Senator to the fact that, when they were called upon to make a choice between the two methods, they chose the one we propose to follow while you propose another one.

Mr. REED. They proposed two methods.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes; but when they were obliged to make a choice between the two methods, they chose the one that you propose to cast aside.

Mr. REED. They proposed two methods, and when they came to submit their amendments it is true they submitted those amendments to the legislatures of the States. Very well; let the precedent stand for whatever value there is to it; but let me call attention to the difference in conditions. In those days the smaller population all over the country, the fact that every man was closer to the public questions of the day, the fact that every one of these questions had been discussed for years and that the principles of government which were involved in the constitutional amendments upon which the vote was about to be taken had been the subject of debate, and political alignments had been made, so that a legislature elected might be well said to go there instructed and with a full understanding of what the people wanted, may have been very great factors in determining the question.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I think the Senator is quite right about that. The very subject before us, however, has been debated before the people of this country for 75 years or more.

Mr. REED. Now, I will answer that. The very subject before us has been debated by the people of the United States—by a few of the people of the United States—for a good while; it has been debated by a few agitators—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Does not the Senator think that as many have participated in that debate as participated in the debate of the fundamental principles expressed in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution?

Mr. REED. Not in the same proportion, nor anything like it. I will tell you how the debate has been conducted in my State. I know something about what has gone on there. It has been the subject of laughter and jest more than of any serious consideration. Ladies have come, as I said the other day, and asked to address audiences that were called together by Democrats or Republicans. They have been accorded the platform and have spoken their little piece, bowed themselves out, and the business of the evening went on. Nobody regarded it in a

very serious way. We had a vote on it. There was not any debate during that campaign on woman suffrage, except on one side. Some of the ladies turned out and spoke for it. I believe I state the truth when I say that the great mass of the women of Missouri were totally indifferent to it, and when they got through the people voted it down by 140,000 majority.

In the days when the Constitution was first amended, when the Bill of Rights was added, when Thomas Jefferson was gathering in his two hands, figuratively speaking, the lovers of human liberty and molding them into a tremendous force for the perpetuation of liberty, the burning issues of liberty were flaming in the hearts of all the people.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And he submitted them to the legislatures of the States.

Mr. REED. Yes; he submitted them to the legislatures. Take the full benefit of that. Now, I am going to show you a reason that ought to appeal—and would appeal to anybody but a suffragist—why this ought to be distinguished from the ordinary method of submission. Several States of the Union had the original right to fix the qualifications of their voters, and they proceeded in nearly every instance to write those qualifications into their constitutions. They did so for the purpose of depriving the legislatures of any power or right ever to change those qualifications. Now it is proposed to take an action by which three-fourths of the States of the Union may change the fundamental law of this country so as to change the qualifications of the voters of a State against the will of the people of that State. Upon such a question as that, where the people have reserved to themselves in their constitution the right to fix the qualifications, the least that this body can do is to preserve to the people in the form and manner of submission the right to express their opinions. That is what distinguishes this amendment from every other amendment, and the line of demarcation and of distinction is so plain that any man, except a suffragist, can see it; and a suffragist can see it, but will not admit it. That is the reason.

I will take a concrete case. I went over it yesterday, but I venture to repeat it in substance. My own State, with 3,500,000 people, has an electorate of many hundred thousand. Those people have written a constitution and said, "We will not again change the qualifications of voters; the legislature shall not do it." Now, we propose to say to those people, "The legislature shall or may do it; and not only your legislature, but, if your legislature should vote against it, the legislatures of other States can change the qualifications of the voter, which you expressly reserved to yourselves." We ask at least that you give our people in some manner and form the opportunity to vote on this amendment; that if you pass it you will at least give us the privilege of having an election and of selecting our delegates to a convention to pass upon this particular question, and to that extent you will save to them a portion of the rights they sought to reserve in their constitution. Why is not that fair? Why is not that reasonable, and why should not Democrats here grant it?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. REED. I am quite content to stop, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. Apropos of the discussion which was provoked by the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], with respect to the manner of submitting the first 10 amendments and other amendments, my recollection of the historical circumstances attending the first 10 amendments is this: Patrick Henry, particularly, and some other Virginians, tendered some 13 or 14 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, 10 of which constitute the first 10 amendments to that instrument. Those amendments were submitted to the people for discussion, and were earnestly discussed from the North to the South, many of those who were afterwards followers of Hamilton and the Federalist Party opposing the amendments and the followers of Mr. Jefferson and others supporting them. The legislatures chosen to pass upon the amendments were selected with reference to their views upon the amendments, so that in effect they constituted conventions selected by the people to vote upon the ratification of the amendments. The same can be said with respect to the eleventh amendment; the same can be said with respect to the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, because they were live issues; they were presented to the people, all eyes were focused upon the same, and the members of the legislatures were largely, if not entirely, selected because of their support of or their opposition to those amendments.

Now, with respect to the legislatures that are at present in existence, some of which have been recently elected and some of which were elected two years ago, with half of the Senators

holding over for four years—many of them were selected with reference to local issues, with reference to questions not involving woman suffrage at all; so that in submitting to the legislatures in many of the States the proposed amendment it will be found that a portion or all of their members were elected upon other issues. The question of amending the Constitution of the United States, as contemplated in the resolution under consideration, was not an issue when they were elected, and they were chosen without reference to their views upon this question.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for his statement; it is very clear. That is not all, Mr. President. In ordinary elections in the States, when there is no matter of special importance, it is frequently the case that you have great difficulty in getting anybody to go to the legislature who amounts to very much. I do not think that I would be guilty of a breach of courtesy even if I stated the plain fact that there have been times in this country when a man who was a member of the legislature of some State would apologize when he announced the fact; and, as was said the other day, it was because legislatures were so susceptible to influence, because so many scandals broke out in them, that the important matter of the election of United States Senators was taken away from the legislatures altogether. In the Senator's own State of Montana one conspicuous case arose in which I know that the Senator and his colleague took a distinguished part in favor of purity and decency; but it was one of those cases that contributed materially to the sentiment in favor of a direct vote of the people. I do not know whether we improved the personnel of the Senate; I do not know, if we keep on having these expensive elections, whether we will have improved the moral tone of the method of election. That is a question to be determined in the future.

Mr. President, there are some Senators here from the South. I want to talk to them for a minute, not on the lines pursued by my friend Mr. SMITH this morning. I leave that argument to Senators from distinctly Southern States. Missouri is in the twilight zone, in a way, between the North and the South. We have the virtues of both, and the vices of neither. I do not know in how many Southern States this question has been submitted to a popular vote in any form. It has just been submitted in Texas, the great Empire State of the Southwest, that came into this country as an organized and independent government, that has always proudly asserted its independence as a State, and whose people have always justly exhibited a pride in their great Commonwealth. The people have just voted in that State, and in a very decisive vote have repudiated woman suffrage. Now the Senators from that State, both of whom I esteem very highly, have this question to answer by their vote on this amendment; and I hope they will understand that I am not trying to make this unpleasantly personal, because that is not my object.

This is the question: Would you now cast a vote the effect of which may be, so far as Texas is concerned, to have the present legislature, elected upon a different issue, convened and have it declare for the ratification of this amendment, in the face of the decision of the people at the election just held? Or will you, at least, say this to the people of Texas, "While I voted to submit this proposed amendment to the Constitution, I also voted for the Underwood amendment, which reserved to the people of the State of Texas the right to elect delegates to a convention and to give them the instructions of the people of Texas"?

That is the question that is presented there. Of course Senators will answer that as they ought to answer it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Before the Senator takes his seat, a very interesting question was precipitated yesterday by the discussion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] in respect to which I should like to have the views of the Senator from Missouri. If this amendment should prevail, what is the Senator's view as to the machinery for conducting the election under which the delegates to the conventions in the various States should be selected? Is it his view that it should be provided by the State legislatures, or that Congress should provide it?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question in a moment, and let me pursue for the present the theme I was on?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I shall be very glad then to answer it; and if I start to take my seat without answering it, I hope somebody will call my attention to it, because I think the answer is very simple, plain, and easy.

Now I address myself to other Members from Southern States.

We all know that it has been the commonly understood situation that in the South the women have not desired the right of suffrage and that the sentiment has been strongly against suffrage. There have been more reasons than one for that. One of those reasons undoubtedly arises out of the race question. Another reason is probably found in the fact that for the most part the ladies of the South are intensely wedded to their home life, and are but little inclined to thrust themselves into public affairs; and I think I can say, without at all disparaging the women of other parts of the country, that at least it is true that one of the most glorious types of womanhood that ever beautified and rendered sweet and lovely this old earth is the women of the South. Down in the South you have taught State rights—a doctrine which was originally fundamentally right, if properly understood, but to which I have always thought the South gave too extreme a construction, that resulted in the endeavor of the South to withdraw from the Union, for I do not believe that right ever existed; but I do say, as I ought to say in passing, that the man who would harshly judge the South to-day for the position that it took would be a most ungenerous man.

The doctrine that the State of Georgia or the State of Mississippi or the State of South Carolina was a little republic in itself, whose people controlled its own affairs, and which in all local matters was a sovereign, with only the limitation that certain rights that had been yielded to the Federal Government should, of course, be subtracted from the sum total of the powers that the State otherwise would have had as a complete sovereignty—that doctrine was a splendid doctrine. It has been close to the hearts of the people of the South. It has, sir, been very close to the hearts of all men who have understood the dangers of centralized government. How can men from the South be found who will vote to take away the very thing that constitutes the control of the destiny of every State, that thing being the electorate itself? How can you, who have sought to retain as large a measure of power and control in your own States as possible, go back to your people and justify this surrender of that right which lies at the very foundation of all your rights, and which, when legislation follows, may be found to constitute the means by which the entire election machinery of your State will go into the hands of Federal agents?

We might just as well look this question in the face. When politics run high, as they will again, and when passion rides in its chariots of fire across this land, as it will again, and when the clamors go up from the dark sisters of the South that they are not being permitted to vote, and the sisters of the North who belong to the political party that feels that it is losing votes down South get aroused, I want to say to you, Senators, you are very likely to get some legislation compared with which the force bill will be a gentle and merely persuasive measure. So I say that men of the South ought at least to give their people a chance to vote on this question.

There was something said here in the argument to-day—and I am occupying the floor when I did not expect to stand here more than a moment—to which I want to allude, because of the fact that people of the different parts of this country know their own affairs, and that they may be misled by judging the entire country by the conditions of their own States or people.

I readily confess—I not only readily confess, but I gladly insist—that the people of the State of Montana, with its not very large population, with its boundless opportunities, its undeveloped resources, may properly decide a question in favor of women voting, when under the conditions in other States it might be highly unwise. I know—any man who has visited the great West knows—that the people of these Western States that are sparsely settled are closer to their government and know more about their public men and public affairs than the people of the great congested States. An entirely different proposition is presented. I do not know what the vote of Nevada is to-day, but, if I recall aright, a few years ago, when I was serving on the executive committee of the national committee, I think they had a total vote of about 25,000 in the State. That vote is not as large as the votes of some wards of some cities.

In a population of that kind, if a man is a candidate for Senator or governor, every man, woman, and child in the State knows him and knows all about him. It is an intimate and close relationship that exists. They know his public life; they know his private character; and not only the men, women, and children know him, but every well-bred dog recognizes him. So I sometimes think that it is a greater compliment to be elected from one of those States than it is to be elected from a great, big State, where they do not know the men so well.

The women in those Western States, with their environment and their surroundings, are closer to public affairs than they

are in the great, congested centers. I suppose there is not a lady of any intelligence in the State of New Mexico who does not know all about the distinguished Senators from that State. They know about their past and their present and, as nearly as anything human can judge, they know about what their future is going to be. They know who are the members of the legislature. They know the questions that are arising out there that affect them and affect their State. They have all been talked over. I do not mean to say that they have not anything else to do, but the life of the whole State is close to them.

Let us take New York City. I do not pick it out as a place of ignorance, but as a place of great numbers. The average lady in New York City does not know her Congressman or what his name is. There are a good many men who do not know. A good many hardly know where the capital of their State is, and they are not intensely ignorant at that. The problem is afar off. There are too many theaters and moving pictures and cabarets, and there are too many matters of interest happening every day, tens of thousands of events where there is one happening out in these Western States; and that is not a disparagement of the Western States. Nobody ever heard me disparage the Western States. If I had my life to live over again, I would rather go in a place like that than in any other place in the world. So that it is so outrageously unjust for the people of one State to try to force a law upon the people of another State.

What right have I as a citizen of Missouri, or what right have the people of Missouri, or what right has the Legislature of Missouri, to say who shall vote in the sovereign State of Texas, when the people of Texas by their vote have just decided that question? And what right has Texas to say who shall vote in Missouri, when the people of Missouri are capable of deciding that question for themselves, and have decided it in recent years? What right have I to go down into Mississippi—a State where I have never had the privilege of visiting, but a State which I respect, and whose people I respect—and try to tell those people down there whom they ought to allow to vote? What right have I to insist that the question shall be submitted to a legislature composed in most of the States of the Union, when they are picked up at ordinary by-elections, of men who have very little to do, and who are sent to the legislature to fill out a ticket?

Why, I tell you, sirs, that I have attended many political conventions in my State—and I cite it because it is as good a State as there is anywhere—and I have attended many political conventions where, when we got through making up the rest of the ticket, we would have to canvass the convention to find men who would let us put their names on the ticket for the legislature. Now, why not give the people of these States a chance to elect delegates to a convention, at least? Why not give to the people of the State of Texas the right, before their privilege of fixing the qualifications of their voters shall be taken away from them, at least the right to express their opinions through delegates elected by the people and sent to a convention? How can any man justify a denial of that?

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] asked me a question, which was—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, let me remark that the Senator apparently felt that I was endeavoring to ask him a hard question. I am sure that it was a very easy one for the Senator to answer. I did not intend to put it as a poser to the Senator at all.

Mr. REED. Oh, I know the Senator did not, and I did not mean to make any reply that would give the impression that the Senator had. I am unfortunate when I talk in doing it in a sort of a brutal way, I guess. I do not mean it.

My opinion is that the problem is very easy of solution. All that is necessary in the world is for the legislatures of the various States, when they meet, to pass a simple statute providing for the selection of delegates to a convention, to be held at a certain time, to consider and pass upon the amendment. That machinery may be easily called into play by simply employing the ordinary machinery of elections for the purpose of taking the ballot. Of course, I would say, as a matter of preference, just my opinion that comes to me on my feet, that probably could be done best at some general election when the people would turn out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. But, of course, the elections could be held before that, if the legislatures of the States should meet in time, or, if we are to have extra sessions, they could be convened for that purpose as well as the other.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the legislature could or could not call a convention, as it saw fit.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. And, of course, legislatures that were against woman suffrage would not call a convention.

Mr. REED. I do not think that would follow.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That would be the natural political tendency, would it not?

Mr. REED. I would not say so. I do not think that would follow.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Is it not a fact that it would result, first, in a contest before the legislature over the question as to whether a convention should be called, then a contest would occur before the people over the election of delegates to the convention, and finally a contest would ensue before the convention as to whether it should be adopted or not; and does it not mean there would be three fights over this matter, and that is the reason why the Senator desires to pursue that method?

Mr. REED. No; that is not the reason, not as the Senator puts it. It is true there might be a contest as to whether the convention should be called, but if there was any large sentiment in favor of the proposition I have not the slightest doubt of its being called even by a legislature that upon a vote on the main question might be against it, and for this reason—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But, Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Permit me to complete the sentence. The argument that the people have the right to express their opinion, and this is a means provided for the expression of that opinion, would be a very potential argument.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I agree with the Senator, but he will bear in mind that is exactly what we are now asking and what he is resisting.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. We are asking that the people be given an opportunity, and he is objecting even to the submission of it. If he were a member of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, how could he consistently, with his record here, vote to call a convention?

Mr. REED. The Senator does not state my position with the fairness he usually manifests. You are not asking that the people be given a chance to vote. You are asking that the legislatures be given a chance to vote, and we, by this amendment, are asking that the people should be given a chance to vote.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I should like to ask the Senator just one further question. If this joint resolution had been originally introduced with a proposition to submit it to conventions called in each of the States, would the Senator have voted for it?

Mr. REED. I would have declined to vote for it and for the reason—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. I say it is a question that belongs exclusively to the people of each State. That is well known to be my position. But if I was a member of my State legislature and the question was presented as to whether the people of the State should have the right to vote on suffrage, and there was any considerable sentiment in favor of it, I would vote to give the people a chance to have that vote and decide that question. Now, I follow the Senator along in his objection. I do not think there would be any difficulty in getting the legislature to pass a law for submission; at least, there would not be any difficulty if there was any considerable sentiment in favor of the measure. At least there would be no difficulty in getting a convention called by any legislature that would ratify this amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REED. Therefore you will not lose an hour or a second there.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The question would be presented in exactly the same way. Those legislatures that are in favor of the amendment would call conventions, and those that were against it would not call the convention.

Mr. REED. Very well. If you had three-fourths of the legislatures of the States in favor of suffrage, you would get your conventions in three-fourths of the States.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly.

Mr. REED. And if you did not have three-fourths of the legislatures or could not get them ultimately, you never could pass your amendment.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Exactly, and you would have three fights to make instead of one.

Mr. REED. Let us discuss the fights as a separate proposition. The point I am making now is that there is no foundation whatever in your claim that you would be delayed because the legislatures would not act by calling the conventions, because every legislature that would vote for suffrage, that would

vote to ratify this amendment outright, would certainly vote to call a convention. So you do not lose a minute. You do have to go and ask the legislatures to cast that vote, and if you do, that affords a little time while that law is being passed, and it may be passed at any session of the legislature for the people to discuss and understand the question.

There would be a little delay in calling this convention. How much delay? Just enough delay so that there could be fair discussion by the people. Do you want this thing or do you not want it? Do you want to change your fundamental law or do you want to retain it as it is? Before you change a fundamental law that has been a part of the Constitution of the United States since the foundation of the Government, that has been engraven in the constitutions of the several States from the first, there ought to be a little period of discussion when the people have that issue segregated out and presented to them sharply for their consideration, and two months' time or three months' time and a debate before the people will do no harm.

There would be three fights, says the Senator. There never ought to be a change in the fundamental laws of this country without discussion, and that is what the Senator means by a fight. If this measure is so sacred and so holy and if it carries so much of good as is contended, then the proponents of it can well afford to argue its blessings to their people and let their people become wise and advised.

Now, we have elected a convention of delegates. We have proceeded to that point. How much time does it take for them to act? Just a reasonable time to debate and discuss this one question and vote upon it. Such a convention as that ought to meet, organize, debate the proposition, and adjourn in less than five days' time. Probably if there was a decisive vote it would meet, organize, and adjourn on the same day. So there is nothing in the claim that this works an endless delay. The truth is that those who stand here crying for suffrage in the name of democracy are afraid to submit this question to a general vote. They are fleeing from a general vote. Those who stand here pronouncing encomiums upon the rights of the citizens of the Republic to vote regardless of sex are trying to deny the right to vote to the great electorate of this country upon this important question. There is no escape from that. That is all there is in it. The thing we are appealing for now is that the people shall have the right to vote at least to the extent that is provided by the Underwood amendment. How can you deny it to us?

I know some people think this is a political question that ought to be settled so that we can play a little politics. Witness the ambitious rivalry of Democratic and Republican leaders. Democrats got together in the last days of the last session saying if we do not put this through the Republicans will put it through at the next session. So we will put it through regardless of the merits, in order that we may get the votes of the women.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. And when this session is convened, behold the spectacle! Before the new committees were organized the Democratic chairman rushed forward with this bill, without a report from a committee, standing here like another Ajax, not defying but inviting the lightning, and declaring "here is the Democratic Party ready to give you suffrage," all in the hope of getting the votes of the women.

Then upon the other side there is the little filibustering tactics to delay action by the Democrats, so that committees may be organized and the Republicans can bring in the bill and they can coddle the ladies and deceive them by the ardor of their advances. Although there is business of the most pressing character, and although appeal after appeal has come for hearings, they have set aside all that, and the manly form of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], stretched to its fullest height, is visible upon the floor demanding instantaneous action, by attitude and manner at least declaring to all these ladies, "behold, I alone am the true lover of women. The Republican Party has always opened its hearts and its arms and its embraces to your cause, and we are the real champions of this measure."

Why this performance? For the cheap clap-trap political purpose of trying to get some votes, not because of the merits of the case. Let me tell these valorous and knightly gentlemen upon both side that they reckon without the intelligence of women. If the women of this country are fit to exercise the sacred privilege of citizenship and voting then they will never vote the Democratic ticket or the Republican ticket because of the performances of either of these champions of their cause. They will see and have seen through the thin veneer of your pretenses and have understood your motives from the first, and know as well what you are up to as your wife knows when you

tell her you are going down town on business and she knows you are going for a game of poker. [Laughter.] Well, looking for a game of pinochle, then.

It may be that women are not by reason of mental attitude, not from lack of mentality, as well qualified for suffrage as men, but when it comes to the question of knowing what you are up to and seeing clear through you, they can see through the little shams and pretenses of a man in the dark of the moon without a star shining when you could not see through them if you had a microscope that magnified a thousand times. They know exactly what you are trying to do here to-day. They understand all about it, and in their hearts they despise you for it, and they play upon you one against the other just as women have played with foolish men since Eve and Adam met in the Garden of Eden.

How thrilling it was yesterday when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson], standing at his full height and speaking in a round rich tone, said as he waved his finger in the air in true dramatic style, "I shall insist that the Senate remain in session to-morrow until this great measure is passed." Did he see the women flocking to the polls in Indiana and demanding ballots for Watson for anything he wanted? But I warn him that the women in Indiana if they come to vote will have "other fish to fry," and other attachments to follow, and other questions to determine. The glorious vision of yesterday will have departed from their recollection. The inspiring scene will be lost in the limbo of time, the days of forgetfulness will have covered the great event, and in the silence of the grave it will be lost with many other celebrated and wonderful events.

You Democrats who talked about initiative and referendum; who went up and down your States declaring that it was the God-given right of the American citizen to cast a vote on every question; who insisted that legislatures acted so improvidently and so thoughtlessly that it was not safe to trust them with the final enactment of a law; who declared that in every instance the people of the State should have the right to demand a reference to them of every act passed by the legislature; and who, when you secured the enactment of such a statute in the Western States, impressed upon your people that you had brought to them a new charter of liberty, a new Declaration of Independence, a new and splendid guaranty of the rights of man—we ask you for a referendum of this constitutional question, and we point out the way for that referendum under the Constitution of the United States, and you propose to sit here with your speeches in favor of referendum votes in the one hand and a denial of a referendum vote in the other. How are you going to justify it?

Let me tell you something you will have to reckon with, you gentlemen who are forcing this measure. You will have to reckon with that large class of women who do not want the vote at all, who have never asked for it, who do not want to be equal to men, because they have always held themselves to be superior to men. You have got to reckon with that large class of women who are not so vocal in their desires, who stay by the fireside and in the homes, and who are not taking orders from anybody; who are not repudiating old policies because they are told to do so. I venture the prediction that, whereas you may gain somewhat of the force of some who may advocate this cause, you may lose some on the other side.

Why not let the voters in the States have a vote on it? Texas has just voted. Why not let her have another vote? My State voted three years ago. I am willing to have a vote to-morrow; and if the people of the State of Missouri vote for woman suffrage, it is all right with me. So far as I am concerned, I do not think I would lift my voice about it. We ask for a referendum vote. I want to keep on repeating it to you referendum men who insist that the people have a right to a referendum vote on everything: What are you going to say when we ask for a mere referendum vote? Consistency is a rare jewel. I would like to see that jewel set firmly in the crown of glory and greatness that adorns the brows of some of my distinguished Democratic initiative and referendum friends.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator kindly yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. ASHURST. I merely wish to say that my view of the situation is that jewelry is vulgar.

Mr. REED. That depends entirely on who wears it and how it is worn. Of course, a diamond on a dirty shirt front does not look well, but I have seen diamonds so worn that they adorned the beauty, while beauty in turn graced them. So I think we might hang jewels all over the distinguished Senator and the jewels and he alike would be more resplendent.

How many States have the initiative and the referendum? Has Iowa a referendum vote? I thought progressive Iowa had all the new things. I know Montana has the referendum vote

and Wyoming has the referendum vote and Texas has the referendum vote. It is impossible that the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] should have overlooked the referendum. Missouri has a referendum vote, and every time the people have voted they have rejected what the legislature did that was submitted to them, that without the least variation or shadow of turning, and I think generally to the benefit of the State. I think California is progressive enough to have the referendum vote.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I will gladly yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. PHELAN. I was about to interrupt the Senator a moment ago, Mr. President, to ask him if it is not true that Congress could provide for the calling of conventions in order to secure an expression from the people of the States. The Senator seemed to assume in his argument, in answer to the Senator from Montana, that it would be necessary for the legislatures to call the conventions.

Mr. REED. I did not so intend. I said it was the way it could be done. I did not mean to say that Congress could not provide it.

Mr. PHELAN. That would defeat your purpose if it was only possible for the legislature to call the convention?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; it would not defeat it.

Mr. PHELAN. You seem to have a poor opinion of the legislatures.

Mr. REED. I have not a very exalted opinion of them. There was a time when men like Patrick Henry and Thomas Jefferson sat in the assemblies of their States, but really and candidly I do not know of anybody of that caliber who is running for the legislature in any State just now.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator seems to have interrogated me on the question of the referendum. I want to assure him that I am in favor of the referendum and will probably support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. California is the home of the referendum. We have perfect confidence in our people and we consult them; and in this amendment before the Senate I have no question of doubt as to the response which California will make, because it is already a suffrage State. I believe in the principle of the referendum and therefore shall support the amendment.

Mr. REED. I am delighted to find the Senator of that opinion.

Mr. PHELAN. May I be permitted to finish my statement?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. I wish it were incorporated in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama that Congress should provide for the calling of the conventions. I would not like to leave it to the legislatures, because you first have to secure the legislature before you can secure the convention.

Mr. REED. Would you think, if we may just converse a moment about it, that there would be any question of your legislature in California calling a convention?

Mr. PHELAN. The people instructed our legislature—that is to say, by referendum—against prohibition, and the legislature the other day voted for prohibition. There seems to be no communication between the several parties. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. So much the more reason then for submitting this question and any other question of importance to the people.

Mr. PHELAN. The people are always right.

Mr. REED. The people are not always right. Of course, they make mistakes, but the people have the right to say. I think we should agree on that, and if the people make a mistake they can correct it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Missouri seems to be rather severe on legislatures. Did not the legislature of Missouri once elect the Senator to the United States Senate?

Mr. REED. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. MYERS. No; I have another question. Do you think any better result would have been obtained if there had been a direct vote of the people?

Mr. REED. I will answer both questions. First, the legislature elected me to the Senate after the people had a primary that instructed them to elect me—a State-wide primary, where we had a general vote.

Mr. MYERS. A primary of your party only?

Mr. REED. Yes; a primary of my party held under the law under which every man running on the ticket that I was on would vote for me in the legislature and every Republican would vote for the Republican candidate. I got a majority of the votes of the State, and I likewise got a majority of the votes in the legislature.

The Senator asks me whether a better result could have been obtained if the people had had a direct vote. I can only answer that by saying that the people ratified and confirmed the action of the legislature by afterwards electing me by a direct vote. I do not know but both of them made a mistake. [Laughter.]

I do not claim infallibility for either of them. I do not claim the legislatures always are wrong. I would not be so understood. Many splendid and very patriotic men get into legislatures; very stupid men get into legislatures; many men who act from improper motives get into legislatures. The Senator, along with me, voted to take the right away from the legislatures to elect Members of the Senate. I believe he voted with me on it; I know if he did not he stood with me on it, for legislatures have been found wanting.

Now, I am delighted to find what the Senator from California says, and if I was understood as meaning that Congress could not provide the means, I was misunderstood. I directed myself to the question of the Senator from Montana, and I answered him in part merely and answered otherwise, and thank the Senator for his correction.

Mr. President, if we could get one or two more votes of men who believe in the initiative and referendum, we would be all right here to-day.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me for an interruption?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. I want to point out to the Senator that, even should the Senate adopt the amendment, it would be of no utility. I think I can demonstrate that to him in a moment. I am not without sympathy for the amendment of the Senator from Alabama, but there is no use to waste time in trying to do that which will not be done. Suppose the Senate should to-day adopt this amendment. It would go to conference, and under the present make-up of the committees of conference the conferees would recede in five minutes from the Senate's amendment, because both the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate are opposed to this amendment or to any other amendment. The Senator from Missouri knows that as well as I know it.

Mr. REED. Well, now the Senator—

Mr. ASHURST. Let me finish.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. What I say here is as well known as any fact can be to anybody, that both the committees are opposed to any amendment of any character whatever; that the conferees would recede in three minutes; the report would come back to this body; and the conference committee's report would not be rejected, but would be accepted. We would simply have lost a week's time; we would have been fooling ourselves and other people in attempting to do a vain and useless thing.

I repeat, I am not without sympathy for the amendment, but it is of no practical utility whatever to urge it now.

Mr. REED. Has the Senator from Arizona concluded?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. REED. Now, the Senator brings me some information which he says I know as well as he knows it—well, I did not know it. I did not know that the committee of either House of Congress would deliberately betray its instructions.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator pardon me there?

Mr. REED. Let me finish the statement, and then I will yield. Whenever the conferees go out from this body with their minds made up in advance that they will not endeavor to carry out the action of this body, they go out to betray the body—

Mr. ASHURST. Now, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. And I am not prepared to say that that is the situation.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is uniformly courteous, although at times he uses, as I myself do—I am a very frequent sinner in that regard—a word now and then that has a little sting to it. The conferees on the part of the Senate who would be appointed would not betray the Senate. Conferences are nearly a thousand years old; they go back to the days of the ancient Witenagemote. It has been the rule for centuries that when a matter is committed to conferees, when one house passes a bill in one form and the other house passes it in another form, the house that recedes does not betray.

Mr. REED. No; but the man who goes out intending not even to try to carry out the instructions he receives—the Senator has objected to my term, so I will not again use it—goes very far from fulfilling the obligations of his position. I will put it in that way.

Mr. ASHURST. That might be true; but I will ask the Senator if he does not believe that what I have related would be exactly the thing that would take place? If we put this amendment on, does not the Senator believe that that would take place?

Mr. REED. No; I am not prepared to think that, because I think it would be discreditable on the part of the Senate conferees to do a thing of that kind. I would think it very discourteous on the part of the House conferees not to give due and proper and serious consideration to any action of the co-ordinate legislative branch. To my mind, when the House of Representatives acts it speaks, so far as one branch of the legislature can, for the great American people, for no matter what may have been said, no matter how efforts may have been made to belittle it, it is the branch closest to the people, and it is the only way the great American people have to express their voice, except as they may now and always have had that right in this body.

Therefore, when the House of Representatives meets and, after due deliberation, passes upon a measure and sends it here, I think it is worthy of the most serious consideration, and in any conference I have ever sat upon—though they have not been numerous—I have felt that the representatives of the House of Representatives had the right to be heard, their opinions to be weighed, and I never found them unwilling to hear and to weigh the opinions of the Members of the Senate. Upon the other hand, when this body speaks in the name of the American people, so far as one branch of the legislature can so speak, and when, after debate of days, it adds an amendment of this kind to a measure, I believe, first, that our conferees, as loyal Members of the Senate, will endeavor to have it accepted. I do not see why a question so well grounded in justice as this would not receive the cordial consideration and mayhap the support of the other House. So I hope my friend will at least give us his vote; for, if he does give us his vote, and this matter is treated so summarily that it is disposed of in three minutes, there will be very little time lost, and he will at least have the satisfaction of saying to some of us that he gave the people of our States an opportunity to vote and the people of his own State an opportunity to vote.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in response to the interrogatory propounded by the Senator as to whether or not I would vote for the amendment, let me say that there is not a man in the Senate Chamber who feels more than do I the necessity for an amendment to the Federal Constitution to sweep away the present archaic, reactionary manner of ratifying and passing on referred amendments. Indeed, Mr. President, as I said the other day, under the present situation 431 men compose Congress; if they were of a mind to do so—they would not do so, I apprehend—but if they were of a mind to do so, they could pass a joint resolution providing for kingly government or for a government directed by the apostles of socialism. Then, 3,500 men composing the legislatures of the States could ratify the amendment. So, I repeat, as I said the other day, that under the present archaic reactionary method of submitting amendments to be passed upon by the legislatures, and not by the people of the States, 4,000 men constitutionally and legally could sweep away every vestige of liberty which the American people possess; and likewise these 4,000 could transform this Government into a Bolshevik government, into a soviet, into a kingly government. But the American people are not going to do that, for their particular virtue is the virtue of knowing how to govern themselves and other people.

I am in the near future going to urge with what poor capacity I have the proposed constitutional amendment which has been introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] to provide that hereafter when constitutional amendments are submitted to the States they shall be ratified by the votes of the people of each State. The reason, however, why I shall not vote for this particular amendment at this particular time to be submitted to a convention is the following: No constitutional amendment, except the prohibition amendment, has been more widely discussed, more thoroughly understood, than has this amendment. All the American people who can read, all the American people who receive mail and receive dispatches of any kind, know that Congress is submitting this amendment. They know that the legislatures will be in session, and the people will not be taken unawares. They can petition their legislatures.

Then, again, Mr. President, I hardly think it would be fair to what I would call the cause of woman suffrage to make an exception in this instance, after having amended the Constitution eighteen times since 1789, and upon each occasion the amendment having been submitted to the State legislatures. The first 12 amendments were all submitted at one time, and two, I think, the first and second amendments which were submitted, are still pending. The eleventh amendment was submitted to the legislatures; the twelfth was submitted to the legislatures; the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth were submitted to the legislatures, and the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth were submitted to the legislatures.

I hope the Senator will pardon me when I say—and I want to say here that what he says on any question, whether I agree with him or not, carries with me great weight—I somewhat question the source from which the amendment comes. No man has a higher regard for the ability and the stalwart statesmanship of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] than have I, but I rather suspect—no; I can not use that word—I dread, rather, that this may defeat, delay, and hinder the celerity with which I would like to see this amendment adopted.

I think the Senator from Alabama is correct in his philosophy as to how amendments should be ratified, yet I do not wish to see this particular one singled out and have it ratified in this way. I trust, however, that we shall pass a joint resolution submitting an amendment to the Constitution providing that hereafter no amendment shall be ratified by a State except by the vote of the people.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] will allow me, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] that the fathers some 128 years ago in writing this Constitution provided a method by which the voice of the people might be heard. I listened with deliberation and care to the proponents of this measure for many months favoring the opportunity of the American electorate to pass on this grave question. Of course, we all know that the constitutional provision directly gives the opportunity if Congress avails itself of it. I did not rush into offering this amendment, because I agree with the Senator that it would come stronger from the proponents of the measure, but when no one on that side, after advocating the submission of this question to the people, proposed the method, and the only constitutional method by which the voice of the people might really be heard, I felt that it was not rushing in; that with due modesty I might myself propose it.

Mr. ASHURST. I am speaking in the time of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], but I want to say again that for the statesmanship of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alabama I have the highest regard. Indeed, so far from finding fault with their spirit of independence, I am inclined to overpraise it at times.

Now, another thing—and I hope I am not offensive when I say it—I am very certain that, even if we should attach this method, which provides for ratification by conventions instead of by the legislatures of the proposed constitutional amendment, neither the distinguished Senator from Missouri nor the able Senator from Alabama would vote for the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; but the Senator overlooks the fact that the position the Senator from Missouri and I occupy is not the proposition of favoring the establishment of the right of suffrage by the Federal Government and taking it away from the States, but the challenge has been repeatedly hurled on the floor of the Senate by the proponents of this measure that the people of the several States had a right to grant this privilege to the women of the country, and we have merely accepted the challenge which has been thrown at our feet. We challenge you to go to the hustings; we challenge you to submit this question to the people and not to the legislatures of the States.

If the Senator from Missouri will pardon me for occupying his time a moment longer, let us analyze the situation. The Senator from Arizona thinks that because some 17 or 18 amendments have been adopted by the legislatures of the States that forecloses the other method provided in the Constitution. Let us see as to that. Ten of the amendments constituted the Bill of Rights, which it was understood would be adopted in the beginning when the original instrument was agreed to. Three of the amendments grew out of the Civil War, settling a great contest between the people of the sections of this country. Necessarily there was no issue made as to the right of the people to vote on the adoption of those amendments. In the case of the first 10 amendments all of the States were for them, the people were for them; and in the case of the 3 amendments growing out of the Civil War the South was on its back and the North was determined to ratify them and put them in the Constitution.

As to some of the later amendments—for instance, the one changing the decision of the Supreme Court in reference to an income tax—almost every man on this floor, every man in the State legislatures, and the people themselves recognized that the power of the Federal Government in the beginning carried the right to levy an income tax, and that only by a divided court had that power been taken away from them.

As to the amendment providing for the election of Senators by the people there was no real opposition. Why delay the situation in that case when everybody was for it? But when you come to an amendment of this kind, the second direct attempt to invade the sovereign rights of the States and give their power to the Federal Government, it is not such a question as was

involved in the original amendments; it is a question that involves the very fundamental principles of our Government, a question that the people of the United States and the people of the sovereign States alone have the right to pass upon; and I insist that, if the gentlemen who are proponents of this measure claim that this proposal should be submitted to the people in order to give them an opportunity to be heard and to pass upon it, then they can not deny the propriety and justice of adopting the only way by which the people of the sovereign States can reflect their direct will in the acceptance or rejection of this proposal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona makes the argument that because we have in the past adopted constitutional amendments by votes of the legislatures, therefore we ought not to change the method of ratification in this instance; yet he stands here telling us that the method of ratification by legislatures is so bad that he proposes to support an amendment to the Constitution which permanently takes away from them the right of ratification of amendments to the Constitution and confer that power upon the people. When the Senator comes forward with his amendment he will be met with the antiquity argument just as completely then as he can now summon it to his aid, for the argument will then be made, "You are trying to change something that has existed all these years." If it be true that the State legislatures and Congress together might pervert the very form of our Government, if that danger is great enough so that the Senator is willing to support a constitutional amendment to change it; and if that method is, as he described it, archaic and unfair, then why not embrace the chance which is now afforded in the submission of the proposed pending constitutional amendment? Let us submit this proposed amendment in a fair way. Why submit it in an unfair and archaic way? Why not submit it in a fair and modern way? The argument goes too far, but it is adroitly made.

I know the Senator from Arizona is distressed. He does not like to deny the people of his State a right to vote on any question that concerns them. He is that kind of a Democrat. Give them a chance to vote on this matter. Give the people of my State a chance to vote on it. I am begging for that; I am asking it in the name of over three and one-half million people. If you are going to amend the Constitution and force that amendment upon the people of my State, at least give those people a chance to express their opinion. They are a great people—not greater than the people of other States, but as great. They represent the best there is in education, intelligence, patriotism, independence, and love of country. Let them have a chance to have a vote to select delegates to do the thing that you say ought to be reserved to the people always. Let us have that chance now, not to-morrow. If it is good and righteous and fair to change the Constitution so that the people of the States will always have the right—if that is a good thing to do to-morrow or next week, why not do that good thing to-day? Why not deal with the question that is before us?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is one of the ablest lawyers I have ever seen, and he is aware that there is running all through our law the well-known principle that the rule of procedure shall not be changed nor the statute of limitations shortened while the cause is pending.

Mr. REED. Ah; but the cause is not pending until the vote is taken here.

Mr. ASHURST. It has been pending, I think, if not technically at least practically for four years. One of the reasons why I would not at this time vote for the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is that I think it would be a change of the remedy while the case is pending. It would be unusual; it would be analogous to shortening the period of the limitation right in the middle of a trial.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; when the trial is on and rights have been fixed under the law then existing, of course, you can not change it; but this is a question that has not yet arrived at a point that it can be said to be "a cause." When the Congress shall submit it to the people, then it may be said to be in that shape; and if after it had been submitted we were to undertake to change the method of submission, there might be something in the Senator's argument; but it is more specious than it is persuasive.

But, Mr. President, because the question has been discussed surely does not justify the Senator's position, for there is not a question that will be brought forward involving an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the next 50 years that will not have been discussed in some form or other at some time by somebody. No; the Senator is without a reason; he has to go back on a referendum or else support the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama. I hope he will sup-

port it; I am begging him to support it; I am asking it in the name of the people of a great State who will not be given any chance to express their opinion unless the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama is adopted. If they are for it, they ought to be allowed to register their will; and if they are against it, no one ought to deny them the right to protest effectively.

There is another reason that I want to offer. I have often wanted to go to the Senator's State—I have heard so much about it—and I have been so pleased with the people of that State whom I have met; but I do not know anything about the Senator's State except as I hear about it and read about it. The Senator knows more about Arizona in a moment than I could learn by reading and studying for 5 years or 10 years, for he has lived there, and he is a part of the people of that State, and has the spirit of Arizona—the spirit that is born on the broad plains, the spirit that sweeps across Arizona's glorious face upon the wings of the morning. He knows Arizona, but he does not know my State, and I do not know his. I would not deny him the right to have the people of his State vote on a question involving their fundamental rights.

You ask me my position on this question. If we had the votes to pass an amendment to the Constitution providing that women could not vote in the State of Arizona, taking that question out of the hands of the people of the State of Arizona, or Montana, or Colorado, or Wyoming, I would not vote for such a proposition, no matter who told me to, because I would say, "It is for the people of those States to regulate their own affairs." But if such a proposition were brought forward—and it may be brought forward some day, for the tides run in and the tides run out, and opinions change with time—if it ever is offered and I am sitting here I pledge the Senator now that I will vote against it; and if an amendment is offered which reserves to the people of the Senator's State the right to vote and the Senator wants my vote in favor of that he will get it, because it would only be the fair thing to do.

There is not anything about this question that need lead us into doing things that are unfair and unjust. I repeat, so that my position never will be misunderstood, that if an amendment were offered here to-morrow that would deny the people of any of these States where suffrage exists the right to permit their women to vote I would fight it as hard as I am fighting this, because it is the State's business; and I have no right, as a citizen of Missouri, to interfere with the rights of the people of Wyoming or Arizona. Surely if the Representatives of those States asked that their people might vote I would give them that poor privilege, at least.

Mr. President, I beg pardon for speaking so long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	McLean	Smith, Md.
Ball	Hale	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Harding	Moses	Smoot
Beckham	Harris	Myers	Spencer
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Stanley
Brandegee	Henderson	New	Sterling
Calder	Hitchcock	Newberry	Sutherland
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Thomas
Culbertson	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Trammell
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Underwood
Curtis	Kendrick	Phelan	Wadsworth
Dial	Kenyon	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	Keyes	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Kirby	Poindexter	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Ransdell	Watson
Fall	La Follette	Reed	Williams
Fernald	Lenroot	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Lodge	Sherman	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Simmons	
Gay	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore resumed the chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the objection which has been made to the amendment by the proponents of woman suffrage is that it may delay the final adoption of the suffrage amendment. I plan to hasten consideration. The reason why a delay might be caused is that the House has passed the amendment in one form, and it would facilitate matters to have concurrence by the Senate; but, of course, the Senate is an independent body, and that is no reason which should be advanced to us.

Those of us who are in favor of national suffrage, and also in favor of the determination of all questions affecting the amendment of the Constitution by a vote of the people, desire to see that an opportunity shall be given to the people to vote; and to that end I have prepared an amendment to the amendment, with a view of facilitating the early determination by the people of their will upon this subject, so that there will be no needless delay.

I will read the amendment in order to comment upon it. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following article be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the several States.

The Constitution, as the Senate is aware, provides for ratification by three-fourths of the several States "by the legislatures or by conventions, as one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress." Therefore the Congress can propose, as the exclusive method of ratification, ratification by conventions; and I take it that the Congress can also propose the method by which these conventions may be called.

I would oppose leaving it to the legislatures for the very reason that the legislatures might, if unduly influenced, delay the ratification by delaying the calling of the conventions. So an amendment to the Underwood amendment might read as follows, which I will presently propose:

The conventions shall consist of 100 members, being qualified electors of the several States, and shall be voted for at large—

That brings the question fairly before all of the people of the States, not by congressional districts, but at large. It is the one issue before them.

Shall be elected at large by electors having qualifications to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. Such conventions shall be called to meet by the governors of the several States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of September, 1919.

That is an arbitrary date, but it serves the purpose of speedily determining what is the will of the electors, and allows ample opportunity for the campaign of education.

I therefore submit that as an amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama. As the legislatures will not all meet for several years, this plan will, I believe, bring about an earlier ratification.

While I am on my feet, I happen to have here a very eloquent testimonial of the wisdom of submitting all matters to a vote of the people. I do not know that it is entirely relevant; but it is doubtless interesting, and especially to Senators on the other side of the Chamber.

In California, the referendum has been frequently used. California was among the very first States that resorted to the referendum, and, in most instances, it has expressed very fairly the will of the people. Sometimes, where the educational campaign has not been sufficiently extensive or intense, there may be a doubt as to the fair expression of the people. Anyhow, it is the expression of the men who participate in these elections, and the women, because both the men and the women vote in California. Therefore it is fair to say that the expression of opinion by the voters, with or without an educational campaign, is exactly what the voters want; and, as the Senator from Missouri said, if the people make a mistake, it is very easy to remedy it by an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober.

What I have in mind is that on May 17 of this year a Member of this body holding a high and distinguished position undertook to instruct the people of my State in the political subdivision—and a very important one—of Los Angeles city as to how to vote. Of course, we resented it as an intrusion, because the occasion to which I refer was a municipal election; and all our chartered cities sacredly hold to the right to determine their local affairs by and for themselves. I will read the instruction which was sent out to the city of Los Angeles. I quote from the Los Angeles Times of May 18, 1919, a stand-pat Republican paper of general circulation. It is headed:

SENATORS FOR WOODMAN—REPUBLICAN NATIONAL ORGANIZATION IN THE FIGHT TO SAVE LOS ANGELES.

Dr. A. J. Scott, of Mayor Woodman's campaign committee, yesterday received the following telegram from United States Senator REED SMOOT:

Dr. A. J. Scott,
Los Angeles:

Senator Lodge joins me in the hope that every Republican will support the Republican candidate for mayor in the coming city election. Don't let this administration point to Los Angeles as a Democratic city a year hence, when the national campaign is on. The Nation is Republican. We hope Los Angeles will be.

REED SMOOT.

I received just now, from the secretary of the Democratic county committee, this telegram:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 4, 1919.

Hon. JAMES D. PHELAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

M. P. Snyder elected mayor of Los Angeles. All papers concede his election by 15,000 majority. Snyder now leading by 10,000. City clerk estimates total vote cast 75,000.

F. RAY GROVES,
Secretary Democratic County Committee.

I merely introduce that now to show that California is strong for the referendum, and that her judgment is generally right.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Who was elected?

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. M. P. Snyder, mentioned in the telegram, is a Democrat, and has served that city before, conspicuously and well, as its mayor. Mr. Woodman is a Republican. Los Angeles is normally Republican.

I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I merely wanted to ask what the response of the city was; and in view of that I wanted to ask the politics of the successful candidate.

Mr. PHELAN. I have already anticipated that question.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator before he takes his seat will offer a resolution extending our thanks to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] for his services in behalf of the Democratic Party in Los Angeles.

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

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama the following:

The conventions shall consist of 100 members, being qualified electors of the several States, and shall be elected at large by electors having qualifications to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the legislature. Such conventions shall be called to meet by the governors of the several States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of September, 1919.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment submitted by myself.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

The roll call having been concluded, the result was announced—yeas 28, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—28.

Bankhead	Gay	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harris	Moses	Stanley
Borah	Harrison	Overman	Swanson
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Phelan	Underwood
Dial	King	Reed	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Knox	Simmons	Williams
Fletcher	Lodge	Smith, Md.	Wolcott

NAYS—55.

Ashurst	Gronna	McCormick	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McKellar	Sherman
Calder	Harding	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Capper	Henderson	Myers	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Curtis	Kellogg	Norris	Thomas
Edge	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Ellis	Kanyon	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	Keyes	Phelps	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Kirby	Pittman	Warren
France	La Follette	Poincxter	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Ransdell	

NOT VOTING—13.

Brandegee	McCumber	Pomerene	Townsend
Colt	Martin	Robinson	
Gerry	Owen	Shields	
Gore	Penrose	Smith, Ga.	

So Mr. UNDERWOOD's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAY. Mr. President, in February last, when the vote was taken on the woman suffrage question, I explained my position briefly at that time. My position to-day, Mr. President, is the same as it was then. There is no doubt in my mind that women should be given the right to vote. There is doubt, however, that they will ever receive the privilege they are now asking by the methods which some of their supposed friends have adopted. It is a well-known fact that they have finally secured the necessary two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States to pass the Susan B. Anthony amendment and to submit that amendment to the legislatures of the various States of the Union. The advocates of the Susan B. Anthony amendment have won a great victory and are justly entitled to all the praise and honor which comes with the winning of a battle which has been fought for so long a time. It is not my intention to attempt to delay this legislation, but I do desire to present here and now an amendment which I believe would be ratified by the necessary 36 States at the next meeting of their legislatures. I present this as a substitute for the amendment which is now before you. The amendment which I am about to present was drafted by the former first assistant attorney general of Louisiana and by the Democratic national committeemen from that State when this matter was under discussion during the last session of Congress. It meets the objection that many have to the Susan B. Anthony amendment and is more liberal perhaps than the amendment which I have already presented for your consideration.

Section 2 reads that the several States shall have the authority to enforce this article by necessary legislation, but if any State shall enforce or enact any law in conflict therewith, then Congress shall not be excluded from enacting appropriate legislation to enforce it.

This, Mr. President, gives to the various States the right to enact and enforce laws giving women the right to vote. It does not leave all questions to Congress, but puts the matter where those who believe in State rights consider the power should be vested.

Mr. President, it only requires 13 States to prevent the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and I predict that there are 13 States that will never ratify the amendment which the Congress of the United States is about to present to the American people. The last vote in the State of Texas shows full well how the wind is blowing.

With the passage of the amendment which I am now presenting to you as a substitute for the other amendments which have been offered, the objection would be removed and the required number of States would soon pass it and thus give the right of suffrage to those noble, patriotic, and splendid women of our country who have so long fought for this right and who so richly deserve the privilege.

I offer the amendment which I ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The SECRETARY. The amendment is in the nature of a substitute:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. That the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

SEC. 2. That the several States shall have the authority to enforce this article by necessary legislation, but if any State shall enforce or enact any laws in conflict therewith, then Congress shall not be excluded from enacting appropriate legislation to enforce it.

Mr. GAY. I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. REED. Let us have the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I make the same announcement of the transfer of my pair as on the previous vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made upon the last vote concerning my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], is detained from the Senate by illness.

The result was announced—yeas 19, nays 62, as follows:

YEAS—19.

Bankhead	Harris	Ransdell	Thomas
Beckham	Harrison	Reed	Trammell
Dial	King	Simmons	Underwood
Fletcher	Myers	Stanley	Wolcott
Gay	Overman	Swanson	

NAYS—62.

Ashurst	Gronna	McCormick	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McCumber	Sherman
Brandegee	Harding	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Henderson	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Smoot
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Spencer
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Sterling
Cummins	Kellogg	New	Sutherland
Curtis	Kendrick	Newberry	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Norris	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Keyes	Nugent	Walsh, Mont.
Edkins	Kirby	Page	Warren
Fall	Knox	Phelan	Watson
Fernald	La Follette	Phipps	Williams
France	Lenroot	Pittman	
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Polindexter	

NOT VOTING—15.

Borah	Hitchcock	Penrose	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pomerene	Smith, Md.
Gerry	Martin	Robinson	Townsend
Gore	Owen	Shields	

So Mr. GAY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendment as in Committee of the Whole, the joint resolution will be reported to the Senate.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is in the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is, Shall the joint resolution be read a third time?

The joint resolution was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the joint resolution pass? The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BALL (when his name was called). By a special agreement, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and I are paired with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS]. The senior Senator from Tennessee is absent on account of illness in his family. If he were present, I would vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER (when his name was called). On this question the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is paired with me in the affirmative against the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] in the negative. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. KING (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote in the affirmative, but owing to the pair I withhold my vote.

Mr. MCLEAN (when his name was called). On this question I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE]. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MARTIN], as previously stated, is detained from the Senate on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay" and the two Senators with whom he is paired would vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when Mr. PENROSE's name was called). As already announced by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], my colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is paired with the junior Senator from New York and also with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. My colleague has requested me to state that if he were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. MCKELLAR (when Mr. SHIELDS's name was called). The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] is unavoidably detained on business and is paired with the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] and the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL].

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was called). The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] wired me and asked that a pair be arranged for him on this question, which has been done. He also asked me to announce that if he were present he would vote against the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. HARRIS. My colleague [Mr. SMITH of Georgia] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. My colleague is detained by illness.

Mr. NEWBERRY (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained at home by illness in

his family. He is paired as previously announced. He desired me to state that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Understanding, however, that if he were present he would vote just as I am about to do, I am at liberty to disregard the pair for the nonce. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who would have voted for the joint resolution if present. He is paired and his pair has been announced.

Mr. McLEAN. I find that I can transfer the pair which I heretofore announced to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], which I do and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], for whom a pair has been arranged, is unavoidably detained outside the Capitol and unable to be here. I wish to announce that if present he would vote against the passage of the joint resolution.

The roll call resulted—yeas 56, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—56.

Ashurst	Harding	McCumber	Ransdell
Capper	Harris	McKellar	Sheppard
Chamberlain	Henderson	McNary	Sherman
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Smith, Ariz.
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smoot
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	New	Spencer
Edge	Kellogg	Newberry	Stanley
Elkins	Kendrick	Norris	Sterling
Fall	Kenyon	Nugent	Sutherland
Fernald	Keyes	Page	Thomas
France	Kirby	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Gronna	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Hale	McCormick	Polindexter	Watson

NAYS—25.

Bankhead	Gay	Overman	Underwood
Beckham	Harrison	Reed	Wadsworth
Borah	Hitchcock	Simmons	Williams
Brandagee	Knox	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Dial	Lodge	Smith, S. C.	
Dillingham	McLean	Swanson	
Fletcher	Moses	Trammell	

NOT VOTING—15.

Ball	Gore	Owen	Shields
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Smith, Ga.
Colt	King	Pomerene	Townsend
Gerry	Martin	Robinson	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas are 56 and the nays are 25. A quorum being present and the joint resolution having received the affirmative vote of more than two-thirds of the Senators present and voting is declared to have passed the Senate in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

TREATY OF PEACE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being Senate resolution 12, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California May 20, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and
Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they may have been committed; and
Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from California whether he will be willing to have his resolution temporarily laid aside in order that a little routine business may be transacted?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My intention was not to press the resolution this evening, but to ask to have it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I thought that was the Senator's intention.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; it was.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the resolution can temporarily be laid aside we can transact some minor business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the suggestion is made by the Senator from Nebraska that the resolution be temporarily laid aside in order that some business which he has in hand may be transacted. As I understand the rule, in order that the resolution shall not be displaced it is necessary to secure unanimous consent to have that done. I am very agree-

able to the request. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be laid aside temporarily to be taken up to-morrow as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside to be taken up to-morrow at 2 o'clock. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I would not want to exclude taking it up before 2 o'clock if other business before then is disposed of.

Mr. SWANSON. That would have to be done by motion. It comes up as the unfinished business at 2 o'clock. If it is taken up before 2 o'clock, it must be taken up on motion.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; but if we agree to the unanimous consent that it can not come up until 2 o'clock, it could not be taken up prior to that time, even by motion.

Mr. SWANSON. It would come up at 2 o'clock at any rate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that anything in the nature of morning business can be done by unanimous consent without laying aside the unfinished business.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it is not necessary to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest that the Senator ask unanimous consent.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think if the Senator simply makes the request to lay the unfinished business aside temporarily, to hold its place, it will retain its place and then come up automatically.

Mr. LODGE. Then it can be taken up at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it may be taken up after the conclusion of morning business to-morrow or at 2 o'clock, if the morning business continues that long. Then it comes up automatically. Is that understood?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Undoubtedly.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator to withhold that motion for a moment.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; I withhold the motion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to have read the resolution which I send to the desk, and that it lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 64), as follows:

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated in the Senate that certain interests in the city of New York have secured copies of the peace treaty with Germany, while the American people have been unable to secure one; and

Whereas the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. LODGE, has stated in the Senate that he knows of four such copies of said treaty of peace with Germany now in New York, and that the only place where it is not allowed to come is the United States Senate; and

Whereas the Senator from Idaho, Mr. BORAH, has stated that the interests now having possession of said copies of said treaty are peculiarly interested in the treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and it hereby is, authorized and directed to investigate the matter with the view to ascertaining the facts, and particularly to ascertain and report to the Senate the names of the persons, corporations, or interests which have secured copies of said treaty, and from whom they were secured, and by what methods; and also to ascertain and report to the Senate in what manner and to what extent said interests are "particularly" interested in said treaty. For these purposes the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is, authorized to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with the same, the expenses thereof, including the cost of travel, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to remind the Senator that the request of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has not been disposed of.

Mr. KING. I understood that it had been disposed of.

Mr. LODGE. I thought the request of the Senator from California had been agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not so understand.

Mr. LODGE. I understood there was no objection.

SEVERAL SENATORS. There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask that my request may be disposed of, that the resolution which is the unfinished business, may be temporarily laid aside, to be taken up to-morrow at the conclusion of the morning business, or automatically, at any rate, at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate hears the request of the Senator from California. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, what disposition was made of the resolution offered by the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska goes, under the rule, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate under the rule.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator from Massachusetts think it should first go to the Committee on Foreign Relations or to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. I presume it goes to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. We have discussed that many times.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask that the resolution lie over until to-morrow, if that is agreeable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie over under the rule and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Branford, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Branch Connecticut State Grange Patrons of Husbandry, of Suffield, Conn., and a petition of sundry citizens of Guilford, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry employees of the Oakville Co., of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of the Congregational Church of Wauregan, the Baptist Church of Plantsville, the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Manchester, the Methodist Episcopal Church of Stratford, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South Farms, Middletown, and the Mary Taylor Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church of Milford; of the North Methodist Episcopal Church Society of Manchester, of the Christian Endeavor Society of the First Congregational Church of Norwich, and of sundry citizens of Ridgefield, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HARDING presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 158, S. N. P. J., of Nottingham; of Local Lodge No. 153, S. N. P. J., of Youngstown; of Local Lodge No. 5, S. N. P. J., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 20, S. S. P. Z., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 79, H. Z. J., of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 8, of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 9, of Cleveland; of the Jugo-Slav Republican Alliance, No. 21, of Cleveland; of the St. Nikola Society, No. 22, N. C. S., of Cleveland; of Local Lodge No. 275, S. N. P. J., of Maynard; of Local Lodge No. 358, S. N. P. J., of Power Point; of the Slovenian Benefit Society, of Barberton; of Local Lodge No. 279, S. N. P. J., of Ramsey; of Local Lodge No. 17, S. N. P. J., of Lorain; of Local Lodge No. 62, S. S. P. Z., of Lorain; of Local Lodge No. 104, S. N. P. J., of Lorain; of the South Slavic Catholic Union of East Palestine; of the St. Barbara Society of East Palestine; of the Slovenian Progressive Benefit Society of East Palestine; of the Slovenian National Benefit Society, No. 55, of East Palestine; of Local Lodge No. 355, S. N. P. J., of Fairport Harbor; and of sundry citizens of Bridgeport, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the independence of the Jugo-Slavs and for justice and fair dealing in connection with peace deliberations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. KELLOGG, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 120) to repeal chapter 154 of the act of the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, being the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the President in time of war to supervise or take possession and assume control of any telegraph, telephone, marine cable, or radio system or systems, or any part thereof, and to operate the same in such manner as may be needful or desirable for the duration of the war, and to provide just compensation therefor," approved July 16, 1918, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 4) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 641) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to

provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 5) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 1373) to amend the Articles of War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 1374) for the relief of Stephen A. Winchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 1375) for the relief of Catherine Grace; to the Committee on Claims.

REGISTERS AND RECEIVERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Mr. HENDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1339) to amend sections 2237 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the cost of reporting hearings held on Costa Rican matters by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the last session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, upon voucher to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, said payment to be at the rate of \$1 per printed page, and not to exceed the sum of \$33.

COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. KELLOGG submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was read and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the Committee on Printing be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to order and have printed 5,000 copies of the revised covenant for a league of nations, as it is now embodied, together with the original draft, in Senate Document No. 7, presented by Mr. PITTMAN under date of May 20, 1919.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE WITH PANAMA.

The following treaty was ratified by the Senate and the injunction of secrecy was removed therefrom June 4, 1919:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND PANAMA, SIGNED FEBRUARY 8, 1919, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMERCE BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES AND TO INCREASE THE EXCHANGE OF COMMODITIES BY FACILITATING THE WORK OF TRAVELING SALESMEN.

The Senate:

I transmit herewith, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention between the United States and Panama, signed February 8, 1919, for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, March 1, 1919.

The President:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate, if his judgment approve thereof, to receive the advice and consent of the Senate to its ratification, a convention signed February 8, 1919, between the United States and Panama,

for the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANK L. POLK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1919.

The United States of America and the Republic of Panama being desirous to foster the development of commerce between them and to increase the exchange of commodities by facilitating the work of traveling salesmen have agreed to conclude a convention for that purpose and have to that end appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America, Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, and The President of the Republic of Panama, Señor José Edgardo Lefèvre, chargé d'affaires of the Republic of Panama near the Government of the United States of America,

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, which were found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I.

Manufacturers, merchants, and traders domiciled within the jurisdiction of one of the high contracting parties may operate as commercial travelers either personally or by means of agents or employees within the jurisdiction of the other high contracting party on obtaining from the latter, upon payment of a single fee, a license which shall be valid throughout its entire territorial jurisdiction.

In case either of the high contracting parties shall be engaged in war, it reserves to itself the right to prevent from operating within its jurisdiction under the provisions of this treaty, or otherwise, enemy nationals or other aliens whose presence it may consider prejudicial to public order and national safety.

ARTICLE II.

In order to secure the license above mentioned the applicant must obtain from the country of domicile of the manufacturers, merchants, and traders represented a certificate attesting his character as a commercial traveler. This certificate, which shall be issued by the authority to be designated in each country for the purpose, shall be viséed by the consul of the country in which the applicant proposes to operate, and the authorities of the latter shall, upon the presentation of such certificate, issue to the applicant the national license as provided in Article I.

ARTICLE III.

A commercial traveler may sell his samples without obtaining a special license as an importer.

ARTICLE IV.

Samples without commercial value shall be admitted to entry free of duty.

Samples marked, stamped, or defaced in such manner that they can not be put to other uses shall be considered as objects without commercial value.

ARTICLE V.

Samples having commercial value shall be provisionally admitted upon giving bond for the payment of lawful duties if they shall not have been withdrawn from the country within a period of six months.

Duties shall be paid on such portion of the samples as shall not have been so withdrawn.

ARTICLE VI.

All customs formalities shall be simplified as much as possible with a view to avoid delay in the dispatch of samples.

ARTICLE VII.

Peddlers and other salesmen who vend directly to the consumer, even though they have not an established place of business in the country in which they operate, shall not be considered as commercial travelers, but shall be subject to the license fees levied on business of the kind which they carry on.

ARTICLE VIII.

No license shall be required of:

(a) Persons traveling only to study trade and its needs, even though they initiate commercial relations, provided they do not make sales of merchandise.

(b) Persons operating through local agents which pay the license fee or other imposts to which their business is subject.

(c) Travelers who are exclusively buyers.

ARTICLE IX.

Any concessions affecting any of the provisions of the present treaty that may hereafter be granted by either high contracting party, either by law or by treaty or convention, shall immediately be extended to the other party.

ARTICLE X.

This convention shall be ratified; and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington or Panama within two years, or sooner if possible.

The present convention shall remain in force until the end of six months after either of the high contracting parties shall have given notice to the other of its intention to terminate the same, each of them reserving to itself the right of giving such notice to the other at any time. And it is hereby agreed between the parties that, on the expiration of six months after such notice shall have been received by either of them from the other party as above mentioned, this convention shall altogether cease and terminate.

In testimony whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed these articles and have thereunder affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, at Washington, this 8th day of February, 1919.

[SEAL.]

FRANK L. POLK.

[SEAL.]

J. E. LEFÈVRE.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 5, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of June 3), 1919.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

D. E. Simmons to be United States attorney, southern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, June 4, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, never far from any of us, we call upon Thee out of the depths of the soul for courage, strength, faith, and grace to sustain us through the obligations of this day, that we may be the better prepared for whatever Thou dost lay upon us to-morrow.

Now is the day of salvation. If we live up to the high-water mark of Christian manhood to-day, now, in this world, we need have no fears for the morrow nor for the world that is to come.

To live, to act, to progress is the psalm of life in this world and the world to come.

Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. Protect, guide, and strengthen us for the present moment, and all praise and gratitude shall be Thine. In the Great Exemplar's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. SEARS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Florida rise?

Mr. SEARS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will wait a moment. Any Members who desire to take the oath of office will present themselves.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. GLYNN, Mr. HUDDLESTON, and Mr. LEE of Georgia appeared before the Speaker's desk and took the oath of office.

PROPOSED SOLDIERS' HOME AT ST. CLOUD, FLA.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill (H. R. 3468) to establish an old soldiers' home at St. Cloud, Fla. I am going to send to the Speaker's desk some petitions that I received in support of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not yet obtained consent.

Mr. SEARS. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the subject?

Mr. SEARS. An old soldiers' home.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we expect to take up appropriation bills in a very short time, and the gentleman will have an opportunity to address the House, I am sure, in connection with the consideration of one of those bills.

Mr. SEARS. I simply want to ask the Speaker to refer these petitions to the Committee on Appropriations. It will not take over a minute. I can not do that in the other time.

Mr. MONDELL. The rule in regard to matters of that kind is that they shall be placed in the basket.

Mr. SEARS. If the gentleman objects, of course I can not help it; I do not care to take up the time of the House. These petitions are signed by old soldiers. I have presented them as the son of a Confederate soldier. Does the gentleman object?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman can take it up on one of the appropriation bills.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House dispense with business in order under paragraph 4, Rule XXIV, as to Calendar Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the House dispense with the business of Calendar Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Reserving the right to object—which I do not intend to do, but probably shall hereafter, unless it is a matter of great importance—I hate to see Calendar Wednesday dispensed with at the beginning of a Congress for fear of the precedent. I would like the gentleman from Wyoming to tell us the situation as to these appropriation bills which it is necessary to have enacted and passed before July 1. What appropriation bills are there that went over from the last session that must be considered and passed before July 1?

Mr. MONDELL. There are four of the larger supply bills—the District of Columbia bill, the sundry civil bill, and the Army and Navy bills—and in addition to those is the railroad appropriation bill. It is highly important, in my opinion, that this program of legislation or appropriation which came to us as a heritage from the last Congress be disposed of in the House, if possible, by the 15th or, at the furthest, the 16th of this month.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman realizes that that can not be done unless the Members of the House, and particularly those upon our side of the Chamber, refrain from a great deal of what, in my judgment, I consider unnecessary debate. If we are to pass these bills by that time, I hope the gentleman, the leader of the majority, will try to use his influence upon the Members upon this side of the House not to engage in unnecessary delay by debate and motions and things of that kind.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman will do that.

Mr. GARRETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we should have a ruling. I submit a parliamentary inquiry or I will make the point of order that the unfinished business should be disposed of, and that the unfinished business is a vote upon the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. That has been decided. It was decided last by the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Speaker CLARK, holding that that should go over until Thursday instead of Wednesday. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Wyoming that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I want to make an announcement to the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for one minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Immediately following the action of the House on the Agricultural appropriation bill I shall call up or submit a resolution from the Committee on Rules,

House resolution 78, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], providing for a general investigation of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. The business before the House is the Agricultural appropriation bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Agricultural appropriation bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Agricultural appropriation bill is before the House, and the previous question has been ordered. The question arises as to the amendments on that bill. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to that bill? If not, the Chair will put the amendments en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The question being taken, the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the bill to be engrossed and read a third time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BLACK. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is there any gentleman who is opposed to the bill who desires to offer a motion to recommit?

Mr. ANDERSON. I desire to offer a motion to recommit, and am a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. BLACK. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, and, of course, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first recognize a member of the committee on the minority side. If no such gentleman desires to offer a motion, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], who offers the following motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back forthwith with an amendment striking out, on page 71, line 4, the figures "\$1,500,000," and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$2,500,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WINGO. I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph of the bill to which this motion applies be reported, so that we may know what it is about.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the paragraph referred to be reported. If there be no objection, it will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

For cooperative agricultural extension work, to be allotted, paid, and expended in the same manner, upon the same terms and conditions, and under the same supervision as the additional appropriations made by the act of May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. L., 372), entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," \$1,500,000; and all sums appropriated by this act for use for demonstration or extension work within any State shall be used and expended in accordance with plans mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the proper officials of the college in such State which receives the benefits of said act of May 8, 1914.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. WINGO) there were—ayes 33, noes 100.

Accordingly the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 346, nays 1, answered "present" 2, not voting 80, as follows:

YEAS—346.

Ackerman	Ayres	Benson	Brand
Alexander	Babka	Black	Britten
Almon	Bacharach	Bland, Ind.	Brooks, Ill.
Anderson	Bankhead	Bland, Mo.	Brooks, Pa.
Andrews, Md.	Barbour	Bland, Va.	Browne
Andrews, Nebr.	Barkley	Blanton	Browning
Anthony	Bee	Booher	Buchanan
Ashbrook	Begg	Bowers	Burdick
Aswell	Bell	Box	Burroughs

Butler	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sanders, N. Y.
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Sanders, La.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Greene, Mass.	MacCrane	Scott
Caldwell	Greene, Vt.	MacGregor	Scars
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	Madden	Sells
Campbell, Pa.	Hadley	Magee	Shreve
Candler	Hardy, Colo.	Maher	Sims
Cannon	Hardy, Tex.	Major	Sinclair
Cantrill	Harrison	Mansfield	Sisson
Caraway	Haskell	Mapes	Slemp
Carss	Haugen	Martin	Small
Carter	Hawley	Mays	Smith, Mich.
Chindblom	Hayden	Mead	Smith, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Hays	Merritt	Smithwick
Clark, Mo.	Hedlin	Michener	Snell
Classon	Hernandez	Miller	Snyder
Cleary	Hersey	Minahan, N. J.	Steagall
Coady	Hersman	Monahan, Wis.	Stedman
Cole	Hickey	Mondell	Steele
Collier	Hicks	Moon	Stephens, Miss.
Connally	Hoch	Moore, Ohio	Stephens, Ohio
Cooper	Holland	Moore, Pa.	Stevenson
Copley	Houghton	Moore, Ind.	Stiness
Costello	Huddleston	Morgan	Strong, Kans.
Crago	Hudspeth	Mott	Strong, Pa.
Cramton	Hulings	Murphy	Summers, Wash.
Crowther	Hull, Tenn.	Neely	Sweet
Cullen	Husted	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Currie, Mich.	Igoe	Nelson, Wis.	Taylor, Colo.
Curry, Calif.	Jacoway	Newton, Minn.	Taylor, Tenn.
Dallinger	Jeffers	Newton, Mo.	Thomas
Darrow	Johnson, Ky.	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson, Okla.
Davis, Minn.	Johnson, Miss.	Nichols, Mich.	Tillman
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Wash.	Nolan	Timberlake
Denison	Johnston, N. Y.	O'Connell	Tincher
Dent	Jones, Pa.	Ogden	Tinkham
Dewalt	Jones, Tex.	Oldfield	Towner
Dickinson, Iowa	Juul	Oliver	Treadway
Dickinson, Mo.	Kelley, Mich.	Olney	Upshaw
Dominick	Kendall	Osborne	Vaile
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Overstreet	Vare
Dowell	Kettner	Padgett	Venable
Drane	Kincheloe	Paige	Vestal
Dunbar	King	Park	Vinson
Dunn	Kinkaid	Parker	Voigt
Dupré	Kitchin	Parrish	Volstead
Dyer	Klecza	Pell	Walters
Eagle	Knutson	Platt	Ward
Echols	Kraus	Pou	Wason
Edmonds	LaGuardia	Purnell	Watkins
Elliott	Lampert	Quin	Watson, Pa.
Elston	Langley	Radcliffe	Watson, Va.
Emerson	Lanham	Ragsdale	Weaver
Esch	Lankford	Rainey, H. T.	Webb
Evans, Mont.	Layton	Rainey, J. W.	Webster
Evans, Nebr.	Lazaro	Raker	Welling
Evans, Nev.	Lee, Calif.	Ramsey	Welty
Fairfield	Lee, Ga.	Ramsayer	Whaley
Fess	Leibach	Randall, Calif.	Wheeler
Fitzgerald	Leshner	Randall, Wis.	White, Kans.
Flood	Lever	Rayburn	White, Me.
Fordney	Linthicum	Reavis	Williams
Foster	Little	Reed, N. Y.	Wilson, Ill.
Frear	Lonergan	Reed, W. Va.	Wilson, La.
French	Longworth	Rhodes	Wilson, Pa.
Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Ricketts	Wingo
Gallagher	Luhling	Riddick	Winslow
Gallivan	McAndrews	Robison, Ky.	Wise
Gandy	McArthur	Rodenberg	Wood, Ind.
Ganly	McCulloch	Rogers	Woods, Va.
Gard	McDuffie	Romjue	Woodyard
Garland	McFadden	Rose	Wright
Garner	McGlennon	Rouse	Yates
Garrett	McKenzie	Rowe	Young, N. Dak.
Glynn	McKiniry	Rubey	Young, Tex.
Good	McKinley	Rucker	Zihlman
Goodykoontz	McLane	Sabath	
Gould	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.	

NAYS—1.

Walsh

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Blackmon Sinnott

NOT VOTING—80.

Baer	Fields	James	Phelan
Benham	Fisher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter
Boies	Focht	Kahn	Reber
Briggs	Freeman	Kearns	Riordan
Brinson	Fuller, Mass.	Kelly, Pa.	Robinson, N. C.
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.	Rowan
Burke	Goldfogle	Kiess	Sanford
Carew	Goodall	Kreider	Saunders, Va.
Casey	Goodwin, Ark.	Larsen	Schall
Christopherson	Graham, Pa.	Luce	Scully
Crisp	Griffin	McClintie	Sherwood
Dale	Hamill	McKeown	Siegel
Davey	Hamilton	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Dempsey	Hastings	Mason	Smith, Ill.
Donovan	Hill	Montague	Steenerson
Dooling	Howard	Mooney	Sullivan
Doughton	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Va.	Sumners, Tex.
Eagan	Humphreys	Morin	Temple
Ellsworth	Hutchinson	Mudd	Thompson, Ohio
Ferris	Ireland	Peters	Tilson

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. McKEOWN.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. MONTAGUE.
 Mr. MANN with Mr. BLACKMON.
 Mr. BOIES with Mr. BRIGGS.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. BRINSON.
 Mr. FOCHT with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. CRISP.
 Mr. GOODALL with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. IRELAND with Mr. DOUGHTON.
 Mr. JAMES with Mr. EAGAN.
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. FIELDS.
 Mr. KEARNS with Mr. FISHER.
 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. KIESS with Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. KREIDER with Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. MASON with Mr. McCLINTIC.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. PETERS with Mr. PHELAN.

Mr. PORTER with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD with Mr. ROWAN.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.

Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. SHERWOOD.

Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio with Mr. SULLIVAN.

Mr. TILSON with Mr. SUMNERS of Texas.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. LUCE. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not be recorded.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. HAMILTON. I was just at the door of the cloakroom and had a man stationed to notify me when my name was reached, but the Clerk got by.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, did the bells ring twice?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not inform the gentleman.

Mr. BAER. I was called from the room by a constituent, but if I had been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. KEARNS. I was in the Hall, but I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to say that the rule does not contemplate that a Member can vote simply because he did not hear his name called. It is on the theory that the gentleman's name was not called at all, and therefore the only way that a Member can properly qualify is that he was present and listening, did not hear his name called, and therefore is allowed to vote on the theory that his name was not called. Unless gentlemen can state that they were present and listening when their names should have been called, they do not qualify.

Mr. KEARNS. I could not have heard my name if it had been called, there was so much confusion in the room. I was present.

The SPEAKER. Unless the gentleman will state that he was present and listening to hear his name called, the gentleman can not qualify.

Mr. KEARNS. I think I was; I was doing nothing but watching the roll call, and did not hear my name called. There was much confusion in the Hall.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the gentleman has qualified.

Mr. BLACKMON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MANN, and I desire to be recorded "present."

The name of Mr. BLACKMON was called, and he answered "Present," as above recorded.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I just came in; I was at the far end of the Hall, but before I got down here I heard other names called right after mine.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name should have been called?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; but I did not hear it.

The Clerk called Mr. SABATH's name, and he answered "Aye," as above recorded.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I understood the Chair to state that I could only vote "present." I wish to vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The rule does not allow the gentleman to vote "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. HAUGEN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WAR EXPENDITURES.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 78.

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed to appoint from the membership of this House a select committee of 15 members, for the Sixty-sixth Congress, and which said committee is hereby authorized to fully investigate all contracts and expenditures made by the War Department, or under its directions, during the present war; and, in addition to the powers herein conferred, shall have the same powers and authority as are now conferred by the rules of this House upon the standing Committee on Expenditures in the War Department; said committee is hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths and affirmations, to take testimony, to sit during the sessions of the House and during any recess which may occur during its sessions, and may meet at such places as said committee deems advisable. Said committee is also hereby authorized and empowered to appoint such subcommittees as it may deem advisable, and such subcommittees, when so appointed, are hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths and take testimony, and to meet at such times and places as said committee shall from time to time direct.

Resolved further, That said select committee shall report to the House, in one or more reports, as it may deem advisable, the result of its investigations, with such recommendations as it may care to make.

Resolved further, That the Speaker of the House is hereby authorized to issue subpoenas to witnesses, upon the request of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, during any recess of Congress during the sessions.

Resolved further, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be directed to serve all subpoenas and other process put into his hands by said committee or any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the spelling of the word "expenditures," in line 6.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the resolution be limited to 40 minutes on a side; that 40 minutes be controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] and 40 minutes by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the time for debate on the resolution be limited to 40 minutes on a side; that the gentleman from Kansas control 40 minutes and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] 40 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the resolution as to its purpose and scope speaks for itself. The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department found itself confronted with a very great work, and believing the work should be thoroughly done did not feel like undertaking it with the standing Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. So it is proposed that a special committee of 15 members provided for in this resolution shall undertake this great work.

During the period that the United States has been engaged in war the War Department has expended to May 1, 1919, \$16,300,000,000.

Expenditures for aircraft, \$948,000,000.

Expenditures for ordnance, \$4,323,000,000.

Expenditures for camps, cantonments, and manufacturing establishment, \$974,000,000.

Res., \$105,000,000.

Average expenditures of the War Department for three years prior to the beginning of the war:

Fiscal year 1914	\$123,500,000
Fiscal year 1915	126,000,000
Fiscal year 1916	132,000,000

The people of the United States are entitled to know just how that money was expended, and in order to advise the country as to the manner in which it was expended it will be necessary for a committee of this House to make such an investigation as is contemplated in this resolution.

The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, through their chairman [Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois], stated to the Committee on Rules this morning that in making a preliminary survey of the work to be done it was discovered that it would probably be necessary to appoint a number of subcommittees, probably five in all, one to undertake the investigation of the aircraft production, another of ordnance, another

of the camps and cantonments, another of the Quartermaster Department, and so forth. The resolution provides that these subcommittees may report at any time any conclusion that they have reached.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield for a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman feel that the investigation of aircraft expenditures by Mr. Justice Hughes has been taken by the American people as having been very thorough and a complete vindication?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There has been a thorough investigation made of that, but it comes to the knowledge of Members of the House and to the country that since that investigation was made there have been activities by the Aircraft Division and large sums of money spent.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And, as a matter of fact, has not more been expended since that investigation than was expended up to that time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I was about to follow what I had already said with that statement. It is also true, I will say in further answer to the gentleman from New York, that the Aircraft Division of the War Department is probably now expending large sums of money for aviation fields. The country would like to know the necessity for that expenditure of money, in view of the fact that we are raising money from the people in every way that we can devise.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does not the gentleman know that before any expenditure was made for aviation fields the Secretary of War came before the Committee on Military Affairs and laid all the cards on the table and explained what he was going to do and the prices he was going to pay for them, and did he not get an authorization of this Congress to do it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The question as to whether or not the money is being wisely expended for aviation fields at this time is a matter that may well be inquired into by a committee of this House.

Mr. McARTHUR rose.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further, and I shall not bother him any more?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. McARTHUR. Is it not true that in the report of Mr. Justice Hughes he specifically stated that he made no investigation of the spruce production of the Northwest and admitted that it ought to be investigated?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. His report indicated it was a somewhat limited investigation. Indeed the appointment of Mr. Justice Hughes carried a limitation upon his activities.

Mr. LITTLE. And I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if there is any objection from the Committee on Military Affairs to an examination of these expenditures?

Mr. CALDWELL. Oh, no; and I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand my question. I propose to vote for this resolution, not because I believe they are going to find anything but because I am sure they will not.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded for this colloquy. The country expects a thorough investigation of all the expenditures. It expects the committee making this investigation to be thorough and impartial. It is not intended, it could not be the intention of this House, that any innocent person shall be punished. It is not intended that anybody should be embarrassed who has not placed himself in a position to be embarrassed, but it should not be the intention of anyone that a guilty person should go unpunished or unexposed. If anyone has mispent or unwisely expended public money through the activities of the War Department, the country should know who that person is and the extent of the expenditures.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, there is certainly no objection to the purpose of this resolution on the part of the minority of this House. If there has been extravagance, the minority party wishes that extravagance exposed. If there has been rascality, no one is more earnestly in favor of exposing the rascal than the Democratic minority on this floor. So far as the purpose of the resolution is concerned there is no controversy, but there is a division of opinion upon this point. The introducer of this resolution stated before the Committee on Rules this morning that the desire was to have a nonpartisan investigation, and in the next breath we were informed that the purpose of the majority is to put 10 Republican Members on this investigating committee and 5 Democratic Members. In all

fairness I submit that the preponderance is too great. The committee should be divided at least in the proportion of 9 and 6. Think what sort of an arrangement you will have. This committee will be divided into subcommittees of three, of course, made up of two Democrats and one Republican—no; of two Republicans and one Democrat. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is hard to get over the habit, is it not?

Mr. POUL. I wish it were as I first stated [laughter], and if the people of this country had not been deceived it would have been that way. Now, this subcommittee goes to Europe. You have two Republicans and one Democrat. As man to man, is that fair? Is that a nonpartisan committee? Men who have served on these investigating committees have some idea of how arduous their duties are. It is impossible for one man to properly represent the side of the minority, if there is such a side. For my part, I can not understand why you gentlemen want to divide this committee in the proportion of 10 to 5 if you really intend to have a nonpartisan investigation. If you intend to have a partisan investigation, if you intend to put things over as you want to put them over, with no proper regard for the rights of the minority, then take your 10 and give us 5; but if you mean what you say, that this investigation is to be fair, is to be judicial, is to be nonpartisan, in the language of the gentleman who introduced the resolution, you will be willing to divide in the proportion of 9 and 6.

I do not know, but I venture the assertion that never in the history of Congress will you find one single great investigating committee where the preponderance was 2 to 1 in favor of the majority. You have got your majority; you can do whatever you wish. In the name of fair play, why is it you are not willing to give the minority one more vote on this great committee, which is to do this great work and which is to conduct, according to you, a nonpartisan investigation? Now, Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say. I have an amendment which I would like to introduce and have pending, and which I send to the Clerk's desk to have read. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered as pending, to be voted on at the proper time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that request for unanimous consent. I do not object that it shall be read for information and be pending, but I object to unanimous consent that it be voted upon.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment—

The SPEAKER. The time has not come for the offering of an amendment.

Mr. POUL. Then I ask to have it read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be read for the information of the House.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. POUL: In line 4, after the word "Congress," insert the words "of whom not less than six shall be taken from the minority party."

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used six minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that there will be no opposition to the creation of this committee as expressed by the speaker who has just left the floor and has been expressed by different persons unofficially when the matter was talked about. The country not only expects but demands the facts concerning the expenditures of the War Department. It is not a new thing. It follows the procedure after at least two great wars in which our country was engaged.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. Not now. The country demands it and for that reason no one ought to resist it. If in this riot of expenditure induced by the war there has been extravagance and if the extravagance was such that could not be avoided, the country will properly excuse it. If it could have been avoided, there is no reason why the country should not know it. Men have said, "What do you expect to do with these facts; we all expected mistakes to be made, and to get this information after the war is over would be conceding that the water is over the wheel and nothing to be gained by it." I have heard that from some quarters. But there is something to be gained by it in the suggestion that mistakes made unnecessarily should be avoided if under the exigencies of the future we shall be called upon to do anything like what we have done. But

that is not the great thing in my mind. It is not simply to show the facts of the great war in expenditures and to give the information to the public which it has the right to possess, but it is to look into present expenditures because, unless the facts are brought to the public, there will continue future expenses that the public ought not to suffer. That is the main reason for this investigation, and I think that the people in responsible positions would be glad to have the facts brought out with a view of immediate relief.

The Federal Reserve Board in the May report makes the astonishing statement that the monthly expenditure of the Government is \$1,400,000,000. This is seven months after the war is over, and if that rate continues to the end of the year it will use up all the available funds either from the borrowing or the taxing source and leave the Nation by the 1st of January with a deficit of over \$2,000,000,000 and a half of a year yet to be accounted for. The people have the right to know what these expenditures are, and where there is unnecessary continuance it should be pried away from the Government if we have got to use, figuratively speaking, a 40-foot pole to do it. Everyone knows—

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. FESS (continuing). That there is now existing a determination and elaborate effort to maintain agencies that were purely war agencies on the basis that those war agencies have become peace agencies and the country will suffer if we do not continue them. What we want—I can not yield to the gentleman now—are the facts, not only to show what was done unnecessarily—and if nothing unnecessarily was done nobody is harmed—but the facts as a groundwork for needed relief legislation in the immediate future.

Now, as to the make-up of the committee, I can see how my friend Poul, the gentleman from North Carolina, might say he would prefer 9 to 6 instead of 10 to 5. The reason it was put at 10 to 5 is that this committee will almost certainly divide itself into five subcommittees, and the five subcommittees could not be represented on a basis of 9 to 6 without putting some one on two subcommittees, and the easy way to effect it would be to make your five subcommittees, 3 for each subcommittee. It would be unwise to make it unduly large, say 25 instead of 15, for the reason that this committee must sit constantly. The work is simply tremendous; you can not now see the limit of the range, and to call 25 men out of this body to sit permanently, to be almost permanently absent from the session while the investigations are going on, would take more of the membership from the House than it is wise to do. It seems to me that if 9 to 6 would be satisfactory to friend Poul, the gentleman from North Carolina, that 10 to 5 would not be unsatisfactory to him. What he said about the ability of one person to sit as a permanent representative, that it would physically fatigue him, probably is true, but 9 to 6 will not remedy that. You will increase the fatigue. I believe that the majority party, which is responsible for the investigation, should be given the power to make it effective.

My friend who just left the floor conceded that and expressed the wish that it were two Democrats to one Republican instead of two Republicans to one Democrat. If that was an honest expression, as it was, then his objection can not be serious, I am sure.

Mr. POUL. If my friend will permit, I merely meant that if it had to be two to one, that it should be two Democrats and one Republican.

Mr. FESS. And I will be just as frank with my friend and say that since it can not be Democratic it must be Republican.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. REAVIS. I recall the gentleman from North Carolina saying that if the people had not been deceived in the late election it would have been two Democrats.

Mr. FESS. I do not want to comment on that statement. It was an amusing one to me at the time, especially when viewed in the light of the campaign slogan, "He kept us out of war." But, in spite of what some Members may insist, this investigation is designed to get the facts and to get them primarily for the benefit of the public rather than the benefit of any political party. If it were true that it was for the benefit of some political party, then I would confess my doubts of the wisdom of the proposed legislation. But it is for the benefit of future legislation to get at the unnecessary expenditures that will continue unless we expose the extravagance as it has existed. And I am sure the resolution will pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield nine minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the country is to be congratulated that upon this proposition there is absolutely no division of sentiment in the Rules Committee or upon the floor of this House. I am sure that the membership of this House, at least, understands thoroughly the purpose of this resolution and of this investigation. Now, of course, our Republican friends will not publicly make the admission that they are going into this investigation for the purpose of digging up campaign material for the presidential election next year. Of course, confidentially, we here all know that that is their purpose. Now, so far as the Democratic members of this Rules Committee are concerned, and so far as the Democratic side of the House in this Congress is concerned, so far as the War Department is concerned, we welcome this investigation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My hope and my prayer is that this great Republic of ours will never be drawn into another war. But, gentlemen on that side of the House, if we are, when you have completed this investigation and it becomes a part of the files and of the records of this Government, and if you happen to be in power when the next war comes, you can go back to this record and see how a real and the greatest war in all history was successfully conducted by a Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I congratulate the Committee on Rules in finally being able to get into the House with a report from the Committee on Rules, and I want to absolve from that criticism entirely the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], who is the chairman of the committee, because he has been present at every meeting of that committee. But it is a fact, which the record of the Rules Committee will show, that although you have eight members to our four on that committee, you have never been able to get a quorum of the Rules Committee of this Congress without the presence of the Democratic members of the committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And you bring this resolution in here to-day because of the fact that three out of four Democratic members of the Rules Committee were there this morning to make a quorum and voted for this report and to bring it before the House, when there were but four members of the Rules Committee present out of eight that the Republicans have on that committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You would not be here on the floor with the resolution to-day if it were not for that fact. And to show that we are not playing any partisan politics in the matter in the votes that were supposed to come before the Rules Committee this morning, I went so far as to pair with a Republican member of the committee in order to give him an opportunity to be associated with the members of his regiment to-day that are having a meeting over in New York.

Now, gentlemen, the Democratic Party on the floor of this House and the War Department welcome this investigation, and we believe that when you have finished it you will find yourselves exactly in the same attitude as you did when you spent three or four months investigating other members of the administration in the so-called leak investigation, when every Republican member of that investigating committee had to sign a report exonerating in full every branch of the Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ah, this is a wonderful procedure, but we welcome you to go to it. Investigate what? Investigate the proceedings of an administration that has turned the tide of battle, that has crushed Prussianism, that has brought the greatest victory to American arms in all the history of the Nation? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Investigate what? Why, you tried it in the last Congress. You had military officers who had been discharged from the service coming before the Rules Committee to investigate the Argonne Forest Battle, the greatest battle in all history, and yet if you had heard these gentlemen talk before that committee you would have believed that the American arms had suffered disgrace and defeat in that battle, when, upon the other hand, they had stamped themselves the greatest soldiers in the history of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Ah, gentlemen, we have no objection to this. The sensible people of this country understand the purpose of it. Why do you not come in here—the people have put you in control—why do you not come in here and bring in legislation to meet the problems of the day and not look into the water that has already gone over the wheel? [Applause on the Democratic side.] There are great problems here for this Congress to solve, and you admit it. You talk about efficiency in running the Government! The American people have not forgotten that the Democratic Party ran the Government successfully in all of its phases during the greatest war in history. And now you say that the Democratic Party is not efficient, and you are so inefficient that you would not be here on this floor to-day with this resolution if the Democratic members had not given

you a quorum in your committee this morning. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am not criticizing the chairman of the committee. He is entitled to the high position which he holds in his party's service. No member of this committee is criticizing the chairman of the committee for any unfair treatment of the Democratic members of that committee, but the point to which I call the attention of the country here to-day is that you are wasting and frittering away time in investigation of things that are passed, when there are great problems to be solved. And the business of this House, and especially the business of the majority side, since you are charged with power, should be not put to the investigations of the past, but in solving the problems of the present and of the future.

I commend to my Republican friends on that side of the House the action of the Republican Party recently taken in Kentucky. The Republican Party in Kentucky recently had a platform convention; but, gentlemen, not one word in that platform, from start to finish, though it was a long platform, dared to criticize the national administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] use some of his time?

Mr. POU. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WELTY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WELTY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a year ago to-day the First and Second Divisions were engaged at the front south of Soissons, with a hope that they would stop the retreat of the French. The marines were a part of this organization, and they were sent near Bois de Belleau, a short distance northwest of Chateau-Thierry. They arrived there about June 1, 8,000 strong, and it was estimated that these lads did not only hold back but repulsed, time and again, four times their weight. On June 6 an advance was made, and this part of the battle ended June 18, at which time it was learned that these two divisions did not only check but defeated the Germans by driving them out of the woods and for a number of miles beyond; but when the roll was called some of the companies had no commissioned or noncommissioned officers left, and out of the 8,000 marines who went in 6,200 were either killed or wounded. Col. Catlin, who was in command of one of these regiments, told me that 60 per cent of the rank and file of these boys were college men, and that in one regiment 93 per cent of its men were either marksmen, sharpshooters, or expert riflemen.

A year ago to-day the Germans knew for the first time how Americans can fight. Our soldiers had looked forward to this day for months, and now they were permitted to demonstrate the difference in a man when he fights for an ideal and one who fights for property and because he is told to fight. They were not only ready but willing to hold up the traditions of American soldiers. Heretofore he fought on his own soil and near his front door, that others might enjoy freedom and equality of rights, but it was the first time that he crossed the seas and planted the American banner on foreign soil, demonstrating that the spirit of freedom was a growing and continuing spirit. It was a new spirit planted, and when Europe saw how gallantly they fought they concluded that American soldiers had not only caught but possessed the spirit of the Crusaders. With them it was ever onward and no retreat.

I have just returned from the Walter Reed Hospital, where one of these brave lads submitted to a fifth major operation, due to a piece of bursting shell entering his left lung during this battle. His comrades tell me that he refused to be borne off of the field, and when told at the hospital that he could not resume the fight he wept because he could no longer continue with his comrades in this great fight for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, he is not the only one at Walter Reed possessing this spirit; there are hundreds of others, maimed for life, happy in the thought that they had a part in this great world struggle, even though their bodies are physically disfigured for life.

I am sorry to say that there are those with us to-day who have not caught this spirit of sacrifice; but their one and only thought was how much they could get out of this war for themselves. And when the draft act was passed they were busy getting soft places for their sons within the draft age, and I am sorry that in the selection of hundreds of thousands of officers, they, too, were commissioned and became nothing more nor less than rubber stamps for these profiteers.

Business had to be mobilized in order to support these lads, and thousands of business men, laborers, too old to shoulder the gun, were willing to make every sacrifice in order that we might win; and these men have contributed just as much toward the success of our cause as the boys on the field of battle, but these spirits possessed by the soldier, business man, and laborer demand now that the light of publicity be thrown on every man, woman, and child who had a part in the prosecution of the war, so that the profiteer and vampire may be known by their cowardly slinking way, and withdrawal from this light because of a sense of guilt; and, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, let us help in throwing on this light in order to point out their illegal acts, so that full justice might be administered.

During the prosecution of this war I received numerous complaints, and I have contented myself by calling them to the attention of the President, officers of the War Department, and the Department of Justice, because I believed that the enemy should not know that we had these with us who would steal from the Government while others were giving their lives to maintain the same. But now that the war is over I think it high time that a searching inquiry should be made with a view of prosecuting everyone who may be found guilty of profiteering or of presenting a false and fraudulent claim to the Government. I know that there are those who believe that an inquiry will not result in any good, because of our experiences during the Civil and Spanish-American Wars, and they point with justification to the fruitless inquiry of the Beef Trust scandal, when 21 years ago they had thousands of pounds of embalmed beef on hand which they could not sell to the public, but found ready market after the declaration of war with Spain. But, Mr. Speaker, are we not suffering to this day because those in authority at that time failed to do their duty? I well remember when the first cans of beef came to Chickamauga Park, some of the cans were bulged out, and when opened the meat had a green, slimy appearance, and for some reason our pet dogs in camp and the razor-back hogs of Georgia refused to touch it when thrown to them for food; yet the officers passed it for food to the soldiers, and for want of anything better they ate it after being cooked. And what was the result? Two-thirds of the soldiers became sick. I have seen hundreds of soldiers drop during a drill or parade, as though they were hit by a bullet. I ask again, can a Government long live when it permits acts of this sort to go unpunished? Mr. Speaker, I may not know the signs of the times, but I doubt if another beef scandal can be put over on the American public.

I know there are some who want to make politics out of this. In my resolution of inquiry, which was referred to the Rules Committee May 20, I asked for a nonpartisan committee, but I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and others on the majority side ask for a committee of 15, with only a third of them Democrats.

The President and Secretary Baker did not ask a soldier or business man offering his services for his politics. It so happened in my State that a large majority of the judge advocates and other officers selected were Republicans. I do not know what has been the practice in other States, but I have come to the conclusion that Secretary Baker in his attempt to avoid the politics of the Civil and Spanish-American Wars was leaning backward. However, it seems that there were those under his authority who did not share his views when it came to the selection of these officers. I was informed by Gen. Crowder that when it came to the selection of judge advocates from Ohio that the matter was left exclusively with Secretary Baker, and yet I found upon inquiry from the Secretary of War that he did not know a single judge advocate selected from Ohio. But somehow from the hundreds of able lawyers in Ohio it so happened that only three were of the Democratic faith, and a majority came from Cincinnati, because the examining committee thought Cincinnati was the largest city in Ohio, and every good lawyer must come from the larger cities.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am not asking for a nonpartisan committee because of a desire that Democrats should be protected. Far from it. I believe that a man who defrauded a Government during the war is a traitor and should be dealt with accordingly; and I do hope that when you come to a traitor who professes to be a Democrat that no blank cartridge be used.

But I am asking for a nonpartisan committee, because these men who profited during the war possess neither politics nor religion. They assume their cloak only to appear in respectable company. I am not saying that my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, does not intend to go to the bottom in this investigation, but he will probably find that he may be embarrassed, because some of these

have powerful friends among those who organized not only the Senate but the House as well. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

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

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, when this country entered into the Great War people generally believed that in the high civilization of the twentieth century war was impossible. We were entirely unprepared. We were told to be neutral. There were some men here and there over the country, red-blooded men, who urged preparation. But we were told at that time that they were "nervous and hysterical," and that there was no danger of war. The people did not recognize the fact that a ravening tiger was loose in the world. They did not recognize at that time that it was the duty of humanity and of this great Republic to go in and destroy that tiger.

And so the dictates of humanity forced us into this war. We were unprepared. Our regular officers had had no experience—not one of them—in the handling and equipping and supplying of great masses of men. They knew nothing about gas and grenades and trench warfare. They had not small arms munitions, artillery, airplanes, motor trucks, food, clothing, or even an army, and it was a stupendous task, and, of course, mistakes were made. Of course, in the hurry and confusion cost was not considered, and of course there was great extravagance. But to the everlasting credit of the American people all loyal men of all parties joined hands in common front against the common foe [applause], and for the first time in the history of the country the minority party supported the majority administration in time of war.

Now, I believe, with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], that this investigation should go on, not so much to determine who has been making mistakes or even to expose grafters and profiteers, desirable as that may be, but for the purpose of informing Congress how it may put an end to the enormous outlays and the expenses that are still going on without diminution six months after the war is over. The people are entitled to know what the facts are, but I also believe that investigation will show that the men who were at the head of the war operations were honestly doing the best they knew how. Honest mistakes that have been made we can overlook. Honest extravagance we can forget. The point of this investigation should be to inform this Congress as to the measures to be taken to cut off unnecessary expense and to better equip Congress to handle the far more important matters that are pressing for solution. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina use some of his time?

Mr. POUL. How many more speeches, I would like to ask, will there be on that side?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Probably two; and then I shall reserve a little time in which to move the previous question.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD].

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] says the country demands this investigation. I do not know whether there is much demand for it in the country or not, but I know that the Democratic administration welcomes it. The Democratic membership of this House will vote for it. I shall vote for it, because it provides for a better committee, with broader powers than any existing committee, for the purpose of investigating the expenditures in the War Department and the general conduct of the war.

I should have preferred, Mr. Speaker, to see a joint committee of the Senate and House appointed. Such a committee, I believe, would have attracted the attention of the country and held it, whereas a committee here, making an investigation, and a committee over there on the other side of the Capitol making an investigation, will not do that. It would have been less expensive for the Government and less trouble to the officials of the War Department to appear before one committee than before two committees. It would have resulted in a more thorough investigation. I should have preferred such a committee on the conduct of the war and the expenditures for the war, such a committee as we had after the war between the States. But as we are not in control of things and can not dictate what kind of a committee we shall have we will support the committee provided for in this resolution. I for one believe I speak the unanimous voice of the Democratic side when I say we shall vote for this as the very best proposition to make this investigation that the Republicans will present to

the House. We hope to improve it by amendment, but we are so willing for this investigation that we will vote for it whether it is amended or not.

The Democrats of the House and the Democrats of the country are proud of the splendid record which the able and efficient Secretary of War has made, and proud of his honest and splendid management of the multiplied duties of his great office. [Applause.]

We are proud of the glorious record made by American armies across the water [applause], and we want to see every man who has failed in his duty to his country in this great hour, who has taken advantage of the exigencies of war and the hurried manner in which great things had to be done, to improperly enrich himself, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, exposed and brought to justice. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it would have been better if there had been a larger representation given to the Democrats upon the proposed committee. I think the suggestion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], that the Democrats have six and the Republicans nine, is certainly fair and certainly reasonable. I can see no answer to his position. I see no reason why there should be more than three subcommittees of this proposed committee. Two of those subcommittees could have two of the subjects of investigation assigned to each of them. This would meet the argument for five subcommittees. If that were done there could be three committees of five members each, three Democrats and two Republicans—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. You are wrong again. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLOOD. I mean three Republicans and two Democrats. I wish it were the other way. [Laughter.] Three Republicans and two Democrats. Such a division would appeal more to the sense of justice and right of the country than a division of two to one, as we are to have it in the proposed committee. It would be nearer nonpartisan and would appeal more strongly to the sense of justice and right of the Members of this House. But whether this committee be partisan or nonpartisan, I want to see it created. I want to see a thorough investigation made. I want to see a speedy investigation made, and I know that the War Department and the Democratic administration and the Democratic membership of this House and the Democratic Party in the country have nothing to fear from this investigation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this being admittedly a nonpartisan investigation, I have been highly edified in listening to the absolutely "nonpartisan" speeches that have been made upon that side of the House. I can not avoid the conclusion, however, that beneath the braggadocio of some of these gentlemen there lurks a little timidity about what may happen as a result of this investigation. While undoubtedly there has been a great waste of public money, for which the people of this country will have to pay, I sincerely trust it will not develop that any money has been misused for the benefit of any person or corporation. That is one of the things we are going to try to find out.

In my district there has been a Government activity—if that is the word to use. There was activity there for four or five months, during which some six or seven million dollars was spent in the erection of an alleged nitrate plant. One of the most beautiful spots in my county is now a devastated ruin and all work has been finally abandoned, but before it is finally paid for it will have cost the American people something over \$12,000,000. I heard many rumors—not very pretty ones—I do not vouch for them—connected with the construction of this plant, rumors in the first place as to the qualifications necessary in order to obtain employment. I shall not elaborate upon these. But I heard of one instance, pretty well vouched for, of a man who obtained employment there as a carpenter, a man who had been well satisfied with wages amounting to in the neighborhood of \$15 a week, who, through some influence or other, obtained employment there at a salary of \$75 a week. He discovered that his job apparently consisted of every now and then approaching a wall and hammering in a nail which another gentleman kindly held for that purpose. He was conscientious enough to have some doubt whether the wages he was being paid, considering the amount of work he did, were not a trifle excessive, and he was somewhat concerned to observe after a few days that another gentleman was almost continuously in attendance upon him. When he walked up to hammer in a nail this other gentleman would observe him apparently with intense interest. When he sat upon a bench to rest and to ruminate, possibly upon the noble deeds of our great Secretary of War, he ob-

served that this man was watching him intently. Finally he became disturbed and he accosted the man and said, "Sir, what does this mean? Are you shadowing me? Are you a detective?" The man replied, "No, sir; I am your helper." [Laughter.] Those are some of the things that we propose to investigate under this resolution.

Let us join together, Republicans and Democrats, in this House to see to it that the American people are fully advised as to where these vast expenditures have gone. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] has 10 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 12 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman from North Carolina use some time?

Mr. POU. There will be only one more speech on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, very early in the history of our Government the House provided for certain committees whose duty it was to examine into the expenditures of Government departments. Those committees have not always functioned as they should. I believe it to be the duty of those committees to hold sessions in every Congress and to examine into the expenditures and all of the expenditures of the departments. They have not always done so; but in almost every session of Congress, and invariably so at the close of periods of great expenditures, these committees have made examinations, and special committees have been appointed for that purpose.

In ordinary times the War Department spends about \$125,000,000 to \$130,000,000 a year. Since the war began it has expended \$16,000,000,000. One division of the War Department has expended more than \$4,000,000,000. Manifestly these enormous expenditures should be audited and examined and inquired into. I assume they would be, without regard to whether Republicans or Democrats controlled the House. I believe we are proposing nothing more than the gentlemen on the other side would have proposed if they had had control of the House. I feel confident that the gentlemen on the other side expect, and are perfectly honest in their statement that they desire to have these investigations made, though I am frank to say that I never before heard a man express so much regret with regard to something that he wanted to have done as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL], who just spoke, expressed. While he was exceedingly anxious, so he said, to have these investigations made, he spoke with great regret with regard to them.

Mr. Speaker, the important work of this Congress will be constructive; but, as we proceed first with our program of appropriations and then with our program of constructive legislation, it becomes our duty—the American people expect it of us—to have a fair and thorough investigation, and we expect a fair investigation, of the activities and expenditures of the departments of the Government.

Something has been said about the representation on this committee, and gentlemen have insisted that the minority should have a larger representation than is suggested. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], I think, explained that matter fully and clearly. The minority could not be given a larger representation than is proposed on this committee if it is to be divided into subcommittees, as it seems necessary that it should be, without increasing the committee to a size that would call from other active work a larger number, both of the minority and the majority, than can be well spared. All of the legislative committees of the House will be very busy, and the active, forceful men on both sides will be needed in that work in as large number as are available, and it would not be wise, either from the standpoint of the majority or the minority, to have these investigating committees too large in number. In view of the situation, I think the arrangement made is eminently fair and just, and I want to say for the majority that we are taking up these investigations not in any spirit of endeavor to make political capital, whatever gentlemen may say, but because it is our duty to do so. It would be their duty if they were in control of the House to make such an audit and examination as would inform the American people of the manner and character of the very great expenditures during the period of the war.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that since the beginning of this session of the Congress several of the older Members of the House have taken occasion to address themselves particularly to the new Members of the body. For just a moment I venture to do that thing.

You gentlemen who come here as new Members have heard for a good many years of the gag rule and the steam roller. Now, I want to say to you that in just a few moments you are

going to see these modern instrumentalities of politics in very full and active operation.

The issue will be put to the test here when the gentleman from Kansas moves the previous question. If the previous question be carried, then all possibility of amending this resolution will fail. If it be not carried, then the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] will have the opportunity of offering the amendment which he has had read for the information of the House, and that is to provide that the minority representation on the committee shall be not less than six in number.

Of course, the resolution which is before you does not change the majority and minority representation; that is left to the honored Speaker of this House. But I assume that the Speaker of this House will carry out the plan that was officially announced to the Committee on Rules to be "the plan" and name 10 majority members and 5 minority members. Against that injustice I protest.

A friend of mine on that side, and I am very fond of him, spoke to me a few moments ago of the similarity of debate in this Congress and eight years ago, when the Democrats first came into power. On this question of investigations I agreed with him as to some of the debate, but let me point out this difference in the investigations which the Democrats ordered and the investigation which the Republicans now propose to order.

The steel investigating committee consisted of nine members—five majority and four minority. The sugar investigating committee consisted of nine members—five majority and four minority. The so-called Mulhall investigating committee consisted of seven members—four of the majority and three of the minority. The Pujo investigation was conducted by one of the standing committees of the House, the Committee on Banking and Currency. My friend from North Carolina said that in the history of the Government there had been no investigating committee in which there were 2 to 1. My friend is mistaken. I venture to call your attention to a committee, and I hesitate somewhat to do it, because when brought to recollection I fear it will be pregnant with sad memories to those on the Republican side. In the last Republican Congress you created what was commonly known as the Ballinger-Pinchot investigating committee. It was a joint committee, as this committee ought to be, of the House and the Senate, and you had eight of the majority party and four of the minority. That is the only precedent you have. You remember what happened to you after the Ballinger-Pinchot investigation. Gentlemen, why not play the game fair? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The membership of this House, the relative proportion of party representation, entitles the minority under all the rules of the game to the representation suggested by the amendment that will be proposed, if opportunity be given, by the gentleman from North Carolina. We gave it to you while we were in power. Aye, more. Why not at least begin this matter with some semblance of fairness?

Of course, we do not oppose the investigation. It is to be an investigation of what in many respects is the most glorious chapter in the history of this United States. The job was done with thoroughness and completeness. We do not object, and we welcome the opportunity to show the efficiency with which those charged with the responsibility dealt in this great crisis of the world. But I do insist, Mr. Speaker, that in common decency, measured by all the decent precedents of the past; in common fairness, measured by the standard which we ourselves have set, we are entitled to this proportionate representation upon this very important committee. I appeal to the sense of fairness of this House to vote down the previous question and give us an opportunity to have a vote on the amendment that will then be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, before taking any more time, I want to call attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to some rather formal amendments to the resolution that I shall ask unanimous consent to make.

Mr. POU. I have no objection if they are the corrections the gentleman showed me.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Line 6, page 2, I ask unanimous consent that the word "further" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to strike out, on page 2, line 6, the word "further."

Mr. IGOE. Reserving the right to object, why not vote down the previous question and then we can take up this amendment and others at the same time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is another matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that in line 10, page 2, the word "further" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. On page 2, line 12, I ask unanimous consent that the word "select" be added after the word "said."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In line 14, page 2, I ask unanimous consent that the word "further" be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion on this resolution. Gentlemen on the Democratic side say they court the investigation that it proposes—in fact, they are anxious for such an investigation—but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is not satisfied with the way the committee is made up. He has called the attention of the House to the fact that in other investigations authorized by the House the political proportions of the committees differed from the proportions proposed here. He cited, I think, four precedents—the steel investigation, the sugar investigations, and the so-called Money Trust or Pujo investigation. I call the gentleman's attention and the attention of the House to the fact that each of these investigations was to inquire into industrial and financial institutions of the country rather than a political [laughter on the Democratic side] or governmental activity.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Ah, the gentleman has let the cat out of the bag.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I suggest to the gentleman from Kansas that the gentleman is perfectly right when he speaks of a political or governmental activity—they are synonymous under this administration.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Have been. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Oh, gentlemen seem pleased. In all probability the investigation will disclose that there has been a mingling of political and governmental activities. I have not the slightest doubt of that. The other precedent referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] called for an investigation of a governmental activity, but the membership of that committee was composed exactly as it is proposed to compose this committee, in the same proportion of the majority and the minority members.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman refer to the Pujo committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; the Ballinger committee. However, it was a committee to investigate a governmental activity, and that is what this committee is. There is nothing unfair about these proportions.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. That was a Republican committee, and that is what this committee is to be.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; that is true. I congratulate the Republican side of the House and the country upon the fact that the Republicans have an opportunity to make a delayed investigation of the activities of the War Department. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Democratic majority that went out in the last Congress had many opportunities to inquire into the activities of the War Department. Many failures have been called to the attention of the country that did not seem to get a response from the committees of this House, and the matters were not investigated.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. PELL. In what way does the proportion of this proposed victory investigating committee compare with the proportions of the committee which investigated the Spanish War?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am really not able to answer the gentleman. I think, however, that that was a joint committee, although I am not sure. Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for an investigation that is so colossal in its nature that there will have to be at least five subcommittees. The sensible thing to do will be to have two Republicans and one Democrat upon each one of these subcommittees, rather than to have two Republicans and one Democrat on a portion of the subcommit-

tees, and three Republicans and two Democrats on other subcommittees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, before that is done, I would like to ask if the gentleman objects to a vote upon my proposed amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do. I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. POU. On that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 154, answered "present" 2, not voting 76, as follows:

YEAS—197.

Ackerman	Fairfield	Luce	Rowe
Anderson	Fess	Lufkin	Sanders, Ind.
Andrews, Md.	Focht	Luhning	Sanders, N. Y.
Andrews, Nebr.	Fordney	McArthur	Sanford
Bacharach	Foster	McCulloch	Scott
Baer	Frear	McKenzie	Sells
Barbour	French	McKinley	Shreve
Begg	Fuller, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinclair
Benham	Garland	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Sinclair
Bland, Ind.	Glynn	MacCrate	Slemp
Boles	Good	MacGregor	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Goodall	Madden	Smith, Mich.
Britten	Goodykoontz	Magee	Snell
Brooks, Ill.	Gould	Mapes	Snyder
Brooks, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	Mason	Stephens, Ohio
Browne	Green, Iowa	Merritt	Stiness
Browning	Greene, Mass.	Michener	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Greene, Vt.	Miller	Strong, Pa.
Burroughs	Griest	Monahan, Wis.	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Hadley	Mondell	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Tenn.
Cannon	Hardy, Colo.	Moore, Pa.	Timberlake
Chindblom	Haskell	Moores, Ind.	Tincher
Christopherson	Haugen	Morgan	Tinkham
Classon	Hawley	Mott	Towner
Cole	Hays	Murphy	Treadway
Cooper	Hernandez	Nelson, Wis.	Vaile
Copley	Hersey	Newton, Minn.	Vare
Costello	Hickey	Newton, Mo.	Vestal
Crago	Hoch	Nichols, Mich.	Voigt
Cramton	Houghton	Nolan	Volstead
Crowther	Hulings	Ogden	Walsh
Currie, Mich.	Husted	Osborne	Walters
Curry, Calif.	Jefferis	Paige	Ward
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Parker	Watson, Pa.
Darrow	Jones, Pa.	Platt	Webster
Davis, Minn.	Juul	Purnell	Wheeler
Denison	Kearns	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kendall	Ramsey	White, Me.
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramseyer	Williams
Dunbar	King	Randall, Wis.	Wilson, Ill.
Dunn	Kinkaid	Reavis	Winslow
Dyer	Knutson	Reber	Wood, Ind.
Echols	LaGuardia	Reed, N. Y.	Woodyard
Edmonds	Lampert	Reed, W. Va.	Yates
Elliott	Langley	Rhodes	Young, N. Dak.
Elston	Layton	Ricketts	Zihlman
Emerson	Lehlbach	Robison, Ky.	
Esch	Little	Rogers	
Evans, Nebr.	Longworth	Rose	

NAYS—154.

Alexander	Dominick	Lee, Ga.	Rouse
Almon	Donovan	Leshner	Rubey
Ashbrook	Doremus	Lever	Rucker
Aswell	Drane	Linthicum	Sabath
Ayres	Dupré	Loneragan	Sanders, La.
Babka	Eagle	McAndrews	Sears
Bankhead	Evans, Mont.	McDuffie	Sims
Barkley	Fitzgerald	McGlennon	Slisson
Bee	Flood	McKiniry	Small
Bell	Gallagher	McLane	Smith, N. Y.
Black	Gallivan	Maher	Smithwick
Bland, Mo.	Gandy	Major	Steagall
Bland, Va.	Ganly	Mansfield	Stedman
Blanton	Gard	Martin	Steele
Booher	Garner	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Box	Garrett	Mead	Taylor, Ark.
Brand	Goodwin, Ark.	Minahan, N. J.	Taylor, Colo.
Briggs	Hardy, Tex.	Moon	Thomas
Brinson	Harrison	Neely	Thompson, Okla.
Buchanan	Hayden	Nelson, Mo.	Tillman
Byrnes, S. C.	Hefflin	Nichols, S. C.	Upshaw
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hersman	O'Connell	Venable
Caldwell	Holland	Oldfield	Vinson
Campbell, Pa.	Huddleston	Oliver	Watkins
Candler	Hudspeth	Overstreet	Watson, Va.
Cantrill	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett	Weaver
Caraway	Igoe	Park	Webb
Carss	Jacoway	Parrish	Welling
Carter	Johnson, Ky.	Pell	Welty
Casey	Johnson, Miss.	Pou	Whaley
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, N. Y.	Quin	Wilson, La.
Cleary	Jones, Tex.	Ragsdale	Wilson, Pa.
Coady	Kincheloe	Rainey, H. T.	Wingo
Collier	Kitchin	Rainey, J. W.	Wise
Connally	Klecza	Raker	Woods, Va.
Crisp	Lanham	Randall, Calif.	Wright
Cullen	Lankford	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Lazaro	Riordan	
Dickinson, Mo.	Lea, Calif.	Romjue	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Blackmon
Dewalt

NOT VOTING—76.

Anthony	Fuller, Mass.	Kennedy, R. I.	Porter
Benson	Godwin, N. C.	Kettner	Riddick
Brumbaugh	Goldfogle	Kiess	Robinson, N. C.
Burke	Graham, Pa.	Kraus	Rodenberg
Carew	Griffin	Kreider	Rowan
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Larsen	Saunders, Va.
Dale	Hastings	McClintic	Schall
Davey	Hicks	McFadden	Scully
Dempsey	Hill	McKeown	Sherwood
Dent	Howard	McPherson	Siegel
Dooling	Hull, Iowa	Mann	Smith, Ill.
Doughton	Humphreys	Montague	Steenerson
Eagan	Hutchinson	Mooney	Stevenson
Ellsworth	Ireland	Moore, Va.	Sullivan
Evans, Nev.	James	Mudd	Summers, Tex.
Ferris	Johnson, S. Dak.	Olney	Temple
Fields	Kahn	Peters	Thompson, Ohio
Fisher	Kelley, Mich.	Phelan	Tilson
Freeman	Kelly, Pa.		Wason

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. BENSON.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. HICKS with Mr. KETTNER.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. KRAUS with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.

Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. WASON with Mr. STEVENSON.

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no," but I have a general pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. McFADDEN, who would have voted "yes." I desire to change my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. DEWALT was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 341, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 87, as follows:

YEAS—341.

Ackerman	Classon	Ganly	Langley
Alexander	Cleary	Gard	Lanham
Almon	Coady	Garland	Lankford
Anderson	Cole	Garner	Layton
Andrews, Md.	Collier	Garrett	Lazaro
Andrews, Nebr.	Connally	Glynn	Lea, Calif.
Ashbrook	Cooper	Godwin, N. C.	Lee, Ga.
Aswell	Copley	Good	Leshner
Ayres	Costello	Goodall	Lever
Babka	Crago	Goodykoontz	Linthicum
Bacharach	Cramton	Graham, Ill.	Little
Baer	Crisp	Greene, Mass.	Loneragan
Bankhead	Cullen	Greene, Vt.	Longworth
Barbour	Currie, Mich.	Griest	Luce
Barkley	Curry, Calif.	Hadley	Lufkin
Bee	Dale	Hamilton	Luhning
Begg	Dallinger	Hardy, Colo.	McAndrews
Bell	Darrow	Hardy, Tex.	McArthur
Benham	Davis, Minn.	Haskell	McCulloch
Benson	Davis, Tenn.	Hawley	McDuffie
Black	Denison	Hayden	McGlennon
Bland, Ind.	Dewalt	Hays	McKiniry
Bland, Mo.	Dickinson, Mo.	Hefflin	McLane
Bland, Va.	Dickinson, Iowa	Hernandez	McLaughlin, Mich.
Blanton	Dominick	Hersey	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Boles	Donovan	Hersman	MacCrate
Booher	Doremus	Hickey	MacGregor
Bowers	Dowell	Hoch	Madden
Box	Drane	Holland	Magee
Brand	Dunbar	Houghton	Maher
Briggs	Dunn	Huddleston	Major
Brinson	Dupré	Hudspeth	Mansfield
Brooks, Ill.	Dyer	Hulings	Mapes
Brooks, Pa.	Eagle	Hull, Tenn.	Martin
Browne	Echols	Igoe	Mason
Browning	Edmonds	Jacoway	Mays
Buchanan	Elliott	Jefferis	Mead
Burdick	Elston	Johnson, Ky.	Merritt
Burroughs	Emerson	Johnson, Miss.	Michener
Butler	Esch	Johnson, Wash.	Minahan, N. J.
Byrnes, S. C.	Evans, Mont.	Johnston, N. Y.	Mondell
Byrnes, Tenn.	Evans, Nebr.	Jones, Pa.	Moon
Caldwell	Fairfield	Jones, Tex.	Moore, Ohio
Campbell, Kans.	Fess	Juul	Moore, Pa.
Campbell, Pa.	Fitzgerald	Kearns	Moores, Ind.
Cannon	Flood	Kendall	Mott
Cantrill	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Murphy
Caraway	Fordney	Kincheloe	Neely
Carss	Foster	King	Nelson, Mo.
Carter	Frear	Kinkaid	Nelson, Wis.
Casey	French	Kitchin	Newton, Minn.
Chindblom	Fuller, Ill.	Klecza	Newton, Mo.
Christopherson	Gallagher	Knutson	Nichols, S. C.
Clark, Mo.	Gallivan	LaGuardia	
	Gandy	Lampert	

Nolan	Rhodes	Snell	Ward
O'Connell	Ricketts	Snyder	Wason
Ogden	Riddick	Stagall	Watkins
Oldfield	Riordan	Stedman	Watson, Pa.
Oliver	Robison, Ky.	Steele	Watson, Va.
Olney	Rodenberg	Stephens, Ohio	Weaver
Osborne	Rogers	Stiness	Webb
Overstreet	Romjue	Strong, Kans.	Webster
Padgett	Rose	Strong, Pa.	Wellington
Page	Rouse	Summers, Wash.	Welty
Park	Rowe	Sweet	Whaley
Parker	Rubey	Taylor, Ark.	Wheeler
Parrish	Rucker	Taylor, Colo.	White, Kans.
Platt	Sabath	Taylor, Tenn.	White, Me.
Pou	Sanders, Ind.	Thomas	Williams
Purnell	Sanders, La.	Thompson, Okla.	Wilson, Ill.
Quin	Sanders, N. Y.	Tillman	Wilson, La.
Radcliffe	Scott	Timberlake	Wilson, Pa.
Ragsdale	Sears	Tincher	Wingo
Rainey, H. T.	Sells	Tinkham	Winslow
Rainey, J. W.	Shreve	Towner	Wise
Raker	Sims	Treadway	Wood, Ind.
Ramsey	Sinclair	Upshaw	Woodyard
Ramseyer	Sinnott	Vaile	Wright
Randall, Calif.	Sisson	Vare	Yates
Randall, Wis.	Slomp	Venable	Young, N. Dak.
Rayburn	Small	Vestal	Young, Tex.
Reavis	Smith, Idaho	Vinson	Zihlman
Reber	Smith, Mich.	Voigt	
Reed, N. Y.	Smith, N. Y.	Volstead	
Reed, W. Va.	Smithwick	Walsh	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Blackmon

NOT VOTING—87.

Anthony	Gould	Kettner	Phelan
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Kless	Porter
Brumbaugh	Green, Iowa	Kraus	Robinson, N. C.
Burke	Griffin	Kreider	Rowan
Carew	Hamill	Larsen	Sanford
Clark, Fla.	Harrison	Lehbach	Saunders, Va.
Crowther	Hastings	McClintic	Schall
Davey	Haugen	McFadden	Scully
Dempsey	Hicks	McKenzie	Sherwood
Dent	Hill	McKeown	Siegel
Dooling	Howard	McKinley	Smith, Ill.
Doughton	Hull, Iowa	McPherson	Steenerson
Eagan	Humphreys	Mann	Stephens, Miss.
Ellsworth	Husted	Miller	Stevenson
Evans, Nev.	Hutchinson	Monahan, Wis.	Sullivan
Ferris	Ireland	Montague	Summers, Tex.
Fields	James	Mooney	Temple
Fisher	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Va.	Thompson, Ohio
Freeman	Kahn	Morin	Tilson
Fuller, Mass.	Kelley, Mich.	Mudd	Walters
Goldfogle	Kelly, Pa.	Pell	Woods, Va.
Goodwin, Ark.	Kennedy, R. I.	Peters	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. FISHER.

Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. CLARK of Florida.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. DAVEY.

Mr. LEHNBACH with Mr. MCCLINTIC.

Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. PELL.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. WOODS of Virginia.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. MILLER. I was present.

The SPEAKER. That is not sufficient.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4226), being the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 4226, the District appropriation bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] if we can not agree upon time for general debate?

Mr. BUCHANAN. What suggestion has the gentleman to make? How much time will your side require?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. So far as I am concerned, I do not care to use more than 30 minutes. I would suggest that we limit the debate to 40 minutes on a side, unless the gentleman has a lot of requests for time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Let us say 45 minutes on a side, with this understanding, that if no contest is made upon the half-and-half plan it will be limited to 45 minutes on a side, but if there is a contest I think we can agree to time on that subject alone.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Make it 40 minutes on a side, and I will agree to the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. BUCHANAN. All right. Let it go.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] to control half the time and I the other half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 80 minutes, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Texas. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, is it proposed at the conclusion of that time to begin the reading of the bill to-day?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is my desire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4226, the District appropriation bill, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, in response to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], concerning the present status of the Federal road act, I desire to submit a communication from the department, which gives the information, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, while the subject is still fresh in our minds, I desire to advert to the resolution just passed by the House, and particularly to the speech made by my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. Gentlemen will recall that that side of the House voted unanimously against ordering the previous question, on the ground that they had not received fair treatment in that they were allowed only 5 out of 15 members on this committee; in other words, they contend that with committees, particularly investigating committees, the proportion for the majority should be less than 2 to 1.

Since listening, profoundly moved as I was, by the affecting character of that speech, I have procured a copy of the Congressional Directory of the Sixty-third Congress, that being the first time that the Democratic Party had had for many years an opportunity to impress their policies upon the country and who were then in complete control of this House. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] said that there was no precedent in the history of this House for giving the minority on any committee which had investigating powers as low as one out of two. I will proceed to read certain committee lists to test his statement.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And he was addressing himself particularly to the new Members.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He was appearing in the character of a good old uncle.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman evidently has my statement confused with the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Oh, no. The gentleman from Tennessee made this positive statement. He said: "Treat us at least fairly; let there be some semblance of decency; give us more than one out of every two, because there is no precedent in history for less."

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will allow me, I will read the list of one of these committees.

I read at random from one of the various investigating committees as formed by the Sixty-third Congress, when the Democratic side was in power:

The Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department: James M. Graham, of Illinois; Oscar Callaway, of Texas; Joseph A. Goulden, of New York; Dudley M. Hughes, of Georgia; Tom Stout, of Montana.

Count them; five Democrats. I now read the names of the other members:

Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming; Charles H. Burke, of South Dakota.

Count them, my friends; two Republicans. In other words, when the Democratic Party had assumed control of the affairs of this House, instead of giving the Republicans a better deal than we are giving the Democrats now, they gave us only two out of seven. The proportion was two and one-half to one, instead of two to one.

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will in a moment. Let me read another:

The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department—

That is the kind of committee we have just formed—a Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. I read:

John A. M. Adair, of Indiana; Hannibal L. Godwin, of North Carolina; John J. Eagan, of New Jersey; Peter J. Doelling, of New York; Frank L. Dershem, of Pennsylvania.

Five. On the Republican side of the committee:

Ernest W. Roberts, of Massachusetts.

One. They were kind enough to give us one out of six on that committee. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, gentlemen, I am not going to debate the question whether it would have been better or not to have given the minority a larger proportion, though it seems to me very patent that in a committee of 15, where there are to be five separate subcommittees, it is the only proportion which would be fair to both sides of the House. But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] says that we have been unfair; that we have been indecent. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

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

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman from Minnesota give me two minutes more?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield the gentleman two minutes more. That is all I can give.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He accuses us of indecency in this matter. I am sure my friend from Tennessee did not have in mind, when he made that attack on this side of the House, the treatment that we received—without complaint, I assume, because I did not happen to be a Member of that Congress myself—without complaint, the proportion of only one out of two and one-half. As a matter of fact, if we had followed the precedent set by the party that is now in the minority, which was then in a majority for the first time in many years, the proportion of this committee would have been as 11 to 4.

In other words, gentlemen, we have not only treated you fairly, but we have treated you much more fairly than you treated us. My friend from Tennessee may shed tears, if he likes, in addressing this House, but I beg of him not to shed "crocodile tears." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] for 40 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it came as a very great surprise to me that any gentleman on that side should care to reopen an issue which has just been so shamefully settled. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the remarks which I made, referring to investigating committees, I referred to special investigating committees. I did not refer to the standing committees of the House. We have made no complaint as to the assignments given us upon the standing committees of the House. Those were accepted without protest. I think myself that the arrangement was as fair as it could have been made. What I complained of was the assignment upon this special committee. The able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], however, has seen fit to call attention to the five-and-two proposition in the Sixty-third Congress. In that Congress the Democratic Party had a majority of about 143. In this Congress the Republicans have a majority of about 41. And yet we gave you upon the standing Committee on Expenditures at that time the same proportion, notwithstanding our majority of 143, that you have given us at this time with your majority of only 41. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

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

Mr. GARRETT. In just a moment I will try to. Now, in view of the fact that this matter has been reopened, and as I see the honored Speaker of the House leaving the Chamber, I desire to make an appeal to him. I stated in the course of my remarks that I supposed the Speaker would carry out the plans that had been formulated by his party's steering committee, but upon reflection I think I was mistaken and that I did the Speaker a grave injustice in that respect. Notwithstanding this resolution which has been forced upon the Speaker of this House, notwithstanding the program which has been laid down by the steering committee of the majority side, that there shall be 10 to 5, I yet have—and that is my only remaining hope—an abiding faith that the Speaker of this House will, fair as he is, disregard the recommendation of his party's steering committee and do us the decent justice that ought to be done when it comes to appointing this committee. [Applause on the Democratic side.] With that expression, Mr. Chairman, of the confidence I have in the fairness and the justice of the Speaker of this House, who now remains our only hope for justice, the episode, so far as I am concerned, is closed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee yields back the remainder of his time, two minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 33 minutes left.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I wish the Chair would call my attention to the fact when I have spoken 20 minutes, if I succeed in speaking that long.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will try to do so.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I feel as though an armistice relative to the recent heated discussion at least has been signed; not that the war is over, but that an armistice has been signed.

Now, I want to call attention to something that you are all interested in, because you represent all parts of this country. The bill that I am going to present to you pertains particularly to the Capital of the Nation—your Capital—and if you discover any politics in it, any partisanship on the part of any member of the committee presenting it—and I am a part of that—I wish you would point it out. We have endeavored here to proceed in an economical way, not because of past extravagance, but because we want to do justice to the people of this District, the city of Washington, and the people of the United States. I want to make an illustration, a comparison. Your subcommittee is composed of five members.

Having been connected with municipalities before I came to Congress, I can not help thinking that your subcommittee really are aldermen of the city of Washington. Now, if this were Cleveland, Detroit, Minneapolis, St. Louis, or some other city of that size, perhaps your five aldermen here could get along pretty well, provided we had six months or a year's time in which to investigate all these matters; but we have not that time, and this is not Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, or any other city of similar size. This is Washington, the Capital of the Nation. And I want to tell you the more you study it the more you will be surprised to find the complexity of the conditions which confront your little board of aldermen.

In the ordinary city the taxgatherer collects the money, the board of aldermen distribute it, and it is all audited by one office. Not so in Washington. I am not condemning the system, I am merely stating to you a fact. I will give you a few illustrations to show you the complexity and the trouble that your subcommittee have to contend with. Appropriations for the District of Columbia are carried in the District bill proper, which I now present to you. Large sums are carried in the sundry civil bill. Large sums are carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill, and the deficiency bills always carry appropriations for the District of Columbia. The funds for park maintenance are carried in the sundry civil bill and are expended by the Chief of Engineers of the Army. That is only one instance. To keep track of all these different things, first, where do we get the money for a particular purpose; next, how is it disposed of and under whose guidance—these are some of the complications.

The funds for the water department are carried in the District bill, but are expended partly by the District Commissioners and partly by the Chief of Engineers of the Army. Those things all have to be watched, audited, and looked after, and your little board of aldermen of five men have got to straighten out all those things and explain to 435 Members why it is so, and all about it.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not want to bother the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I shall not consider it any bother. I shall be glad to answer any question, if I can.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if all the park police force under the direction of the Army are not paid out of the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; they are not. We pay a part of them and the Federal Government pays another part.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not think we paid any part.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am informed by the clerk of the Committee on Appropriations that we do.

Mr. SISSON. If the gentleman will yield—

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SISSON. At the beginning of the war the police force was very greatly reduced, and a certain number of men were detailed from the Army on police duty, and they were paid out of the police fund. Of course, this committee had nothing to do with that, because they were regularly appointed as policemen for the District of Columbia. They were detailed as policemen, and they were in their uniforms. How many there were I do not know.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think that is correct. I will just give you briefly a few other illustrations. Mind you, I am not criticizing this thing. I am simply showing the obstacles and confusion that your committee have to contend with, both in the appropriations and the settlement.

The Zoological Park, with an annual appropriation of \$115,000, is under the Smithsonian Institution. There is a small appropriation for the burial of indigent soldiers, which is under the War Department.

The public buildings and grounds, care and maintenance of parks, and so forth, are under the War Department. Rock Creek Park and Potomac Parkway are under a commission. The Aqueduct Bridge is under the War Department. Columbia Hospital is under a board of trustees. The salaries and expenses of the office of public buildings and grounds are under the War Department. The \$240 bonus to employees is carried in the District bill, but we did not inaugurate it. The refunding of taxes, an indefinite sum, is in the District bill.

I simply cite these things to you to show you that this is different from any other city in the country, and that in order to comprehend it fully much time should be consumed in investigating it.

Now, as to the present bill. The last appropriation bill, for 1919, including deficiencies, amounted to \$15,451,318.66. The bill under consideration carries \$14,782,981. The bill which failed of passage carried \$14,093,701. You must bear in mind that we spent a good deal of time here in the last session in the consideration of a District of Columbia appropriation bill, which passed the House but failed to become a law, owing to the fact that the Sixty-fifth Congress expired on the 4th of March. That bill carried \$689,280 less than the present bill. In this bill we have not come up to the estimates of the commissioners, and we have not come up to the estimates of the War Department. We have not given them all that they asked for, but we have done pretty well, I think. We have given them within about \$800,000 of what they requested.

Gentlemen, owing to the failure of the passage of the last bill I really think the District of Columbia suffered more inconvenience, considering the amount involved, than almost any other branch of our Government. The bill failed of passage, and it left things in a very disordered state in the District of Columbia. So, in order to expedite the passage of this bill, your committee virtually took the old bill, which failed of passage the last time, and called it the foundation of this bill. It is true we raised some salaries. We raised the salaries of teachers. We put on some new employment; but the bill passed the scrutiny of this House, and it carried \$14,782,981. Now, we have taken that as the foundation, so to speak, or the nucleus, of the present bill, and we have added a little over \$600,000 to it. We were then in war. At least, hostilities had only been partially suspended. We felt a little cramped for funds. We did not go on with many improvements. In other words, I choose to style the old bill which failed of passage simply a maintenance bill. Consider that remark, gentlemen. In other words, instead of being a bill to add new improvements or to go ahead with new and needed construction, it was simply to maintain the things that we had.

Therefore, I call the old bill which failed of passage the maintenance bill. We have taken that bill and added \$600,000 or \$800,000 to it in the matter of new construction that the District of Columbia very much needs.

Take the item of streets, which I think is the largest. The old bill carried no appropriation whatever, not a single dollar, for the improvement or opening of new streets in the entire District of Columbia. We simply tried to maintain those we already had as best we could, and provided for no new construction whatever. The present bill, owing to a change in conditions, for new work on streets has added to it \$282,300. We have added a partial and moderate amount to what the District Commissioners have asked for in the estimate. I am frank to say that in the last old bill while the commissioners made an estimate of improvements desired, still they said that "we think it would not be advisable to go into new projects if you will properly maintain the old ones." So we did so, but now we have added a reasonable and moderate sum of \$282,300 for the advancement of new work on about 20 different highways in the District of Columbia.

We have also put into the bill what is called a consolidation of the improvement of new streets. Heretofore in District improvements in the old city of Washington the appropriations have been made in a lump sum, and by reference simply to certain streets on the back of the estimates. While the improvement of suburban roads have been made by appropriations carried in detail on the face of each bill, in this bill the committee recommends carrying one item for street improvement, and it will have the effect of presenting to Congress on the face of the appropriation bill every street that is to be paved or repaved during the ensuing year. So that the entire Congress can pick up the bill and pick out streets we are going to improve and the amount we are going to pay therefor in each case. Whether that is an improvement it is for the Congress to determine. I think it is.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Does this committee give any serious attention to the matter of street cleaning and the removal of garbage?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will come to that in a few minutes. I will say that we do, and for street cleaning we appropriate a large sum of money in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I was going to call the gentleman's attention, and through him the committee's attention, to the fact that it frequently happens that those charged with the responsibility of removing the garbage pay no attention to it, and that the property owners are required to go without having the garbage removed, and are subjected to the stench that ensues from a failure to carry it away. It happens, in many instances, that the men who are employed to take the garbage away refuse to do it unless somebody pays them extra for doing it. It seems to me that there ought to be some method devised by which regularity of action would follow the appropriation in the matter of removal of garbage, and that the people who pay the taxes would not be imposed upon by the contractor or employees and be required to pay additional money for the work that ought to be done and paid for out of the appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have had a little difficulty on the garbage question. The contractors were not able to comply with the contract. We have taken over the garbage plant at Cherry Hill, bought it, and paid \$85,000 for it, improved it to the amount of \$35,000, and we are virtually running our own garbage proposition. We have been obliged to do so, but I think we are doing it cheaper than we did under the old system.

Mr. MADDEN. That is supposed to be a garbage-reduction plant. Of course, the garbage must be gotten to the plant before it can be reduced. The thing I am complaining of is that the garbage is not moved from the premises, and that the people have to pay these men for doing the work that Congress appropriates the money to pay for.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I hope that the gentleman is not censuring the Commissioners of the District.

Mr. MADDEN. No; I am calling attention of the committee to the matter so that the committee may make inquiry into it and remedy it.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. I will state to my friend that some time back there was a good deal of complaint about the garbage. That came to our attention and we called the attention of the District Commissioners to it, and they stated that they had had a great deal of complaint. Legislation went into the bill year before last and the money was appropriated, and we find that there has been very much less complaint since. The difficulty has been to get labor to do this work. I do not think the gentleman will find that the complaints will continue now that we are getting labor enough.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may be permitted to say, my next complaint is that after having called up those who are supposed to be in supreme authority at the District Building you get a man on the telephone who states that you want to communicate with some one else, and tries to switch you off onto somebody else. You can not find the somebody else, and finally, when you have tried five or six, they switch you back to the first man and he tells you that he has not the time to talk to you about it. It seems to me that there is something radically wrong at headquarters where they do the executive work. It makes no difference how many men you employ to do a thing if the man at the head pays no attention to complaints and fails to see that you get it done.

Mr. Sisson. How recent has this complaint been?

Mr. MADDEN. Every day.

Mr. Sisson. I am inclined to believe the gentleman has just been troubled a little and it worries him to the extent that he makes it every day.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not worry me at all. I was simply telling the facts as I found them. Of course, I believe that if we call the matter to the attention of this committee, they will be able to call it to the attention of the people who were complained about.

Mr. Sisson. I was just thinking perhaps the gentleman had heard some of the old complaints that came to us in large numbers some time ago. We have not heard complaints lately.

Mr. MADDEN. I am only complaining about things that I know myself.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I think I can settle this difficulty. You have a subcommittee now, a little board of aldermen, that is going to investigate the garbage question thoroughly, and I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will be satisfied with the next bill that is reported and with all that comes in between that time and now, because we are going to watch that.

I am going to make my remarks a little shorter than I intended. Let us take the question of repairs on streets. As I say, this is a constructive bill. Under the previous bill repairs on streets contained an item for only \$375,000. The commissioners, however, this time recommend \$675,000. We went as far as we thought we could under all the conditions, and we have allowed them \$500,000 for repairs to streets, because I believe the streets of Washington ought to be kept in good repair.

Sewers—there is but one item, and it is new—\$40,000. There has been a great deal of talk about what is called the upper Potomac interceptor. It is a proposition that will cost about \$40,000. When that is completed the function of that interceptor will be to collect the Georgetown sewage, now discharged into the Potomac River, and carry it into the regular sewerage system of the city. Hence there will be no further complaint about the water in the Potomac being impure and unhealthy. That little \$40,000 item, I think, is going to be pretty well expended.

In the last bill we could not give a single dollar—we did not feel as though we could—with which to build any permanent school buildings. We therefore gave you 60 little portable schools, emergency propositions; but we determined then that when the war was over and peace was declared we would attempt to rebuild or add some permanent additions to our school buildings, so we have taken up four school buildings that we think are most essential at this time. There is the Petworth School, where the limit of cost is \$130,000. There has already been appropriated on that school \$87,000, and we have added in this bill \$20,000 additional. Unless that is done, virtually we will have to stop doing things at the Petworth School.

At the Burrville School the limit of cost is \$60,000. Forty thousand dollars has already been appropriated, and they must have \$10,000 more right now in order to continue the building at all.

At the Monroe School the limit of cost is \$130,000. Ninety thousand dollars has been appropriated, and we give them \$20,000 more. Perhaps we were a little bit niggardly—

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

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the committee know anything about what percentage of children of school age are required to attend school only for half a day?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I could not tell the gentleman. We did not have any hearings on that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems that we are not giving the District school facilities enough, and that instead of giving the amount required for the completion of the schools, to a partial amount of the limit of cost, you ought to allow the full cost and have the schools completed.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have given exactly what the commissioners said they wanted for those four school buildings.

Mr. MADDEN. Very well; then you ought to build some more schools.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We are going to. There are 16 or 17 in contemplation; but we can not build them just now, at least the commissioners do not think it advisable, and we have taken these four buildings at their own figures.

Mr. MADDEN. There is money in the Treasury to the amount of \$5,000,000. Why not take that and build some school buildings and give the children a chance to go to school?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I am afraid that the gentleman is now talking about the financial system of the District.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Can the gentleman tell us how much has been appropriated to build different schools with a limit of cost so low that it is impossible under present conditions to complete them?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think there are 16 or 17.

Mr. MAPES. Does not the gentleman think that the committee in making these appropriations originally and fixing the limit of cost below what is advisable under present conditions either was in error or else the committee now ought to increase the limit of cost so that the buildings can be constructed?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They ought to and they will, but when the limit of cost was fixed material was not as high as it is now.

Mr. MAPES. But if the buildings were needed at that time, they are much more needed now, with the greatly increased population in the District, and ought not the committee to change the limit of cost so that they can construct these buildings?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have \$0 portable school buildings to take care of that situation.

Mr. MAPES. But they are not used. Answering the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], I can say that in some of the schools, to my personal knowledge, all of the pupils up to and including the fourth grade are prevented from going to school more than one-half day because of the lack of school facilities.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman realize that under the provisions of this bill the men who take up the ashes and the garbage and the trash of the District draw a great deal more money than do the several hundred school-teachers who are teaching the school children of this District?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I realize that to a certain extent, but I realize some of the men who have been taking up ashes have lost about \$60,000 this year.

Mr. BLANTON. I am talking about the laborers who actually take them up, who are receiving more money than good school-teachers who are teaching the children in this District.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I agree with the gentleman in this, and I am glad to say we raised the school-teachers—

Mr. BLANTON. I want to raise them as high as I can.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The blue sky is a little too much for me. I want to raise the school-teachers, and we have raised them a little bit in here, and if the gentleman does not make the point of order it will go through.

Mr. BLANTON. It is so little.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Well, I do not know. The poorest paid school-teacher under this bill, if it becomes a law, will be \$1,040 per school year.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. PLATT. Has it not been the settled policy of the Washington schools for quite a number of years not to require the little children of the first and second grades to go to school more than half a day? I know it was five or six years ago, and I think it is good policy.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I can not tell; we have had no hearings upon that at all. I think the old bill and this bill together contain between 40 and 50 new employments, and we have raised the salary of a few people in the old and new bill, but very little in this particular bill. I speak of the old bill as the one that my colleague [Mr. Sisson] and myself worked to get through the House last year, but which failed in the Senate. Now, we come to the question of salaries that my friend speaks of. This bill contains the following: Four hundred and ninety-eight school-teachers in class 4. The basic salary, according to this bill, is \$850 each, which added to the \$240 bonus makes \$1,090. Five hundred and forty-three in class 3. The basic salary under this bill is \$800. Add the \$240 to that and you have \$1,040. Three hundred and sixty-four in class 2. The

basic salary under this bill is \$800, nothing below that, all \$800, and adding the \$240 to it makes \$1,040. Ninety in class I. Eight hundred dollars basic salary; in other words, this bill raises the small-grade teachers—1,495 of them—that is, the kindergarten and low grades, those who were a few years ago getting \$540. If this bill passes, the lowest one will get \$1,040. In other words, we add \$78,750 to the salaries of these low-grade teachers.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will allow me, of course it does not add this \$240.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is true, but they get the \$240 bonus.

Mr. MADDEN. To the low-grade teachers. The act gives the \$240 bonus to everybody in Government service receiving less than a certain salary.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I understand that very well. I am simply saying, in reference to the low-grade teachers not being paid very much, what they actually got out of the Treasury, and \$1,040 is the lowest.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman know every clerk almost who has entered the Government service during the recent war has entered on a salary of at least \$1,000 plus this bonus?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I know that very well, indeed, and the matter has been discussed and considered, and I will tell the gentleman this: They say—and it is not my argument—that they work six days in the week, and the little school-teacher, they say, works only five days—

Mr. BLANTON. Works seven.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. They say that; I do not say that.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. I would like to know what is to become of the schools if we can not find a reconciliation between the salaries of men and women who do not need to prepare to do the work and get higher salaries than the teachers who spend much time to prepare after this expenditure?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will tell the gentleman what I think will be the result: Many, many, many of them will retire from teaching and go off to do other work.

Mr. FESS. What will become of the schools? [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman know, without asking me—he is one of the best educators in the country—does not the gentleman know what the result will be?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend I feel—

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I agree before the gentleman answers.

Mr. FESS. I feel sure the gentleman is struck with the proposition I have in mind, and I ask this question seriously: With the scale of prices now ranging, what is to become of the class of men or women who want to go into school work and must spend a lot of time to get ready when other people who do not need to spend any time to get ready for the work get much higher rates than they do?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Of course, that is true, especially this new class of clerks that come under the war-work system. The teacher is partly cared for under the longevity system. Under the longevity system the school-teacher's salary keeps increasing every year, and therefore it is an inducement to hold him or her to the job. It is a good deal like the young man graduating from Annapolis. Every year he gets a foggy increase of salary, and by the time he is about 62 years old he is retired at \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year for the remainder of his life. The longevity system has a tendency to induce the teachers to remain. The prospect which longevity pay holds out to them in my humble belief will keep many, many of them on the job.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will yield.

Mr. MAPES. Under this longevity system what is the minimum the primary teacher will receive?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. For the primary teacher it is about \$1,040, with the bonus.

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

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Minnesota desires additional time—

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I would like to have three or four minutes.

Mr. Sisson. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five minutes additional, with five minutes additional on this side. I want to say this in justice—

Mr. WALSH. You can not do that in committee after the time has been agreed upon.

Mr. Sisson. That is true, but if nobody raises objection right now we can.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. If my friend from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] will give me, say, about two minutes, that will be all I want.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Ordinarily, my friends, I am against riders on appropriation bills; in fact, almost universally against them. Now, there are one or two little riders on this bill. We have in here a provision that the Commissioners of the District when they purchase automobiles or office furniture and supplies shall be authorized to purchase them from the general supply committee of the Army, and so forth. You have heard of that. In all the other branches of the Government there is a law which authorizes that to be done. The District of Columbia is the exception. Now, that is new legislation. Any man here can make a point of order on it. But we trust that you will not leave the District of Columbia out in the cold and simply say, technically speaking, that a point of order lies and that you will knock it out. We have added this in order to make it absolutely safe:

Provided, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office material, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

In other words, we do not want to conflict with the Executive order of the administration in passing this legislation. We thought we would like to be very safe on the proposition. I do not believe any man here, when there are some automobiles and desks to be supplied, would object to them buying them from that supply bureau when they can buy them cheaper there than at any other place. But it is new legislation. If you want to knock it out on a point of order, all right.

And there are one or two other pieces of legislation like that. Now, the committee is in a hurry, because the officials of the District of Columbia, the departments here, need to have this bill passed.

And there is a great big question called the "half and half."

I am not going to discuss it at this time. A portion of the House think one way and many others disagree with them. If anybody is going to raise that question now and spend half a day or a day on it, you are at liberty to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to go into the details of this bill, but in explanation of the money appropriated in the bill which failed, for street improvement, it is fair to state that we did reappropriate all the money which had been carried in the previous bill, not a dollar of which had been expended in new streets, not because, in many instances, the new streets and the new pavements were not needed but because by order of the War Material Board of the Army the District of Columbia, like all other cities situated like the District of Columbia is situated, was not permitted to get any material of any kind, and, in addition to that, they were not permitted to get labor. So while the money was available for that use the District Commissioners could not use it. The war conditions at that time were such that when this bill was made up the subcommittee agreed unanimously with the commissioners in their recommendations simply to reappropriate all the money that had heretofore been appropriated for those purposes, and that was done.

Now, they have either used, or have contracted to be used, practically all of the reappropriated money; that is to say, the current law carries the money, and they are authorized to spend and contract up to the 1st day of July. That has been done.

Now, your committee gave to the District Commissioners some \$350,000 for new work, which means that within 12 months there will be infinitely more money expended on the streets and more streets improved within the same length of time than in any other period in the history of the District of Columbia, so far as my knowledge goes. But that was due to the fact that in

these days now, the closing days of this year, they are letting the contracts for the streets under the current law. So, as a matter of fact, while on its face the bill does not carry quite as much for streets annually as is usually carried, it is carrying at least 33½ per cent more for streets actually in one year than has ever been carried heretofore.

I want to say also just a word about the school-teachers' salaries. The current law for the first time increased the base pay of school-teachers. The lowest-paid school-teacher was \$500. That is what is known as the longevity law, and before any Member of Congress will be able to understand anything about the longevity law he will have to go back to the act which was passed many years ago to ascertain just exactly its provisions and as to the classification of teachers. Last year we raised the base pay of teachers from \$500, which was the lowest, to \$750. We eliminated the three lower grades and put all four grades on the \$750 basis. Now, this does not mean that \$750 is the salary of the school-teachers, because every year that they teach a certain sum is added to that amount. But, gentlemen of the committee, under the current law the lowest pay that a teacher gets on entering any department of the school work is \$870. That, plus the \$120 now carried and the \$120 bonus, makes \$240, and the lowest-paid teacher will now enter school at this next session getting \$1,140 on entrance.

Mr. SHREVE. Will the gentleman yield just at that point?

Mr. Sisson. I will yield only for a question, as I have but 10 minutes.

Mr. SHREVE. What is the pay of the teachers of the high schools?

Mr. Sisson. The salaries of the teachers of the high schools are also graded, and they also have longevity.

Mr. SHREVE. What amount will they draw this year?

Mr. Sisson. Class G-B, I think, is that of the high-school teachers. They get \$2,020, and then the extra \$120 bonus, which makes \$2,140.

Mr. SHREVE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Sisson. Now, I had heard so much complaint about the salaries of the school-teachers in the District of Columbia that I wrote to the schools of all of the cities of over 100,000 inhabitants in the United States, and I got from them reports as to the salaries which they paid, and with the longevity pay carried under the longevity law, together with the \$250 raise which we gave last year, plus the \$240 bonus this year, the base pay of the teachers of the District of Columbia is higher than that of nearly all of the cities of the United States, and there is only one city which for several years has paid as much, and that is the city of Boston. The city of Philadelphia last year, beginning this session, raised their base pay to about the Boston standard.

Now, those are the cities whose salaries are comparable with those of the District of Columbia. Therefore I am not willing that the statement shall go unchallenged here that the school-teachers of the District of Columbia have not been treated fairly by your present subcommittee, because if you will compare the salaries paid the District of Columbia teachers with those paid in the cities where the inhabitants themselves voluntarily vote the tax, you will find that the District of Columbia is in advance of nearly all the cities, and, with the exception of the city of Boston and the city of Philadelphia, is slightly above those of Cleveland and Detroit, which also pay good salaries.

Now, your subcommittee did not feel warranted in increasing the salaries, because a teacher goes in in many cities with what they call a probation period. Here they go on at \$1,040; the next year they get \$1,090, and so on for 10 years, gradually increasing each year that they remain in the service, and then when they go from the lower grades to the higher class—we call them "grades"—they do not lose that longevity, but the longevity which they have earned is added to the base pay of the next higher grade which they enter. It is, therefore, a most difficult problem for your subcommittee to tell how much money is needed to take care of what is called longevity pay. The school authorities and the Board of Education make the best estimates they can. But if a school-teacher dies or leaves the service and a new teacher comes in, that makes the longevity pay a little bit less than it would be otherwise, because the first school-teachers do not get longevity pay. It amounts, in round numbers, to something like \$575,000, so that you can take a \$500,000 fund and divide it up among the school-teachers in accordance with their longevity. Therefore this complaint on the part of the school-teachers in regard to being underpaid heretofore may be a just one; but if it is a just one, it is a criticism of the entire school system of America and is not local here in Washington, because we are along with Boston

and Philadelphia, and in Philadelphia they did not pay the increased rate until last year, when they had a reorganization and a reclassification.

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

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. VARE. Is it not a fact that a beginner at \$1,040 in the District of Columbia receives a salary larger than any beginner elsewhere?

Mr. Sisson. That is true. Counting the bonus of \$240 this year, they get even a higher salary than in Boston or Philadelphia. But I am speaking of what was carried in the current law by the committee. We put it right up to the top notch. For that reason I felt that school-teachers' salaries were reasonable, and I shall not raise any complaint. But I do not believe that the raise which the subcommittee and the full committee put into this bill, as compared with the current law, was justified as compared with other similar salaries paid elsewhere throughout the United States.

Now, I want to say one word with reference to school buildings.

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

Mr. Sisson. I wanted just two minutes to explain the school-building items, but I can do that under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have impatiently waited up to this time, after nearly 30 hours have elapsed, for some older and abler Member of this House to properly denounce one of the most atrocious and dastardly crimes that has ever been attempted in this Republic. I have waited for weeks, hoping that some older Member of this Congress would take the floor and properly denounce the dastardly attack that several weeks ago was made upon that former little giant of this House, our lamented Hon. John L. Burnett, of Alabama, who probably would be among us now, giving us his good advice and counsel, had it not been for the probable shock caused by the deadly, dastardly, cowardly anarchist bomb that was sent into his household at the time so many others were sent through the United States mail from one side of the United States to the other.

Time and again on the floor of this House recently I have warned this Congress of the fact that there were harbored under this Government, by groups of men in organizations, these vicious anarchistic tendencies. I noticed in the papers a denial immediately on behalf of the organizations to which I referred, denying that they had any connection with deadly bombs placed on the front doorstep of a Cabinet officer of the United States in the dead hour of night. Would you expect a murderer to admit his crime?

I realize, when I call attention to the fact that these organizations harbor such things, there are thousands of good men, loyal and patriotic citizens of this country—even Members of Congress, loyal and big men they are—who are members of organized labor unions of this land, and who do not approve of such actions. But I have warned this Congress heretofore that, no matter how many good men there are in unions, the fact remains to-day that it is in the unions of this country, it is among organized labor in this country, that anarchists find harbor and succor and protection.

I call attention to the warning I gave this Congress May 23, 1919, published in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, wherein I recited the partial war record of labor unions, and facts clearly demonstrating that they were dominated by the radical and vicious element, and wherein I challenged Mr. Samuel Gompers and the American Federation of Labor to disprove any of such statements, to wit:

"Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, when my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] stated that thousands of our soldiers have been held idle in the camps of this country solely because officers afraid of losing their jobs refused to discharge many worthy cases I agreed with him as far as he went, but suggested another reason why they have been held, to wit, that in Texas and elsewhere Mr. Samuel Gompers, the president and master of the American Federation of Labor, stated that he and organized labor would never stand for war-time wage schedules

to be reduced one cent, and that Mr. Gompers's opposition to speedy demobilization had greatly influenced the holding of the boys in the camps of this country.

"In the closing hours of the Sixty-fifth Congress I called attention to the fact that our labor unions had permitted Socialism and Bolshevism to dominate and use them as cat's paws, and, regardless of how much and often he preached to the contrary, Mr. Gompers allowed such domination to prevail, and has not purged such organizations of such viciousness. I further called attention to the fact of organized labor's partial war record, and stated that the time had come when Congress must decide whether this Government is to be run in the interests equally of the 110,000,000 people of this Republic or whether it is to be selfishly run by Mr. Gompers in the class interest of the 3,000,000 members of labor unions.

"In a speech in Texas I repeated such statements, following which, in a published interview, Mr. Gompers, without a single denial, stated: 'That I confessed an utter incapacity of understanding the plainest proposition of right, justice, freedom, and democracy.'

"Comparing Mr. Gompers's democracy with my own, he represents only 3,000,000 people, whose union slogan is 'For ourselves only,' while I have deeply at heart the welfare and interests equally not only of Mr. Gompers's men but also of the other 107,000,000 people of the United States of America.

"The Dallas Central Labor Council, the crafts at Cleburne, Tex., and others have tried to excuse this war record by partial denials, and by calling attention to the fact that some members of unions loyally served in France, and wanting to know where I was, and then asserting that I was busy attending banquets and theater parties.

"Union members who during the war profited by raids on the Public Treasury can not hide now behind the patriotism of member-soldiers or excuse themselves by beclouding the record. The issue is too vital. The record must be kept straight.

"I represent no interests other than the welfare of my constituents generally, and have never received one penny contribution, campaign or otherwise, from any source. I have many unions in my district, in the cities of Abilene, Baird, Sweetwater, Ballinger, Coleman, Cisco, Ranger, Eastland, Strawn, Mineral Wells, Comanche, Brownwood, Lampasas, Llano, San Saba, Brady, and other places. Nevertheless I have lately paid out of my own pocket nearly a thousand dollars for printing, addressing, and mailing to them these criticisms.

"Raised on a farm, having delivered groceries in the back door of practically every home in Austin, and by keeping books at night earning every dollar expended for five years' training at my State university, I could not be unfriendly to laborers. I heartily favor lawful unions. I heartily favor the labor principles in the peace treaty, namely: 'Labor is no commodity; association for lawful purposes; adequate wage; 8-hour day and 48-hour week; 1 rest day; abolition of child labor; equal pay for men and women doing work of equal value; equitable economic treatment; and female inspectors.' No fair-minded person would demand less or would demand more.

"Any system is vicious that destroys individual competitive efficiency and incites lazy, inefficient, indifferent service upheld by force. Every doctor, lawyer, preacher, teacher, farmer, Congressman, officer, banker, merchant, and unorganized laborer succeeds only when in honest competition he renders the most efficient service of greatest value to the public. To hold their positions and advance their incomes members of unions have ceased to rely upon individual skill and efficient service, but now collectively depend almost entirely upon Mr. Gompers, force, and anarchy. If unions will abolish strikes, picketing, boycotts, force, disregard of law, and anarchy, I will be their strongest friend, but without such reform I am against them forever and eternally. Now, to correct the record. Unions may boast they have done this or that for the war, but I challenge Mr. Gompers to disprove any of the following well-known facts:

"The Railroad Administration certifies that the raises demanded by the four great brotherhoods and granted to the railroad employees by Director McAdoo approximated \$754,811,000; that the additional raises later demanded of and granted by Director Hines approximated \$67,500,000, aggregating \$822,311,000 raises in salaries (during war) to 400,000 employees (far from trenches); that in 1917 passenger conductors received \$135 to \$165 per month, plus overtime, but with the raises they now receive an average of \$180 per month plus time and a half for all time they put in over eight hours a day and are granted one day off each week.

"Duties of a passenger conductor are not very laborious, unpleasant, or hazardous. Did not the Government require more sacrifice of the soldier to fight on foreign soil, sometimes 24

hours per day in cootie-infested trenches, knee deep in mud, for \$33 per month and keep, than it required of the passenger conductor to continue working 8 hours per day 6 days a week during the war for \$135 to \$165, plus overtime, per month? We can not forget the brotherhoods' threat to tie up every railroad in the United States while in a death struggle we were rescuing the world. No highwayman ever drew a deadlier weapon or made a deadlier threat. No wonder after throwing up his hands and delivering over the \$754,811,000 the honest statesman McAdoo resigned. We can not forget the later threat or revolution. No wonder Director Hines handed over the additional \$67,500,000. But, alas, this \$822,311,000 is paid by the unorganized bleeding public. Has our service improved over 1917? The service is good, bad, or indifferent, just as the employees will it. Employees make the service. Unions furnish the employees. If the service is good, credit unions; if bad, hold unions responsible.

"The department certifies that the raises granted to telegraph employees aggregate \$3,300,867. Telephone raises are now being determined, yet in Indiana union strikers attempted to chase poor helpless work girls off the roofs of buildings. And telegraphers are now threatening a nation-wide strike.

"While every raise granted to postal employees was justly merited, still could not the demand have waited for peace? Upon criticism being made that it takes an extra day or two longer than necessary for New York mail to reach Washington, Mr. Gompers condemned the whole Postal Service. Who performs the Postal Service? From the time such letters are posted until they are delivered they are handled by members of unions. They are collected, stamped, distributed, bagged, transported, handled, and delivered by unions. If the service is good, the unions deserve the credit. If the service is bad, the unions should be held responsible for it.

"During the war unions have forced wage schedules to a maximum of \$1.25 per hour plus time and a half for over eight hours—more than the governor of Texas receives, more than circuit judges in Texas receive. Unions accomplished this by striking 6,000 times during the war, each averaging 18 days. The armistice was signed November 11. This is May. Yet several hundred thousand soldiers have been held idle in camps without excuse. Why? Simply because Mr. Gompers threatened in Texas and elsewhere he would not permit any reduction in war-time wage schedules. With Mr. Gompers against speedy demobilization, it is easy to understand why thousands of our soldiers have been held absolutely idle in the camps of this country. He said that he and unions would not stand for any reduction. Speedy demobilization would tend to reduce. Therefore there could be no speedy demobilization without disaster to the Republic, if Mr. Gompers's threat meant anything. Yet one county in my district, Runnels, with many of its boys yet in camps, is begging for 1,000 laborers to harvest the wheat. I introduced on the day this Congress met a bill to promptly discharge from the service upon application every man physically fit whose purpose when enlisting was to serve only for the duration of the war. I hope that it will be promptly passed.

"Exclusive of all postal and railroad employees elsewhere provided for, unions demanded a blanket bonus of \$120 for each of the 240,000 Government clerks. Congress obeyed and granted the \$120 bonus, but required such clerks to work eight instead of only seven hours per day. Mr. Gompers said it was 'damnable,' although the eight-hour day was still a plank in the union platform. He demanded its veto. Unions published threats to march on the Capitol and to cripple the Government by walking out. President Wilson sized up the situation and realized that the peril menaced the whole world, hence vetoed the eight hours. These 240,000 clerks, many occupying positions vacated by soldiers and many industrially exempt, took their \$120 bonus and continued to work only seven hours. Without such bonus these clerks drew salaries up to \$2,500 per year, paid twice a month. Were unions satisfied? They later demanded a blanket \$240 bonus for the next year. Congress promptly granted it, giving to each of these 240,000 clerks a \$240 bonus, and they still work seven hours. Many receive large salaries from private concerns for work after 5 p. m. They enjoy all the pleasures of Washington, work in comfortable buildings, with ice water and electric fans, are allowed 30 days' vacation on full pay, 30 days additional on doctor's certificate with full pay, all 52 Sundays, all legal holidays, half Saturdays in summer, and all special occasions; some drive their own automobiles, wear the finest tailored clothes, and own their own homes. And they are now arranging to demand a still larger bonus when Congress meets.

"Yet on April 25, 1919, when Maj. Gêrow requested some of the clerks in the Zone Finance Division of the War Department to work a little overtime in order to more promptly mail out the

little \$60 bonus checks granted to soldiers, some of these clerks struck against their Government and walked out and ceased to function when their Government most needed their services.

"Last July Gen. Crowder said it would be unnecessary to draft boys, as he was going to make every man either work or fight. Mr. Gompers defied him, threatening that if the 'work-or-fight' order was applied to them, unions would not stand it. Gen. Crowder then requested and Congress drafted 670,000 18-year-old boys, costing millions in educational expenses alone.

"The Bolshevik Lenin threatens death to captive Americans unless we release Mooney. Unions threaten disastrous strikes if we do not comply.

"With other death threats, Lenin from Russia demands Debs's release. Our unions threaten ruinous strikes unless we comply.

"Forty-five States have ratified national prohibition. It is a part of the fundamental law of the land; yet our unions threaten a nation-wide strike against our Constitution. A majority of union members are nonusers, yet unions threaten 'no liquor no work.' Chicago's 175 unions demand that Congress repeal prohibition.

"And to avert direful calamity during his enforced absence in Europe, the President has been influenced to ask that of Congress which Congress will never do—repeal any portion of the prohibition laws, which are the result of 40 years' tireless effort.

"The Washington school board lately suspended a teacher for teaching Bolshevism in the public schools. Unions are now demanding her reinstatement. The penalty was light, for the board merely suspended such teacher for a week only. If she was teaching Bolshevism to the children of this Nation's Capital, instead of being suspended she should have been discharged.

"Since March 11, 1919, unions have paid a horde of barkers \$25 per week to picket the Raleigh Hotel, and they stand at each entrance to this hotel and defiantly insult every man, woman, and child who enters by telling them that they are 'not decent' as they are patronizing a 'scab' hotel.

"[News Item, Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Apr. 10, 1919.]

"PICKET IS FINED \$25 ON WOMAN'S CHARGE—MRS. ROUSE RESENTED REMARKS AS SHE WAS LEAVING HOTEL RALEIGH.

"Hugh R. Truelove, a newcomer to Washington, making his home at 929 E Street and employed, he says, by the striking waiters as one of the pickets of that organization fighting the Hotel Raleigh, arrested April 7 and charged with making indecent and threatening remarks to patrons of the hotel, was tried and convicted in the District of Columbia branch of the police court to-day and sentenced by Judge John P. McMahon to pay a fine of \$25.

"The complainant in the case was Mrs. Ethel Rouse, a member of the College Woman's Community at Lutherville, Md., who testified that she, in company with her husband and two girls associated with her in the community work, went to the Hotel Raleigh for lunch, and when leaving the hotel Truelove insulted her and her party by remarking, 'Decent people no longer patronize the Hotel Raleigh. If you were decent you would not patronize the hotel.'

"Truelove in his defense said that he was employed by the striking waiters at \$25 a week to stand at the main entrance of the hotel and make certain stereotyped remarks to all patrons of the hotel entering or leaving the building, among those set remarks being the one he was charged with applying to Mrs. Rouse and her friends.

"I am informed that these striking waiters, besides their wages paid and wholesome food furnished them by the hotel, received tips from patrons as high as \$6 to \$8 per day, and that some of them would hardly notice you if you offered them a tip of less than 50 cents. The following is one of the 16 demands made of the hotel by the union:

"Steady and extra waiters shall have at each meal the choice of at least one roast, one entree, with an additional fish entree on fast days, also soup, potatoes, one vegetable, coffee, tea, or milk, bread and butter, and one dessert. A wholesome breakfast shall also be served. No one kind of roast or entree may be served more than once in any four consecutive days.

"Every good woman who enters this hotel is subjected to insult by having forced in her hand a vicious cartoon card and told she is entering a scab hotel. Unions here have lately so picketed 23 merchants in Washington. Why? Because Americans in the Capital of the American Republic refused to bow to unreasonable autocratic union demands.

"The American Federation of Labor has publicly threatened to put out of Congress every Member who has dared to disobey Mr. Gompers. Because duty impelled, I have taken my life, political and otherwise, in my hands by warning my people of existing facts; the Carmen's District Council of Kansas City notified me April 26 that it was urging the brotherhood for the State of Texas to replace me with a friend to unions.

"From the four corners of the United States I have filled my wastebasket with anonymous threats apprising me of the innumerable kinds of deaths that will befall me and my family if I ever again open my mouth against unions. One from Altoona, Pa., advised me that the brotherhood would never let me escape, as I had been marked for special suffering. Another from Altoona, in the name of the 10,000 members of the railroad brother-

hood there, calls me 'a dirty, low-lived, copperheaded, Confederate dog surviving 61-65.' Another from Altoona assures me that next year unions will pick a soldier in my district to use in ridding Congress of me. The Fort Worth Record belittles me with irony and ridicule. In defense of unions the Comanche Enterprise threatens me with political destruction and questions my prohibition record, notwithstanding during 20 years I have made several hundred prohibition speeches, have helped to dry numerous Texas counties, and of the Texas delegation in the Sixty-fifth Congress I was the only Congressman who spoke for national prohibition, and numerous prohibition bills were introduced by me.

"I have before me a printed application for membership in the International Typographical Union from an unorganized town. It requires the obligation to be sworn to by the applicant before an officer qualified to administer oaths. I copy from said obligation the following:

"That my fidelity to the union and my duty to the members thereof shall in no sense be interfered with by any allegiance that I may now or hereafter owe to any other organization, social, political, or religious, secret or otherwise.

"Thus union is placed before God and country.

"Lately in New York Dr. Scott Nearing publicly urged a bloody revolution against the United States; 3,000 members of various unions, of the most radical type it is true, applauded.

"In the Pythian Temple here in Washington on May-day eve, under the auspices of the Fur Workers Union et al., and with Government officers present, bloody revolution against the United States Government was publicly preached and applauded, the red flag anthem was sung, and the following was embraced in resolutions adopted:

"Labor now knows its strength. Labor now makes demands. And these demands are heard; they must be heard, for labor, in its might, has learned to achieve for labor, and labor's word is fast becoming law.

"And concerning this meeting on May-day eve the Washington Star said:

"The spirit of anarchy, nihilism, Bolshevism, sabotage, and defiance of vested power and authority in Government dominated the assembly.

"I realize that many, many honest, upright, loyal, patriotic, deserving citizens in unions do not approve. Yet the vicious element controls unions. Socialism and Bolshevism are making catspaws of unions. The revolutionists of Seattle were members of unions. I. W. W.'s are unbribed unionists, even if they are disowned by Mr. Gompers. Several hundred thousand union men are foreigners and can not speak English. Yet, when that little, fearless giant, Congressman Burnett, proposed a proper immigration measure to keep anarchists in Europe and Asia he was sent a deadly bomb through the United States mails.

"Does the public longer wonder why we Congressmen hesitate to disobey Mr. Gompers? Has the public ever received a death bomb specially prepared and sent to kill a family? Verily, the tail is wagging the dog. Verily, Mr. Gompers has us all buffaloed. Three million union men organized have under duress and are slave driving the other 107,000,000 unorganized peoples of the United States.

"Newspapers are hog tied. Not a merchant, banker, lawyer, doctor, preacher, or legislator can open his mouth without an attempt to ruin him. What is the remedy? There is only one. The other 107,000,000 people must organize to properly control unions.

"The Dallas Council properly asks where I was during the crisis, but unjustly accuses me of being inattentive to duty and 'gloriously entertained with banquets and theater parties.' Since war began I have devoted to the cause every moment of my time, every dollar of my salary above a meager living, and every dollar I possessed. I have even sacrificed my home. Since the adjournment of Congress, working both a day shift and a night shift, I have put in from 12 to 16 hours per day trying to alleviate the sufferings of the people of my country. Yet, when compared with the sacrifice made by our brave soldiers both in France and in the camps of this country, I have done nothing."

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I refuse to yield, Mr. Chairman. I have only 25 minutes in which to discuss a big subject.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman refuses to yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Right now I do. If I had more time I would gladly yield to the distinguished and able gentleman from Ohio.

Neither Mr. Gompers nor the American Federation of Labor, nor anyone for them, has denied or disapproved any of my assertions.

Has anyone denied that when Dr. Scott Nearing preached revolution against the Government of the United States there were 3,000 members of unions applauding him? When he preached revolution against our Government he was applauded by 3,000 men, every one of whom was a member of some union. Has anyone denied that Lenin, from Russia, the admitted

Bolshevik leader of anarchy, sent a notice to this Government that if the United States does not release Debs he will shoot captive Americans, and that we find unions of the United States saying, "Comply with Lenin's request or we will call a strike that will shatter the United States from San Francisco to Florida"? Has anyone denied that Lenin, from Russia, sent us a notice, "Unless you release Mooney," the convicted bomb thrower of San Francisco, who murderously caused a score of innocent people to lose their lives, "we will shoot captive Americans that we hold at this time," and that we find some of the unions of this country saying, "Comply with Lenin's request or we will turn this Government upside down with a nationwide strike"? Has anyone denied that here in the Nation's Capital, here in Washington on May-day eve, a meeting was held in the Pythian Temple, if you please, under the auspices of the Fur Workers' Union and others, in the presence of secret-service men of this Government, dominated by a bunch of anarchists, nearly every one of whom were members of unions, and that they sang the red-flag anthem, and they preached bloody revolution openly against this Government and against the flag? And we men in Congress have never opened our mouths about it. Why? Echo answers, "Why?"

On the front page of the Washington Post yesterday morning, on the front page of the Washington Times that came to us at noon yesterday, and on the front page of the Washington Star that came to us yesterday was a story telling us that a deadly bomb at the dark hour of midnight had been placed upon the front doorstep of your Attorney General. Those papers carried at the same time and on the same front page the intelligence that on that very night there had met in Washington representatives from all the unions in this city, many of them Government employees, who were addressed by the wife of this convicted bomb thrower of California. Not a man in this Congress opened his mouth. Why, may I ask? Have you been getting the same anonymous letters that I have been getting? The following appeared in the Washington Post:

GREAT "WET" PROTEST—CENTRAL LABOR UNION TO MASS 50,000 AT CAPITOL JUNE 14.

Plans for a monster demonstration by organized labor of Washington in front of the Capitol on Flag Day to protest against "war-time" prohibition and legislation preventing the manufacture of 23 per cent beer are nearing completion, it was announced at the meeting last night of the Central Labor Union at Musicians' Hall, 1006 E Street NW. Pledges to participate in the mass protest have been received by the central body from every labor union in the District. Some organizations have adopted resolutions imposing fines upon members who fail to take part.

MRS. MOONEY SPEAKS.

Mrs. Rena Mooney, who is touring the country and speaking before all central labor bodies in behalf of her husband, Thomas Mooney, and others convicted in connection with the bomb-plot explosion during the preparedness parade in San Francisco in 1916, addressed the meeting.

The following is the item appearing in the Washington Times:

LABOR TO HOLD WET RALLY HERE JUNE 14.

Organized labor will stage a monster demonstration against prohibition and legislation affecting the manufacture of 23 per cent beer in front of the Capitol on Flag Day—June 14. Plans toward this end were furthered last night at a meeting of the Central Labor Union in Musicians' Hall, 1006 E Street NW. Mrs. Rena Mooney, wife of Thomas Mooney, who was convicted of bomb throwing in the San Francisco preparedness parade in 1916, addressed the meeting.

Pledges to participate in the demonstration are being received by the central body from every labor union of the District. Some local labor organizations will impose fines on members who fail to take part, it was announced.

The following is the item appearing in the Washington Star:

LABOR TO HOLD WET RALLY HERE JUNE 14.

Organized labor will stage a monster demonstration against prohibition and legislation affecting the manufacture of 23 per cent beer in front of the Capitol on Flag Day—June 14. Plans toward this end were furthered last night at a meeting of the Central Labor Union in Musicians' Hall, 1006 E Street NW. Mrs. Rena Mooney, wife of Thomas Mooney, who was convicted of bomb throwing in the San Francisco preparedness parade in 1916, addressed the meeting.

Pledges to participate in the demonstration are being received by the central body from every labor union of the District. Some local labor organizations will impose fines on members who fail to take part, it was announced.

Hence it can not be denied that on the very night a murderous assassin wrecked many buildings in Washington by exploding a deadly bomb at the residence of the Attorney General of the United States the labor unions of Washington, embracing employees of the United States Government, entertained Mrs. Mooney, the wife of a convicted bomb thrower now serving his just sentence. What was her mission? For what purpose was she granted an audience? Is it not well known that she is now appealing to unions to go behind the law, behind the judgments of courts, behind the mandates of society and force the release of her felon husband? Yet some Government employees give a ready ear. While our newspapers announce to us

that our Government is turning heaven and earth upside down to hunt out and arrest these late murderous conspirators against Government, such newspapers in the same issue advise us that the federated unions of Washington, embracing Government employees, have entertained the wife of a convicted bomb thrower, who by such audience and hearing is at least influenced to believe that such unions will help her to evade the law and free the murderer. Why the necessity of going to the trouble and expense of ferreting out the crime and arresting and convicting such criminals if unions are to undo justice and help criminals to escape?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I will not yield now.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman says no Member of Congress opened his mouth. I am a new Member, but I should like to open my mouth to resent the statement of the gentleman that the men he names are all union men.

Mr. BLANTON. I hope when you open your mouth again you will tell these anarchists—I do not care whether they are labor unionists or not—that if they do not stop their practices we will hang them as high as Haman, and I hope you tell Mr. Gompers that if he does not purge his labor unions of anarchy and disregard of law that Congress, representing the people, will do it for him. They have been sending me anonymous letters from all over the United States, telling me that if I ever opened my mouth against the unions again what would happen to me and my family. Do you think they believe they can scare a man who comes from west Texas? [Laughter.] I have lived in west Texas too long to be scared by a murderous anarchist.

What did the Washington Star say about this Pythian Temple meeting in Washington which occurred on May-day eve? After they met, they passed the following resolution:

Labor now knows its strength. Labor now makes demands. And those demands are heard—they must be heard—for labor in its might has learned to achieve for labor, and labor's word is fast becoming law.

Concerning this meeting the Washington Star said:

The spirit of anarchy, nihilism, Bolshevism, sabotage, and defiance of vested law and authority in government dominated the whole assemblage.

Not a man in this Congress has raised his voice against it. Why? I will tell you. Mr. Gompers has got us all buffaloed. Why, when the Keating banquet was held here, shortly after the adjournment of Congress, there appeared in the Washington Star the next day the following threat to Congressmen from the American Federation of Labor, if you please, the following threat from its secretary, Mr. Morrison, who says that the American Federation of Labor is going to put out of Congress every man who refuses to obey the mandate of Samuel Gompers. Is that what has kept our tongues tied, or is it the threat of bombs like those that came into the home of our Hon. John L. Burnett, the little giant from Alabama?

I wish my friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was here. I want him to go back to the good people of Fayette County, Franklin County, Lamar County, Marion County, Pickens County, Winston County, and Walker County, in his district, and apologize to his splendid constituency for jumping on me the other day because I attempted to tell the people the facts connected with organized labor. My good Alabama friend is too good a man and too able a Representative to indorse the evils I am condemning. Let me repeat again Secretary Morrison's threat, as it appeared in the Washington Star, to wit:

An active campaign is to be conducted by organized labor throughout the Nation to defeat Members of Congress who have shown themselves to be the foes of labor and who are responsible for the failure to deal with unemployment problems during the last session. Strong and determined efforts will be made to elect men carrying union cards or otherwise known to be friends of labor.

This was divulged last night by Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, who was one of the principal speakers at the testimonial banquet given to Edward Keating, retiring Member of Congress from Colorado, by the joint conference retirement committee representing various organizations of Government employees.

In a highly spirited speech Secretary Morrison declared organized labor knows its friends and enemies, and that persistent warfare is to be waged against the latter. Already plans for a general campaign have been discussed by officers of the federation. He said that organizations want to see more trade-unionists in both branches of Congress. He severely scored those legislators who have failed to support legislation beneficial to the working classes of America.

Go down here to the Raleigh Hotel in Washington, take your wife into the main entrance of that hotel, and you will find down there right now paid barkers—paid \$25 a week by unions here in Washington—to stand there at the main entrances and tell your wife, and every other good woman who enters there, that she is not decent, that she is going into a scab hotel, that she is not decent if she goes there. If one of them were to attempt to tell a man or woman in my district a thing of that kind, do you

know what would happen to him? Let me again call your attention to the report of such matter in our daily press, to wit:

[News item, Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Apr. 10, 1919.]

PICKET IS FINED \$25 ON WOMAN'S CHARGE—MRS. ROUSE RESENTED REMARKS AS SHE WAS LEAVING HOTEL RALEIGH.

Hugh R. Truelove, a newcomer to Washington, making his home at 929 E Street, and employed, he says, by the striking waiters as one of the pickets of that organization fighting the Hotel Raleigh, arrested April 7 and charged with making indecent and threatening remarks to patrons of the hotel, was tried and convicted in the District of Columbia branch of the police court to-day and sentenced by Judge John P. McMahon to pay a fine of \$25.

The complainant in the case was Mrs. Ethel Rouse, a member of the College Woman's Community at Lutherville, Md., who testified that she, in company with her husband and two girls associated with her in the community work, went to the Hotel Raleigh for lunch, and when leaving the hotel Truelove insulted her and her party by remarking, "Decent people no longer patronize the Hotel Raleigh. If you were decent you would not patronize the hotel."

Truelove, in his defense, said that he was employed by the striking waiters at \$25 a week to stand at the main entrance of the hotel and make certain stereotyped remarks to all patrons of the hotel entering or leaving the building, among those set remarks being the one he was charged with applying to Mrs. Rouse and her friends.

And also let me again call your attention to the statement made by Manager Weston that besides the wages and good and wholesome food furnished these striking waiters they had been making in tips from six to eight dollars per day, and would hardly give you any service for a tip under 50 cents; and also that, among their many demands, they demanded the following:

Steady and extra waiters shall have at each meal the choice of at least one roast, one entrée, with an additional fish entrée on fast days; also soup, potatoes, one vegetable, coffee, tea, or milk, bread and butter, and one dessert. A wholesome breakfast shall also be served. No one kind of roast or entrée may be served more than once in any four consecutive days.

This is an everlasting disgrace to Washington, and to the United States, and to America, and to civilization, and you know it as well as I do. Why do not we Members of Congress wake up and stop it? The reason that it is permitted by the police of Washington is because you Republicans in power and we Democrats, who ought to be, do not take the proper action to put it out of business. Why, it would destroy the business enterprise of almost any person or aggregation of persons. I am glad that the Raleigh is so well established that they can not ruin it. They can not hurt the Raleigh. We fellows have been coming here to the Raleigh for 20 years before we came to Congress. They could not hurt it, but they can keep some of the Congressmen away from there. You remember before this Congress met the unions sent to every Member of Congress a letter saying, "Don't you go to the Raleigh Hotel." How many of you obeyed the mandate in that letter? Here is one who has not obeyed it. Here is one that can look them square in the eye and say, "When you tell me to do this or that, I will tell you to go to hell." I shall do my duty. That is the kind of a man I am. That is what my people sent me here to tell them.

Disregard of law? These paid barkers are paid to disregard the law. What regard for law have they when they tell a good woman she is not decent simply because she prefers to patronize the Raleigh Hotel? The unions have gotten beyond the control of Mr. Gompers and of the good men in unions, even if he and they would control them. The vicious are in the saddle.

Why, read the following notice in this afternoon's paper:

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND WETS TO BE IN PARADE HERE.

More than 100,000 men and women workers, representing all parts of the country, are to participate in the huge antiprohibition demonstration before Congress on Flag Day, June 14. Those in the parade will not be marching as individuals, according to the officials of the American Federation of Labor, who are completing plans for the demonstration, but will march as representatives of millions of workers all through the United States who are solidly opposed to the enforcement of the war-time prohibition bill in as far as it applies to light wines and beer.

Labor Congressmen will address the workers from the steps of the Capitol. The demonstration will be under the auspices of the Central Labor Union.

What is a labor Congressman? What do they mean by labor Congressmen? Why, we are all for labor and for lawful labor unions. Have we any Congressmen here who belong to unions? I say, no; there are no such men here. The membership of this body are honorable men, are for labor and lawful unions, but belong to no class or organization. Why should the good men who belong to the unions here in Washington, and who may favor prohibition and not want its repeal, be fined for not parading on the 14th against prohibition? The papers said yesterday that such members would be fined. On page 30 of the McClure Magazine for June Mr. Gompers says that—

To stop them, deliberately and by force, from the use of their beer and wine is as unjust as it would be for a crowd of vegetarians to get together and pass a law to stop you and me from eating meat.

That is an old academic question, thrashed out and decided to the contrary nearly 50 years ago. Yet, Mr. Gompers intimates

that if we take away their beer and wine, laborers may turn into Bolsheviks. I wish that my good friend from Georgia [Mr. UPshaw] would carefully digest the above, and then go back to Atlanta and explain why it is that he takes the floor in defense of unions when I point out the things they should purge their organizations of. Every State in the Union, except the three little ones, have ratified national prohibition. I told you the other day that I can not follow my beloved President when he asks me to repeal prohibition, as good a Democrat as I am. [Applause.]

Now, when the war was going on we found the railroad conductors on passenger trains, who did little work, and even had to have an auditor to go with them to take up the tickets. These conductors who were getting \$135 to \$165 a month plus time and a half for all time put in over eight hours and getting one day off each week, more than we paid the boys who were sent to the trenches of France, who stood fighting for 24 hours in trenches knee deep in the mud, cootie infested, fighting like the devil to save the country—we find 400,000 railroad men, organized like no organization was ever perfected before, coming to the Government in our hour of need and insisting that if we do not give them \$754,000,000 right now in cash they are going to ruin us and going to tie up the railroads. They said: "We will tie up the railroads from Alaska to Florida."

Mr. McAdoo, statesman like he was, did like you and I would have done. When a highwayman pulls a pistol or a gun on you—we west Texas fellows do not usually let them get the drop on us—but if they do get the drop on us we throw up our hands. Mr. McAdoo did like you or I would have done and west Texas would do when the other fellow gets the drop on us, and said "take the money."

But he was honest, for when he turned the \$754,000,000 over he resigned. Then they came to Mr. Hines, and they said: "If you do not give us \$67,500,000 more, we will cause a revolution in this country." Mr. Hines did what we would have done. He handed over the money. That \$822,000,000 came out of the pockets of the people of the United States. It came out of the pockets of the bleeding public of the United States. Talk about \$10 shoes! Do you know why there are \$10 shoes and \$12 shoes? It is because these laborers, organized in these cities, are getting \$1.25 an hour. The manufacturers of Hannan and Nettleton and Clapp and other shoes which you purchase for \$12 or \$15 do not make any more than they did 10 years ago when you bought those shoes for \$5. It all goes into the pockets of organized labor. Maybe they deserve it.

The Rochester Herald of Thursday, April 10, 1919, published the startling notice that the local electrical union would thenceforth demand the following:

That its journeymen receive \$9 per day of six hours; that its foremen of five or more men receive \$10.50 per day of six hours; and that all time over that was to be paid for at the rate of \$3 per hour; that on Saturday they would work only three hours, yet receive a full day's wages; that when they worked in rain or snow they would receive \$18 per day for six hours.

The Washington Times yesterday said editorially that the time had come when laborers would work six hours for their employer, six hours for themselves, have eight hours for sleep and four for pleasure. Therein lies part of the vice. They clamor for shorter hours and higher wages only to do double employment and receive double salaries, just as is being done now by thousands of Government employees here in Washington who work seven hours for the Government and a great part of their time for private firms and corporations. If through strikes and force and disregard of law unions can force \$9 a day for six hours, they can force \$18 for three hours, and if railroad conductors on passenger trains can in war time force \$180 per month plus time and a half for all time over eight hours and over six days a week they can force a salary of \$500 for six hours with treble for overtime. The Board of Conciliation under such circumstances is a farce, and we ought to do away with it and save the thousands of dollars we spend on it each year.

Six thousand strikes in war time—a holdup of the people, and I say that the time has come for the tail to quit wagging the dog. It has been wagging the dog too long. Every extra dollar obtained by strikes has come out of the unorganized public. When you fellows wake up and find that the other 107,000,000 unorganized people of this Government have awakened to this situation, and they find that their money has been going to 3,000,000 organized men who have been slave driving them and this Government—when you find that out you are going to be just as afraid of the voice of the 107,000,000 people as we are now afraid of the voice of Morrison, when he tells us in the Washington papers that he is going to put us out of Congress if we do not obey. He will not beat me out of Congress, I

promise you that. I have labor unions all over my district, but they have confidence in me. The laboring people in my district know that I am a better friend to them now than these Congressmen who get up on the floor and preach unionism and say they believe in strikes and force, and when you say that it is a perversion of the oath you took under the Constitution of this Government. I am not afraid of them. They are not going to beat me out of my district. I beat three men the last time, one of them an ex-Member of Congress and two legislators, by 15,000 majority, and much of the majority was made up of laboring men, and I will do it again. But if I have to be beaten, if they put a bomb under me to-night, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, I am ready to face my Maker and say, "God, my witness, I have done my duty in warning my colleagues of this awful thing that is grappling at the throat of our Republic."

But what happened to the late lamented Mr. Borland, from Missouri, will not happen to me. This man made a good fight and deserved to win, and I believe that he would still be living if his heart had not been broken by the fight Mr. Gompers and organized labor made upon him. They claim his defeat and gloat over it. Here is the kind of literature they used in Colorado. Here is one of their circulars:

To organized labor and its friends:

Ben C. Hilliard, Democratic candidate for Congress, is a friend of organized labor. He has established the workday system in the Denver schools, and all mechanical work is being done by organized labor.

The President of the United States has proven himself a friend of organized labor. He deserves a Congressman who will stand with him for progressive legislation.

Hilliard's opponent is an officer with the State militia.

Let us, my dear colleagues, do full justice to the unions of our country, see that they receive every consideration to which they are entitled, put into execution every labor principle contained in the peace treaty, but at the same time wake up and tell unions and tell Mr. Gompers that they must purge themselves of lawlessness and anarchy, for this Government must be run in the interest and welfare of all the 110,000,000 people alike if we follow the mandates of the Father of our Country.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, but the amount to be paid from the Treasury of the United States shall in no event be as much as one-half of said expenses, in full for the following expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, except amounts to pay the interest and sinking fund on the funded debt of said District, of which amounts one half is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and the other half out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, namely:

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph. I do not care to discuss it at length, except to point out that it is clearly a change of the statute of June 11, 1878, which fixes the proportion that Congress shall appropriate as the amount that the Federal Government shall bear in the expenses of the District, found in volume 20 of the Statutes at Large, page 104.

Now, I make this point of order, being one of those who are in favor of abolishing the half-and-half system in the District of Columbia, but I do not think it should be done upon a general appropriation bill. I think it should be considered by the District Committee in regular course and that legislation should be brought into the House after hearings have been held, and I submit this is a change of organic law and is not in order upon a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do not know as a question of parliamentary law whether the gentleman is right or not, but I have been informed that this question has arisen several times and a point of order has been made upon which it has been universally decided, or at least two or three times, that it is not subject to the point of order under the Holman rule, and it has been so decided by two or three Speakers before. I may be wrong, but I think I am right, that the Holman rule protects it.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire whatever to take up the time of the committee in arguing the point of order if the Chairman does not care to hear from me. Of course, I take the position that the point of order is not well taken, that this amendment is clearly in order under the rules of the House. Mr. Chairman, as the Chair makes no intimation as to the views of the Chair I will briefly argue the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the statement of the gentleman will be of value, whether the Chair needs to be informed about the matter or not.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, it is undoubtedly true under the rules of the House that legislation is not in order upon an appropriation bill, with certain exceptions, one exception being under clause 2 of Rule XXI, which says that legislation is in order when it—

Shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salaries of the officers of the United States—

Of course, that is not applicable here—

by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States—

That is not applicable—

or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures.

Under existing law, the act of June 11, 1878, half of the expenses of the District of Columbia is paid out of the Treasury. Now, the paragraph read, against which the point of order is made, is legislation, but what is the character of that legislation? It repeals the law saying half the expenses of the District government shall be paid out of the Treasury, and the paragraph goes further and it says that no amount paid out of the Treasury of the United States for the expenses of the District shall amount to as much as one-half of the expenses, which clearly, beyond cavil, reduces the amount appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States, and it fits like a glove the section of the rule providing that legislation is in order if it reduces the amount covered by the bill. I count myself happy, Mr. Chairman, however, to have precedents fortifying me in this position.

Way back in the Fifty-second Congress, when the Holman rule was adopted—and the language of the rule was, word for word, what it is now—the Speaker held that a motion to reconsider, which is nothing but an amendment, reducing the proportion of the money to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States for the expenses of the District under one-half of the expenses was a retrenchment, that it reduced the amount covered in the bill, and that it came within the Holman rule, and, therefore, was in order. For the last three Congresses, I may state, this amendment has been before each one of those Congresses, and has always been held in order under the provision of the Holman rule, as it reduced expenditures. Every Chairman who has passed upon it has so held. I call the attention of the Chair to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 10, 1914, when an amendment exactly like this was offered, a point of order made against it, and the question was argued, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] in the chair held:

The Chair is of the opinion there is but one question in this, and that is the question of germaneness. The Chair will resolve that in favor of the amendment and hold that it is in order. The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Now, I can continue, Mr. Chairman, to go on and consume the time of the committee, but if I proceed I shall simply be talking in a circle, for I have already, I think, clearly shown to the Chair that the rules of the House provide that legislation is in order on an appropriation bill in certain cases, one case being when it is germane and it reduces the amount of money to come out of the Treasury of the United States. The object of the Holman rule is a wholesome, beneficial one to economize and save money, and it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this is a splendid time to put into effect retrenchment.

The amendment in question retrenches. It legislates, the legislation being to reduce the amount of money coming out of the Treasury, and the amendment specifically says that in no case shall the amount of money appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States for the expenses of the District of Columbia equal one-half of the amount of the appropriation bill. If it can not equal one-half, it is undoubtedly a retrenchment, and, in my opinion, is clearly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's statement, as the Chair understands it, is borne out clearly by a long line of rulings. The organic act of June 11, 1878, provides that, to the extent to which Congress shall approve of said estimates, Congress shall appropriate the amount of 50 per cent thereof and the remaining 50 per cent of such approved estimates shall be levied and assessed upon the taxable property and privileges in the said District other than the property of the United States and the District of Columbia.

The language of the bill provides—

That the following sums are appropriated out of the revenues of the District of Columbia to the extent that they are sufficient therefor, and the remainder out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

It is, of course, clear that this is a change of existing or basic law. It would be within the rule which does not allow legislation upon appropriation bills if it were not within one of the exceptions of such rule. The exception of the rule, called to the attention of the Chair by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], is the exception that provides that if by the amendment offered or the change in the law the appropriations are reduced, the exception prevails and the rule to that extent is nullified.

In this case it is quite clear that if the language of the bill remains a reduction of expenditures from the Treasury of the United States must necessarily result. The very point has been decided in two recent cases exactly in point except the positions were reversed. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I think, was in the chair when the bill as presented contained the provision exactly in accordance with the organic act:

That one-half of the following sums, respectively, be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury.

And in two successive years the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] held, after an elaborate argument in the first instance, that the language of an amendment offered as a substitute, almost, if not exactly, identical with the language which is now the first section of this bill, was in order as an amendment to the original law, because of the fact that it reduced expenditures.

So it seems to the Chair it is quite clear that it is the duty of the Chair to hold that the point of order against the first section on that account is not well taken, and the objections are overruled.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Executive office: Two commissioners, at \$6,000 each; engineer commissioner, so much as may be necessary (to make salary \$6,000); secretary, \$2,700; 3 assistant secretaries to commissioners, at \$1,600 each; clerks—1 \$1,500, 3 at \$1,400 each, 1 \$1,200, 1 (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter) \$1,200, 1 \$840, 2 at \$720 each; 2 messengers, at \$600 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$1,200.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. WALSH. I reserve a point of order on this paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a disposition to increase the salaries of some that are already fixed by statute, but there is no disposition to increase the salaries of the little fellows who receive \$900, \$1,000, or \$1,100.

I request, Mr. Chairman, that this paragraph be passed at this time and be taken up for consideration after the bill has been read. And I will withdraw any action on this at the present moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the paragraph be passed temporarily. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to taking it up later. The gentleman may change his mind and withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed, from time to time, to prescribe a schedule of fees to be paid for inspecting passenger elevators and for inspecting hotels, public halls, moving-picture shows, theaters, and other places of amusement which are required to have annual licenses, and for inspecting buildings which are required by law to have fire escapes; and they are further authorized and directed to impose fees for all inspections or service to be performed by any public officer or employee of the District of Columbia under any law or regulation now in force or hereafter enacted; said fees to cover the cost and expense of such inspections or service; and a schedule of such fees shall be printed and conspicuously displayed in the office of the said commissioners, and said fees shall be paid to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia, and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of revenues of the District of Columbia and the United States in equal parts.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph. It is clearly new legislation and should properly come before the Committee on the District of Columbia, which has jurisdiction of legislation of this nature. And it seems to me it is pernicious legislation, in addition, to have the owners of the premises inspected pay for the inspection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman make the point of order or reserve it?

Mr. MAPES. I intend to make it, but I will reserve it if the gentleman cares to have me do so.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I wish the gentleman would. I wish to say that this is the same provision carried in the bill we passed here last session and which failed to become a law.

Mr. SISSON. We are already operating under that law now, and this statute is carrying that out. I will state frankly that we have no possible objection to the gentleman's committee going into this whole matter and bringing in a proper law, but until that is done I think the very safety of the people to be benefited would demand that they have this inspection.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It was passed before in the other bill, and no objection was raised to it.

Mr. SISSON. And they have had this inspection.

Mr. MAPES. What does the gentleman mean by the statement that this is the law now?

Mr. SISSON. I say this is the law under which they are now operating—this statute here now.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. This is the law now.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I want to inquire is it not a fact that this is what has been construed by the District authorities to be the law?

Mr. SISSON. I did not intend to go into that.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will complete the statement. The authorities have construed the law as giving them the authority; but recently, through litigation, it has been developed that they have not the authority; and in order to continue the inspection in the same way and with the same charges as heretofore they have asked for this legislation.

Mr. SISSON. Yes. This has been the construction placed upon an old statute for quite a while. Now, if you do not do this, there will be practically no inspection in the District. There is no provision made to pay the inspectors out of these fees. I will say frankly to the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations will be glad if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] will permit this item to remain in the bill until a statute can be put on the statute books, because then the committee will have an absolute guide as to what ought to be done in this case.

Mr. MAPES. If the gentleman will permit, this is clearly new legislation. It is not on the appropriation act passed last session. While I do not desire to go into the merits of the question now, it seems to me it is not desirable legislation, and it strikes me that the Committee on Appropriations should report an appropriation to pay these inspectors, rather than to have them paid by the men whose premises they inspect.

Mr. SISSON. I will say to the gentleman that in most of the cities they have a fee system for the inspection of elevators, where a certificate or license is issued. A regular license is posted up in every elevator. I do not know of any exception to that, although there may be exceptions. But in order to run an elevator in most of the cities a license is required, and that license states on its face the last inspection of the elevator, and a certain fee is paid for that license.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, in most of the States the fee charged is only a nominal fee and is not a fee intended to cover the cost of inspection.

Mr. SISSON. That is not the case here.

Mr. WALSH. It says, "Said fees shall pay the cost of inspection."

Mr. SISSON. It is conducted on the fee system. I have not the information here, but I understand a certain fee is charged for inspecting the buildings.

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

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Does the language in this paragraph in any way interfere with the authority of the commissioners to make the inspection of elevators, and so forth? Does it not simply authorize them to charge the owners of the premises for the inspection? In other words, if this language is stricken out, would it interfere in any way with the right of the commissioners to inspect the buildings and the elevators?

Mr. SISSON. The testimony of the commissioners is that this language is absolutely necessary now.

Mr. MAPES. Necessary for what?

Mr. SISSON. Necessary for the inspection of these buildings.

Mr. MAPES. The language does not so read.

Mr. SISSON. That is the construction they have placed upon it. They have had some little litigation in reference to the power of the District Commissioners to regulate the elevators under the present law—that is, the statute—and that lawsuit which

was in progress at that time was the occasion for the District Commissioners asking for this authority. The last committee unanimously gave it to them, and this committee simply reaffirmed the action of the committee before.

Now, I hope the gentleman will permit this provision to remain in the bill, and that his committee will take the matter up and prepare a well-considered plan for having the elevators in the hotels and public buildings inspected.

Mr. MAPES. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that the language of this provision seems to me clear that it can not in any way interfere with the actual inspection. This language simply authorizes the commissioners to provide a schedule of fees for the owners of the premises to pay for the inspection; and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think it is subject to a point of order, although it is very unfortunate. It is very important legislation and the inspection of buildings, which by law are required to have fire escapes, will not be carried on.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAPES. It seems to me clear, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this provision that justifies the remark of the chairman reporting the bill, that it in any way prohibits or restricts the commissioners in authorizing the inspection of buildings and elevators and fire escapes and what not. It is so apparent from the language of the provision that I do not want to let the remark of the gentleman from Minnesota go unanswered.

Mr. Sisson. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. Suppose that this legislation goes out and the District Commissioners find themselves where they can not have these elevators inspected, and suppose an accident occurs in an elevator. Of course, I suppose the gentleman is willing to assume the burden of that responsibility, but I am frank to say that no member of the Committee on Appropriations was willing to assume that burden, especially when the gentlemen charged with enforcing this law were so positive that they needed this additional fund. The fees have already been fixed. This does not change any fees nor the amount of money that is paid for any inspection, but there has been no authority heretofore to require that an elevator which on inspection is found to be in bad shape shall be condemned. They insist very strenuously that they need this power. If the gentleman is willing to assume the responsibility, I will say frankly that the Committee on Appropriations have absolutely no pride in the matter.

Mr. MAPES. I dislike to take the rôle of calling the attention of the members of the Appropriations Committee to the testimony of the commissioners on this subject, but I think if they will read the testimony of the commissioners they will see that their recollection of the testimony is very much distorted. The commissioners themselves testified that this has nothing to do with their right to make the inspection but with the right to make the charge.

Mr. Sisson. But they must have the inspection fee for the purpose of getting the men to make the inspection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public Utilities Commission: For salaries (including inspector of gas and meters, \$2,000; assistant inspectors of gas and meters—1 \$1,200, 2 at \$900 each; messenger, \$600); in all, \$33,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$4,000 per annum.

Mr. MAPES. I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], who has charge of the bill, who the persons are who are employed by the Public Utilities Commission in addition to the people mentioned in this paragraph.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That proviso was a safeguard put on there which is carried in the current law, so that they shall not, under any emergency that might arise, employ anybody at a greater rate of compensation than \$4,000. They seemed to have pretty complete blanket authority under the utilities proposition, and that was put on there for the reason I have stated. It is carried in the permanent law.

Mr. MAPES. This appropriates specifically only \$4,000; but there is a lump-sum appropriation of \$33,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I will read the gentleman the schedule of salaries: Executive secretary, \$4,000; accountant, \$3,000; assistant accountant, \$2,000; traffic engineer, \$3,600; in-

spector, \$1,600; another inspector, \$1,600; another at \$1,400; another at \$1,200; inspector of gas and meters, \$2,000; assistant inspector of gas and meters, \$1,200; another at \$900; inspector of electric meters, \$1,600; chief clerk, \$1,800; clerk and stenographer, \$1,400; another clerk and stenographer, \$1,200; another at \$1,200; another at \$1,000; messenger, \$720; another messenger at \$600, making \$32,920. That is the salary list. Now, there has been no increase in it or anything of that kind.

Mr. MAPES. Why does the Committee on Appropriations in this case change its settled policy of a great many years against appropriating lump sums and in favor of making specific appropriations?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have not done so in this case.

Mr. MAPES. Why have you changed from the specific appropriation to the lump sum?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We have not changed. It has always been a lump sum, and I have simply given the gentleman the details that make up that lump sum.

Mr. MAPES. Why in this particular item does the Committee on Appropriations report it in a lump sum instead of specifically, as it does in other cases?

Mr. Sisson. Under the specific law authorizing these commissioners to make the valuation in the District of Columbia they carry a lump sum, and have no pay roll and no salary, because they did not know at what salary they could get the men.

Mr. MAPES. Is not this true, that under this appropriation, instead of dividing the \$28,000 among these different employees, as the gentleman from Minnesota has read, the commissioners could divide it into seven equal parts and pay each man \$4,000?

Mr. Sisson. I suppose they could have done that.

Mr. MAPES. My question is, why the Appropriation Committee recommended in this instance against the long-settled policy of lump-sum appropriations?

Mr. Sisson. I have always been opposed to lump sums. But at this particular time we could not have made up a pay roll, nor could the District commissioners have made it up.

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

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I think I have the information which my colleague is seeking. I think the motive which actuated the committee was this: We could have put into the bill the salary roll which has just been read by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DAVIS. To have done so would have tended to make such a roll permanent or a statutory roll, and we feared that it never would be reduced, and so it was felt by the subcommittee that there would be a better chance of hereafter cutting down appropriations for the utility commission if we appropriated a lump sum.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. In 1918 the appropriation was \$34,000, but they only spent \$28,785.07. When you put them on a statutory roll you never knew a salary reduced.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee or the gentleman from Michigan under what authority of law are these employees and officers paid, the list of which the chairman of the subcommittee has read.

Mr. CRAMTON. That list was paid under the authority of the appropriation bill of the current year, but if the bill is passed as reported I suppose that list in so far as it may be necessary for the work of the commission will be continued.

Mr. WALSH. I direct the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the fact that it is paid under the current law or under the item carried in this bill. There is no authority for spending any of this money for salary to other people, because the amount of salary is limited to \$2,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; I think the gentleman is in error.

Mr. WALSH. They may have paid it under the next paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will call the gentleman's attention to the value of small punctuation marks sometimes. He will notice the parentheses surrounding this language:

(including inspector of gas and meters, \$2,000; assistant inspectors of gas and meters—1 \$1,200, 2 at \$900 each; messenger, \$600).

The important language is "for salaries * * *"; in all, \$33,000." That whole \$33,000 may be used for salaries and the gentleman overlooks the parentheses.

Mr. WALSH. I did not overlook the parentheses, but my question is, What authority of law is there for paying anybody \$1,200, \$1,600, or \$900, and various other positions that have been paid for?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I think you will find it under the act of March 4, 1913, creating the public-utilities commission. Paragraph 95 reads as follows:

The commission shall have the power in each and every instance to employ and prescribe the duties of such officers, clerks, stenographers, typewriters, inspectors, experts, and employees as it may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, and to fix and pay their compensation within the appropriations provided by Congress.

Mr. WALSH. And that is the authority for the list that the gentleman has just read?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; but they did not want to put them on the statutory roll. The work of the utilities commission has greatly decreased.

Mr. WALSH. I should think so, when we consider the state of the public utilities.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The expenses are greatly decreasing, and if you put these on the statutory roll you never knew a salary on the statutory roll reduced.

The Clerk read as follows:

For incidental and all other general necessary expenses authorized by law, including the employment of expert services where necessary, \$20,000.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Can the gentleman inform the committee what this \$20,000 is to be expended for? I notice that the language here includes the employment of expert services, which I suppose was provided for by the lump-sum appropriation of \$33,000 in the preceding paragraph.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No; that is extra. I read the gentleman the law under which they were authorized to employ expert services. They had a man named Beeler here, and some others, when we were all jammed up in consequence of war work, when the cars were stopped, and everything of that kind. They employed this man Beeler and paid him quite a salary to put in these skip-stops and the platforms and things of that kind. The cost of that is included in this \$20,000. There has to be considerable more of that kind of work done before we have satisfactory services on the part of the street cars. This is not the \$33,000 salary item at all.

Mr. MAPES. To bear out what the gentleman said, that the expenses were being reduced, I notice this appropriation is for \$20,000, and last year the appropriation for the same item was \$25,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. I would like to ask the gentleman how much of the \$25,000 was paid to the expert, Mr. Beeler?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I notice here the expenses: Services of John A. Beeler, 71 days, at \$110 a day, \$7,810; services of assistant, \$7,261, without giving the number of days.

Mr. MAPES. The assistant was paid more than the principal?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; he apparently worked longer. Traveling expenses, John A. Beeler, \$150.68; traveling expenses, assistant, \$81.10; total expenses, aside from expert's fees, \$231.78. Total, \$15,302.78.

Mr. MAPES. Was that all of the \$25,000 that was expended?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. That is all that was expended for this particular expert.

Mr. MAPES. Who is this Mr. Beeler?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. He is supposed to be the greatest expert in the United States on matters of this kind. They paid him a pretty good salary, something I rather objected to at the time, but they said they could not get Mr. Beeler—and they had to have him, they thought—for less than \$110 a day.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. MAPES. I yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota for five minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Is this the expert who is responsible for eliminating the six tickets for a quarter system of fares and imposing the 2-cent extra charge for transfers, along with increasing in number of flat-wheeled cars upon which we are obliged to ride, and disrupting things generally?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I have no official information along that line, except that I have conversed with some members of the Utilities Commission, without naming them; but Mr. Beeler had nothing to do with this at all. The Utilities Commission proper fixed the 2-cent transfer charge.

Mr. WALSH. And this \$110-per-day expert advice that he has been giving—

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. It was not on the transfers at all.

Mr. WALSH. It was not upon the fare or the equipment of the cars?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. No.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language beginning on line 10, page 9, and including all the language in line 12, on the same page, including the figures \$20,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, line 10, strike out all of lines 10, 11, and 12, including the figures \$20,000.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to have information about this item, but it seems to me that the carrying of this tremendous lump-sum item in this appropriation bill is simply an invitation to do again what was apparently done in the employment of some experts at what would seem to be highly exorbitant fees and perquisites in connection with the duty which must repose in the Public Utilities Commission. I think that I am not overstating the case when I state that the public utilities of Washington, the Capital City of the Nation, particularly in regard to its street car services, are entirely inadequate, and the word "inadequate" is a most mild expression. Not alone during the time of confusion incident to the coming of many people into Washington, but to-day the street car service in Washington is a crying shame. The people who are dependent upon it, and there are thousands of them dependent upon it, are compelled to resort to the shifting system of reporting at different times and all sorts of staggered hours, all sorts of subterfuges made to meet the existing contingencies, and the sum result of what has been done in regard to the street car service in the city of Washington has been the charge of 2 cents for a transfer, which the Capital Traction Co. said it did not want and did not need, and the Washington Electric Railway have said is not sufficient to tide it over its financial difficulties. Now, I but speak of this because when we consider all that has been done we have this lump sum of \$20,000 here open as an invitation to these men who compose the Public Utilities Commission, these men who are intrusted and who have the authority, an unquestioned authority, to provide good public utilities for the people of Washington in transportation, in gas, electric light, and in telephones—

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know who make up the Public Utilities Commission?

Mr. GARD. Why, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia make up that commission.

Mr. WALSH. Do they appoint themselves the Public Utilities Commission?

Mr. GARD. Oh, no; they are by operation of law. By operation of law the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are the Public Utilities Commission, and it would seem to me that these excellent gentlemen, two of them residents of the District of Columbia and one a delegate from the Engineer Corps, by themselves and their present assistants are in all respects competent to do that which the law imposes on them to do, and that is to oversee the public utilities, the different public utilities in the District of Columbia, and I repeat, not alone to the residents here but to the visitor at the National Capital. The public utilities of the city of Washington, in telephone and transportation especially, are a crying shame, and I think instead of having a lump-sum item of \$20,000 here carried to attract some alleged expert who receives out of \$20,000 about \$15,000 in his per diem charges and in his expenses and everything of that kind, that what we need is a more rigid adherence to that which the law imposes upon the Public Utilities Commission, their counsel, their inspectors, and all who get the greater part of this \$33,000 charge, to see that for all the people of the United States here in the Capital City are maintained as they should be maintained the public utilities, and I would be pleased to hear from members of the committee regarding the continuation of this item of \$20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the hearings and the statement of the commissioners as to what became of the \$20,000 in the last item are as follows: Stenographic services and notes, \$2,000; car tickets, \$25; books, periodicals, and so forth, \$150; stationery and office supplies, \$875; blank books, printing, and so forth, \$1,400; postage, \$100; traveling expenses, \$250. Then comes expert services, which I do not think will be necessary next time, \$15,000; making a total of \$20,000. Now, that is what the \$20,000 item was composed of last year and the estimate for the next year the same thing. Now, if this is stricken out the utilities commission will have nothing to work upon at all. This really is contingent expenses. Now, that is the way it was put to your subcommittee,

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, with the word of the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment proposed so as to strike out the figures "\$20,000" and insert "\$10,000," because it would seem to me that would cover all the emergency which seems to face the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 9, line 12, strike out the figures "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$10,000."

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

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have my colleague read a little from the hearings along this particular line, which will take two or three minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may be recognized, I wish to say I do not care to delay the committee, but the motion pending is, in effect, a motion to end the work of the Public Utilities Commission, and whether we favor or disapprove some of the results of their work, we all agree that the subject matter, pertaining, as it does, to our public utilities, is one of the utmost importance to the people of this city. I am sure that if the street railroads, for instance, of Washington were now under public ownership and rendered service only one-half as poor as we have had here the last year it would be hailed everywhere as a proof of the failure of municipal ownership. Now, I am sure the gentleman does not want to end the work of the only public agency that there is at present struggling with these problems. But that is what his amendment would result in.

Now, in the hearings one of the commissioners, Mr. Gardiner, expressed his views as to the need of this money for experts, which is what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] especially objects to. He points out that the Public Utilities Commission is of the same membership as the District commission, and therefore these men on the Public Utilities Commission have all the other multitudinous duties of District Commissioners to attend to, and hence they must either entirely neglect their work as commissioners, which is very important, or they must to a large degree delegate the work of investigation under the Public Utilities Commission. Mr. Gardiner, one of the commissioners, said:

As public utility commissioners we should ride on those street cars every day; we should drive along the tracks and ride on the street cars; and we should take up the complaints of the people and look into them and find out the conditions. That is what a public utility commission should do, but we can not do it. As you know very well, we are kept right in that building all the time. That is my own opinion about this thing. * * * The Public Utilities Commission should be a separate body, who should devote all their attention to their work. Then it would not need the services of all of these experts.

But this Congress has created a commission composed of these commissioners, and unless this bill is to blindly legislate out of existence the only body now charged with that work we must continue a decent appropriation that will enable them to do their work. And while I agree with the motives that I am sure inspire the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], I am sure it would be extremely shortsighted for this House, without investigation and simply on the impulse of the moment, to hamstring the work of this utilities commission.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. MAPES. Can the gentleman tell us whether the Public Utilities Commission has investigated anything in connection with the street car service here except the question of the fares and putting into effect the skip stops?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Public Utilities Commission has up the matter of gas rates, the electric rates, the whole electric situation, the valuation of these utilities, and, as one of these matters, this matter of street car service, and that includes both the matter of fares and of service, the furnishing of more cars, the routing of cars, the issuance of transfers, providing skip stops, and other propositions of that kind.

Mr. MAPES. What has it done to improve the service and prevent the tie-ups and the delays in the traffic?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I hope my colleague will understand that I am not one of the experts that is provided for in this appropriation and I am not prepared to answer all of those questions in detail.

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

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. GARD. I rise to be heard on the modified amendment. I have not been heard on that. However, I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the utilities commission has not acted as promptly as I would like in regard to the valuation of all the public utilities in the District of Columbia, but they have had some litigation. They have been assisted in the making of these valuations, but every point has been contested by some of the companies. Some of the companies have agreed to the valuation, and the commission has made a valuation on the majority of the utilities.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Is it not a fact—not only a fact now, but contemplated in the future—that there is going to be more litigation in regard to this matter, and that out of this fund they would have to pay some of the expenses?

Mr. Sisson. I was about to say that they are getting down to the point where they expect to make some orders to carry into effect all of the reforms that they hope to be able to bring about in the District of Columbia.

This legislation, you will all recall, was made necessary by virtue of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which decided that before you could make a rate as to railways the burden of proof was on the Government to be able to show that the rates were not confiscatory. I have never agreed to the soundness of that decision, but still that is the position in which we find ourselves. That made it necessary not only throughout the States, that valuation of railroads on the part of the Federal Government should be made, but also within the District of Columbia. Congress was about to pass an act granting universal transfers, and another bill was introduced consolidating the street railway companies. Col. Harding was then on the District commission, and Col. Harding and the attorneys came before your subcommittee some years ago and stated that in the event that legislation should be enacted it would simply put the District into litigation, and they requested that nothing of that sort should be done until this physical valuation should be made. Now, we have all agreed that the public utilities in the District of Columbia are not what they ought to be, but your committee did not feel that it would be proper for it to deprive the commission of the money which it requested and which it might need in the event it had quite a good deal of litigation in reference to any other order which it might enter. So we left this sum at \$20,000 not to enable them to bring about the very reforms that my friend from Ohio desires to be made but—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Also our committee feels that if there is a change in the legislation as to the kind of commission we should have, the committee headed by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] should wrestle with that problem.

Mr. Sisson. Yes; and his committee framed the legislation by which we are operating.

Mr. MAPES. I am glad that there is one piece of legislation that the Committee on Appropriations is willing that the regular Committee on the District of Columbia should handle.

Mr. Sisson. We will turn it all over to you.

Mr. MAPES. I rose to ask the gentleman a question about a subject to which he referred when he spoke about legislation being proposed some time ago looking toward the consolidation of the different companies. I saw a notice in one of the newspapers a few days ago to the effect that a public utilities company had defaulted on the interest on its bonds, and the newspaper article went on to say that a company was organized some time ago for the purpose of bringing about a merger of the two companies. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Public Utilities Commission is doing any work to bring about the consolidation of the two companies here?

Mr. Sisson. Some time ago I went into the matter with a great deal of earnestness, but whether that earnestness was accompanied by much ability I do not know; but I have been a very strong advocate of a universal transfer. I also felt that if we did not have universal transfers we ought to have a consolidation of the companies. You would thereby be relieved of managerial and overhead charges, it seems to me, which would tend to bring the business into a position where the overhead charges would be brought down to about half what they are now.

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

Mr. Sisson. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sisson. Now, if I could have my way about it, I would like to eliminate the two companies and have but one company.

Mr. MAPES. It is universally conceded that two street car companies in one city are a nuisance.

Mr. Sisson. That is absolutely true.

Mr. MAPES. I wanted to direct the gentleman's attention to this question: Is there not some way in which the Public Utilities Commission can spend this money in the employment of expert services to force a consolidation of the two companies?

Mr. Sisson. My understanding is that before you could make a consolidation, even by act of Congress, it would be necessary that the body making the order of consolidation should not only have the authority to make the order, but also under that decision of the Supreme Court in making the consolidation it would be necessary to have a physical valuation of the property, so that the accounts might be properly adjusted. Of course, they could make a consolidation, but they would have to agree upon the respective values of the properties. But when you are compelling them to do it you ought to have the facts whereby you and the court could sustain the order.

Mr. MAPES. As a matter of practical procedure, is there no way that we can compel a consolidation of the companies here, except by taking them over by the Government?

Mr. Sisson. I do not know about that. I think Congress would have the power to pass an act requiring them to consolidate, but the Utilities Commission or some other commission would have to make the valuation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] desire time?

Mr. GARD. Yes; I desire to be heard in favor of the amendment offered by me.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment can be modified by unanimous consent, reducing the amount from \$20,000 to \$10,000.

Mr. GARD. I want to be heard on that. I was heard on the proposition to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to inquire how long the chairman in charge of the bill desires to keep the committee in session?

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. We would like to proceed for an hour longer, but probably we shall not be able to proceed more than half an hour.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I say I would like to proceed for an hour, but I know we can not, and hence I was going to suggest that the committee rise at 6 o'clock.

Mr. BLANTON. If the chairman of the committee intends to move to rise at 6 o'clock, I will withdraw the point.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Yes; at 6 o'clock I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, if there was any sort of procedure by which the public utilities of Washington could be benefited and the benefit accrue to the people who live here and who come here, I should be in favor of any sort of an appropriation, even in excess of this lump-sum appropriation of \$20,000.

The test of public utilities, which are created and have their existence only for the benefit of the public, is in the good they bring to the public, and it is not a proper carrying out of an authorized service when the extent of benefit of any public utilities commission consists in giving increased rates to telephone companies, gas companies, electric-light companies, and street railway companies, and no benefit is afforded to the people who are compelled to use these commodities. I would not for a moment think of handicapping the Public Utilities Commission of Washington, but here we have three commissioners, we have a number of officers whom the chairman says it is the plan not to carry on the permanent roll, because they hope every year that there will not be any necessity for their continuance. Therefore they carry only little inconsequential items amounting to about \$3,800, whereas the bulk of the appropriation, the \$28,000, is spent upon assistants, upon counsel for the public utilities commission, upon engineers, upon inspectors, upon men who do the work. The only thing that remains therefore for this \$20,000 which they said a moment ago they thought there was no use for—the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Davis], has figured out that practically all the expense of last year was the expense of the expert, which will not be needed this year. But in order that full scope might be given to whatever necessities could arise,

in order to give full scope to the payment of all necessary expenses, it was my thought to decrease this apparently unnecessary provision of \$20,000 at least to \$10,000.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GARD. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Does the gentleman want this commission to stop work?

Mr. GARD. I want them to go to work.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Can they go to work unless they have the money?

Mr. GARD. They certainly can go to work. They have \$33,000 in a previous item.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. The gentleman's argument is certainly in favor of these utility companies themselves, because they want the commission to stop work, and not to spend any money, and not to do anything.

Mr. GARD. They have their own salaries and this \$33,000 with which to carry on their work, and unless the gentleman can tell me something immediately in prospect for which this \$20,000 can be properly expended, then I must insist upon my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. GARD) there were—ayes 6, noes 10.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 6, the noes are 10, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BLANTON. I made the point of no quorum before the Chair made that announcement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. Will not the gentleman withdraw that point?

Mr. BLANTON. I would rather have a larger vote here than the few Republicans who sit over there and the few Democrats who sit here. I think there are about 14 Republicans on the other side.

Mr. GARD. There are hardly 20 people in the Hall, and I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I thought we could proceed rapidly with the appropriation bill, but it does not appear possible to do so, and I will move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill, H. R. 4226, had come to no resolution thereon.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PRESENTED TO THE WHITE HOUSE FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the White House for the approval of the President of the United States the following joint resolution and bill:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan to the city of Dawson, Ga., tents and cots for use of Confederate veterans in their State convention, June 17 and 18, 1919.

H. R. 1290. Making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. KREIDER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, June 5, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 4746) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Oxford, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4747) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Greene, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4748) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Richfield Springs, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4749) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Cooperstown, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4750) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Sidney, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4751) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Walton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4752) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Delhi, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate one German cannon or fieldpiece to the village of Deposit, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4754) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Union, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4755) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Endicott, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4756) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Johnson City, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4757) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oneonta, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4758) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Norwich, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4759) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Binghamton, N. Y., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 4760) to increase the efficiency of the Medical Department of the United States Navy and to improve the status and efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4761) to abolish the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency and the office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and authorizing the Federal Reserve Board to perform the duties thereof; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 4762) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., four German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 4763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Washingtonville, Ohio, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4764) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the counties of Guernsey, Morgan, Monroe, Muskingum, Noble, and Washington, State of Ohio, 20 German cannons or fieldpieces each, with carriage, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 4765) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Newfield, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 4766) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to certain cities in Missouri one German cannon or fieldpiece, with equipment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. VOIGT: A bill (H. R. 4767) to repeal section 19 of the trading-with-the-enemy act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 4768) for the relief of certain employees of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 4769) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver a condemned cannon to the village of Heuvelton, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 4770) to amend the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 4771) authorizing the establishment of a poultry experimental farm near Glendale, Ariz.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4772) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Hamburg, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 4773) providing for wage increases in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4774) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German cannon, with carriage and cannon balls, to the twin cities of Danville and Buckeye City, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 4775) authorizing the Commissioner of Navigation to register as a vessel of the United States the foreign-built vessel called the *J. A. Bisso*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McGLENNON: A bill (H. R. 4776) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Bayonne, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 4777) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for a site and erect a public building thereon at Clinton, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4779) to provide for a site and erect a public building thereon at Lenoir City, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4780) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Oneida, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4781) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at LaFollette, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4782) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Jefferson City, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4783) to provide a site and erect a public building thereon at Rockwood, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRAND: A bill (H. R. 4784) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Carnesville, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4785) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hartwell, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4786) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Watkinsville, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4787) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monroe, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4788) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Covington, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4789) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madison, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4790) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Greensboro, Ga., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4791) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Washington, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4792) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lexington, Ga., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4793) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elberton, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4794) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Danielsville, Ga., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 4795) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hopkinsville, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4796) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Calhoun, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4797) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hawesville, Ky., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4798) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madisonville, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4799) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morganfield, Ky., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4800) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of East Aurora, N. Y., one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4801) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Springville, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 4802) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the village of Winsted, in the town of Winchester, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4803) to provide for the purchase of an additional site and the erection of an addition to the present post office thereon at Waterbury, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 4804) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Williamsburg, Blair County, Pa., one German cannon, fieldpiece, or other war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSON: A bill (H. R. 4805) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Albany, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4806) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Corbin, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4807) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Pineville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4808) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Somerset, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4809) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Harlan, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4810) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Benham, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4811) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of London, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4812) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Lynch, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4813) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Burkesville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4814) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Manchester, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4815) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Hyden, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4816) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Burnside, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4817) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Monticello, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4818) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to Whitley City, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4819) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Mount Vernon, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4820) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Middlesboro, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4821) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Tompkinsville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4822) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Livingston, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4823) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Williamsburg, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4824) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a German, Austrian, Bulgarian, or Turkish cannon, with carriage and suitable outfit of shells, to the city of Barbourville, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 4825) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grayville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4826) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Eldorado, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4827) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of West Salem, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4828) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cypress, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 4829) to relieve Congress from the adjudication of private claims against the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON: A bill (H. R. 4830) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor" by providing for a bureau of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LAGUARDIA: A bill (H. R. 4831) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provisions for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4832) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish a 4-inch fieldpiece, captured by the Three hundred and fifteenth Infantry on November 11, 1918, in action against Cote de Morimont, north of Verdun, to the city of Philadelphia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4833) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Moore, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4834) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Purcell, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4835) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lexington, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4836) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sulphur, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4837) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hickory, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4838) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dougherty, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4839) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Paoil, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4840) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Washington, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4841) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Elmore City, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4842) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Maysville, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4843) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lindsay, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4844) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stratford, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4845) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wynnewood, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4846) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pauls Valley, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4847) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rosedale, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4848) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Byars, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4849) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harrah, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4850) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Guthrie, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4851) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wayne, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4852) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blanchard, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4853) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Norman, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4854) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Noble, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4855) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Britton, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4856) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Luther, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4857) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Arcadia, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4858) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Edmond, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4859) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Oklahoma City, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4860) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Crescent, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4861) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marshall, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4862) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mulhall, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4863) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Coyle, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4864) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stillwater, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4865) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Perkins, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4866) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Yale, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4867) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cushing, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4868) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Davis, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4869) to amend section 4516 of the Revised Statutes of the United States and section 2 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States, to abolish

arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto, and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4870) to provide revenue for the Government and to safeguard, by a license control of imports of potassium salts and by imposing an import duty thereon, the interests of domestic potash producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 4871) to prohibit the transportation of illegally caught lobsters, also the importation, bringing into, or landing in the United States of any lobsters less than a certain size taken or obtained outside of territorial limits of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 4872) to repeal the law known as the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4873) for the erection of a public building in the city of Stillwater, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4874) for the erection of a public building in the city of Yale, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4875) for the erection of a public building in the city of Cushing, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4876) for the erection of a public building in the city of Edmond, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4877) for the erection of a public building in the city of Norman, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4878) for the erection of a public building in the city of Purcell, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4879) for the erection of a public building in the city of Davis, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4880) for the erection of a public building in the city of Sulphur, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4881) for the erection of a public building in the city of Wynnewood, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4882) for the erection of a public building in the city of Pauls Valley, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4883) for the erection of a public building in the town of Lindsay, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4884) for the erection of a public building in the town of Stratford, State of Oklahoma, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 4885) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building and site at San Luis Obispo, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOULD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) creating a commission to devise a policy of cooperation between the employing and the working element of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the payment to each discharged soldier, sailor, and marine of a bonus in addition to his regular pay and allowance; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, relative to freight rates on materials for public works; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, favoring an appropriation by Congress to secure the early eradication of the European corn borer in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Michigan, favoring the enactment of laws preventing the return to the United States of

any German or Austrian who has been engaged in opposition to the United States and its Allies, and that all alien enemies interned in this country be deported and forever debarred from returning; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial from the Michigan Legislature, favoring the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial from the Ohio Legislature, requesting all trophies of the late war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Memorial from the Ohio Legislature, requesting the Secretary of War to make provision that all trophies of war captured by Ohio troops be collected and sent to Ohio, to be kept as perpetual memorials; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4886) to correct the military record of Edwin Collar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4887) to correct the military record of Harrison R. Crecelius; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4888) to correct the military record of Anderson Creason; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4889) to correct the military record of John B. Hutchings; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4890) to correct the military record of Benjamin Munkers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4891) to correct the military record of William Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4892) for the relief of William M. Gritten; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4893) for the relief of George W. Drake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4894) for the relief of Robert Griffin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4895) for the relief of Jessie Lee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4896) for the relief of James B. Norman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4897) for the relief of Christopher L. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4898) for the relief of Vincent Rust; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4899) for the relief of James F. Alexander; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 4900) granting an increase of pension to Arthur C. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 4901) granting an increase of pension to Clarence L. Wimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEGG: A bill (H. R. 4902) granting a pension to George W. Earhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4903) granting a pension to Harvey Shimer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4904) granting a pension to Jacob Gish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4905) granting a pension to Howard H. Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4906) granting an increase of pension to Mark Hebblethwaite; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 4907) for the relief of certain pay officers of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of Julio Carrasco, a citizen of Mexico; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 4909) granting an increase of pension to Seth N. Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4910) granting an increase of pension to Oscar P. Quiggle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4911) granting a pension to Mathew N. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4912) granting a pension to Emma A. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4913) granting a pension to Mrs. Edward McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4914) granting a pension to Mrs. Nannie A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4915) granting an increase of pension to John A. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4916) granting an increase of pension to John S. Lozier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4917) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cribbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4918) granting an increase of pension to John W. Paulus; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4919) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Margaret Pressler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4920) granting an increase of pension to Peter V. Gruesbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4921) granting an increase of pension to Charles Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4922) to correct the military record of James Hennessy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4923) to correct the military record of Andrew K. Hite; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4924) to correct the military record of Barnebal Schwartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4925) to correct the military record of the late Warren W. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 4926) granting a pension to Jacob Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 4927) for the relief of Nancy A. Parson, C. M. Parson, D. F. Staggs, Ollie Staggs, Rosa Staggs, Lena Birchfield, Alice Birchfield, Bertie Gwin, Greely Gilbert, Linville Gilbert, and Nelson Gilbert; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4928) to reimburse T. Caffey, postmaster at Leeds, Ala., for money and stamps stolen from said post office at Leeds, Ala., and repaid by him to the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4929) granting a pension to James E. Norman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4930) granting an increase of pension to Newton Sigsby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4931) granting an increase of pension to John Coss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 4932) granting an increase of pension to Charles Will; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4933) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hartman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 4934) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Loomis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MEAD: A bill (H. R. 4935) granting a pension to Peter L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4936) granting a pension to Henry A. Meal; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4937) granting an increase of pension to James Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 4938) granting a pension to Ella V. Altmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4939) granting a pension to Sarah M. J. Bertrand; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4940) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4941) granting an increase of pension to Stewart Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4942) granting an increase of pension to James A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4943) granting an increase of pension to William Tomlinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4944) granting an increase of pension to William H. Snowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4945) granting an increase of pension to William H. S. Sipolt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4946) granting an increase of pension to Enos Snodgrass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4947) granting an increase of pension to Perry Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4948) granting an increase of pension to William Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4949) granting an increase of pension to Victor Fousse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4950) granting an increase of pension to Nathan C. Dobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4951) granting an increase of pension to James B. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4952) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4953) granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4954) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel H. Ballah; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 4955) for the relief of Walter Parks; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 4956) providing for the purchase of certain inventions, designs, and methods of aircraft, aircraft parts, and aviation technique of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, of New York; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 4957) granting a pension to Eliza Hess Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4958) granting an increase of pension to Jesse B. Connelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4959) granting an increase of pension to James K. Meacham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 4960) granting a pension to Louis N. Hickey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 4961) granting an increase of pension to Simon P. Kieffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4962) granting an increase of pension to Georgeanna C. Pierson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4963) granting an increase of pension to John L. Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4964) for the relief of Jacob W. Moyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4965) granting a pension to Robert Goodman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4966) granting a pension to Bridget Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4967) granting an increase of pension to John L. Dick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4968) granting a pension to Malissa Sands; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4969) granting a pension to Mary Ann Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 4970) for the relief of Harriet Fisher; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 97) to pay to Silas McElroy, of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of \$10,000 for injuries received while in the service of the Government; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Christian Street Methodist Episcopal Church, David Lord, pastor, urging amendment to the National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of S. D. P. F., No. 14, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Jefferson Lodge, No. 9, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, protesting against affairs existing in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions of Licking Lodge, No. 80, of Newark, Ohio, of the International Association of Machinists, favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Licking Lodge, No. 80, International Association of Machinists, opposing continuance of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BABKA: Petition of members employed in first and second class post offices of the United States and its island possessions, relating to increase of salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BEGG: Petition of Civil War veterans over 72 years of age who are members of the Ohio Soldiers and Sailors' Home, Erie County, Ohio, asking that they be given \$50 per month instead of \$40; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Sill Post, No. 57, Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, of North Baltimore, Ohio, to provide for the burial of the Civil War veterans and their wives; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church congregation of Auburn, Salem County, N. J., protesting against repeal of war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition protesting against repeal of war-prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Lodge No. 21, Z. S. Z., relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of J. R. Z. No. 3, relating to Jugo-Slav affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE: Petition of Ministerial Association of Bucyrus, Ohio, to grant to all American Indians full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of the Zriuski, Frankapen, No. 18, C. of L. of Illinois, urging justice to the Jugo-Slav; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of P. H. Molter and seven other residents of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Idle Hour Tennis Club, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Sparta, Monroe County, Wis., opposing the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry farmers, voters, and taxpayers of Baraboo, Wis., asking for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of La Crosse, Wis., protesting against luxury-tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of St. John the Baptist, K. S. K. J., organization of Wenona, Ill., on the Jugo-Slav-Italian matter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Utica, Ill., protesting against any modification of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Rockford (Ill.) Gas Co., opposing repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rykert & Andrews, of Sycamore, Ill., for repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of McAdams & Sons, of Ottawa, Ill., for repeal of tax on automobiles and other industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Automobile Dealers' Association, favoring H. R. 2857, to regulate the interstate use of automobiles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Broome County, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Cherry Valley, N. Y., and vicinity, asking the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Otego Valley Grange No. 1427, urging the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Binghamton Grange, 1072, of Binghamton, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Walton, N. Y., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Oneonta, N. Y., and vicinity, for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Vestal, N. Y., and vicinity, urging the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of residents of Binghamton, N. Y., and of Smyrna, N. Y., asking for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Tiger Post, No. 23, American Legion, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Lithuanian residents of Binghamton, N. Y., for the protection of Lithuania by the United States of America from foreign aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorials of Benjamin T. Ash and other jewelers of Binghamton, N. Y., and vicinity; of Hills, McLean & Haskins, of Binghamton, N. Y.; and of J. Gordon Black, of Richfield Springs, N. Y., favoring the repeal of the so-called luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the New York Sales Co., Universal Motor Co., Larrabee-Deyo Motor Truck Co., of Binghamton, N. Y.; also of Clark A. Sanford and Earl E. Jenkins, of Margaretville, N. Y.; also of R. W. Hume, of Oneonta, N. Y., opposing manufacturers' sale tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of Richfield Springs, N. Y., and vicinity, asking the repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918 and other sales taxes in title 9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian Churches of Deposit, N. Y.; also Methodist Episcopal Church of Cooperstown, N. Y.; also Sunday school of High Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Binghamton, N. Y., urging the rejection of the President's recommendation that light wines and beer be removed from the operation of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOCH: Petition of 396 voters, members of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Emporia, Kans., protesting against the proposed repeal of any part of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Overbrook, Kans., protesting against the proposed repeal of portions of the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of Mrs. Mattie Hopper and others, of Briggsville, Ark., protesting against the repeal of war-time prohibition on beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of McKessan & Robbins, the Hastings Pavement Co., the R. R. Appleton Co., all of New York City, in the State of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Oil Seeds Co., of New York City, opposing appropriation for continuance of Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Samuel Meckler, of Brooklyn, N. Y., condemning the atrocities against the Jews in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of G. Levor & Co. (Inc.) and 300 employees, of Greater New York and New York State, urging against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENDALL: Petition of sundry Jugo-Slavic organizations of Adah, Ralphon, Gray's Landing, Fayette City, Orient, Boswell, Republic, and Edenborn, in the Twenty-third congressional district, State of Pennsylvania, against a subjugation of any part of their mother country to Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Star Junction, Pa., against the repeal of war-time prohibition as it relates to wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution passed by Local Union No. 3163, United Mine Workers of America, Macdonaldton, Pa., favoring operation and supervision of mines by the United States Government; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, resolution passed by Local Union No. 3078, United Mine Workers of America, Meyersdale, Pa., favoring United States Government control of mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, resolution passed by Local Union No. 3168, United Mine Workers of America, Berlin, Pa., favoring United States Government control of mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of York Run Grange, No. 1699, Patrons of Husbandry, Smithfield, Pa., for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution adopted by the Central Presbyterian Church, of South Brownsville, Pa., favoring a dry Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution adopted by the Sabbath-school convention held in the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Perryopolis, Pa., favoring a dry Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions of Leo E. Adler, I. Shnoper, and Mrs. I. Shnoper, all of Providence, R. I., urging passage of resolution condemning atrocities committed against the Jews in Poland and other Slavic countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of E. B. Hale, Catherine A. Ross, Annie McManus, Mary Quinn, Emma W. Littlefield, K. H. Clark, Cora B. Hoard, Henry R. Davis, Mary E. Davis, Amey L. Willson, J. J. McGrath, Mary T. Walsh, Martha S. L. Potter, J. Howard Covell, Katharine H. Austin, Mary Mackie, and E. Carol Hodge, all of Providence, R. I., and A. Shuman & Co., of Boston, Mass., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution adopted at mass meeting of 10,000 citizens at Providence, R. I., protesting against the Jewish massacres in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pawtucket (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against proposed repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Resolutions of the Plantsville (Conn.) Baptist Church, for prohibition between demobilization and January 16, 1920; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of Onondaga Valley, Onondaga County, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the war emergency prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Walbridge & Co., of Buffalo, N. Y., urging repeal of 10 per cent tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Dr. William M. Mehl, of Buffalo, N. Y., urging repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Brost Bros., of Depew; E. B. Olmsted (Inc.) and Klepser Bros., of Buffalo; and Buffalo Automobile Dealers' Association, all of New York State, asking removal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Industrial Traffic Club, of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing rider in railroad appropriation bill which would strip Interstate Commerce Commission of power from long-and-short-haul clause act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of members of Retail Merchants' Association, P. M. Smith and 29 employees, J. A. Watcham, George S. Staniland, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and 45 employees, all of Buffalo, N. Y., against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURPHY: Petition requesting the Secretary of War to remove to the State of Ohio all trophies captured by the Ohio troops during the war with Germany; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petitions from citizens of Shell Lake and of Grantsburg, Wis., protesting against the President's recommendation that Congress lift the ban on wine and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of executive committee of Workers' Defense Union, of New York City, relative to the labor problems; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Richey, Browne & Donald (Inc.), of New York, against proposed continuance of the Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Shaw-Walker Co. and 500 employees, the Allen-Nugent Co., Carter, Macy & Co. (Inc.), the Metal & Thermit Corporation, and McKessan & Robbins, all of New York City and State of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PAIGE: Petition of Division 12, Ancient Order of Hibernians, against the Smith bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Boston Chamber of Commerce; Cambridge Board of Trade; Andrew J. Peters, mayor of Boston; Jordan Marsh & Co.; Sylpho Nathol Co.; Boston Insurance Co.; A. Lincoln Fitem and others, including 350 retail merchants, all in Massachusetts, against repeal of the daylight-saving bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Retail Trade Board, Chamber of Commerce, Boston Mass., representing 350 leading Boston stores, urging repeal of luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, D. M. Dillon, Steam Boiler Works, and the Atlantic Works, protesting against appropriation for the continuance of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Central Labor Union, of Gardner, Mass., protesting against war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Rev. J. A. Day, of Charlton; Methodist Episcopal Churches of Spencer and Leominster; and E. A. Bedurtha and 95 others, of Leominster, all in the State of Massachusetts, against amendment to the war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 400 wounded patients, against curtailing appropriation to maintain General Hospital No. 10, at Brookline, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAKER: Petitions of Mrs. R. G. Green, of the People's Church, of Westwood, Calif., and L. B. Hinman, pastor Methodist Episcopal Church, of Auburn, Calif., urging the enforcement of the present war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council, urging early enactment of legislation now pending which provides homes for returned soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, letter by John Kelly, keeper, Coast Guard Station No. 320, Point Reyes, Calif., and associates, urging the adoption of proposed legislation amalgamating the Coast Guard Service with the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, urging the repeal of the war-time prohibition measure as it affects manufacture of beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICKETTS: Petition of members of South Harvey Methodist Episcopal Church and Sabbath School against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of Fred A. Peepers, of Covington, Ky., protesting against repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, protesting against the tax on sodas and ice cream; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chevrolet Tarrytown Leahy, urging repeal of tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Metal & Thermit Corporation, New York, opposing the continuance of the Department of Labor Employment Service; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of MacArthur Bros. Co.; McKesson & Robbins; the international committee of the Young Men's Christian Association; and Emma J. Carr, principal Lockwood Academy, all of New York, favoring daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHALL: Petition of Jacob Roth and others, to introduce a bill to save Jews in Poland and eastern countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of C. E. Pendell and others, to repeal daylight saving; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEARS: Petition of New England Association and citizens of St. Cloud, Fla., asking that national soldiers' home be located at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition by citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois, in behalf of the rights of the Jugo-Slavs under the peace treaty with Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, protest against modification of war-time prohibition act from citizens of the seventeenth congressional district of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEELE: Protest of the Easton Board of Trade and individual residents of Easton, Bethlehem, and Northampton County, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Croatian Gymnastic Society, of South Bethlehem, with reference to disposition of provinces under consideration by the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Resolution of mass meeting of 10,000 citizens of Providence, R. I., protesting against the Jewish massacres in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: Petition of D. B. MaGee, pastor University Church, of Salina, Kans., protesting against repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George F. Walston, against repeal of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of members and friends of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Hotchkiss, Colo., protesting against amendment of prohibition law pertaining to beer and light wines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members and friends of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hotchkiss, Colo., against repeal of the war-time prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTERS: Petition of St. Joseph's Sodality, of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Ladies Sodality of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, B. V. M., of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. Columba's Sodality, of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. Patrick's Ladies' Sodality of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of St. John's Ladies' Sodality of Johnstown, Pa., against the Smith educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of American Car & Foundry Co. of Huntington, W. Va., favoring the present daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Huntington Lodge, No. 104, International Association of Machinists, of Huntington, W. Va., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 5, 1919.

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

Almighty God, we invoke Thy blessing upon our labor this new day. The words which are spoken here are far-reaching in their effect. The final conclusions of this high office have to do with the happiness and prosperity of millions of Thy people. Give us a just sense of our responsibility. Give us a blessed consciousness of the Divine Presence, that we may know that we are working together with God in the upbuilding of a fairer, higher, and sweeter civilization. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, June 3, 1919, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Lodge	Sheppard
Ball	Hale	McCormick	Sherman
Borah	Harding	McCumber	Simmons
Brandeggee	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Harrison	McLean	Smith, Md.
Capper	Henderson	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Moses	Smoot
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Spencer
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kellogg	Norris	Swanson
Edge	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Elkins	Kenyon	Overman	Underwood
Fall	Keyes	Page	Wadsworth
Ferdald	King	Penrose	Walsh, Mass.
Fletcher	Kirby	Phelan	Warren
France	Knox	Phipps	Watson
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Pomerene	Williams
Gay	Lenroot	Ransdell	

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

GILLESPIE PLANT EXPLOSION (S. DOC. NO. 30).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$327.77 required by the War Department for payment of claims for personal injury or death sustained through the explosions and fires at the T. A. Gillespie Loading Co.'s plant in October, 1918, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

LONGEVITY PAY OF TEACHERS (S. DOC. NO. 29).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$73,000 required for longevity pay to school-teachers and allowances to principals, as provided for by law, for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 28).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a recommendation of the Auditor for the Post Office Department for the reappropriation of the unexpended balances of the appropriations for compensation to employees of that office for the fiscal year 1919, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3157) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution extending the right of suffrage to women, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE. I present two telegrams in the nature of petitions from citizens of Holyoke, Mass., which I ask to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegrams were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hon. H. LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution adopted at mass meeting May 29, 1919, by citizens of Polish extraction in Easthampton:

"Whereas on the 22d day of May, 1919, there were held in nearly all cities of the United States meetings and demonstrations at which one portion of the population was being incited in a demagogic manner against the other; and

"Whereas at these meetings there was made an attempt at disgracing in the eyes of the American people the new Polish State now arising from bondage of over a century; and

"Whereas, due to an ingenious propaganda, the Senate of the United States, contrary to the tenets of the Monroe doctrine and to the prin-

HOLYOKE, MASS., June 2, 1919.