

SENATE.

MONDAY, December 11, 1911.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

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

WILLIAM O. BRADLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky; WILLIAM LORIMER, a Senator from the State of Illinois; JAMES A. O'GORMAN, a Senator from the State of New York; and ROBERT L. OWEN, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by M. C. Latta, one of the President's secretaries.

RAILROAD SECURITIES COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 253).

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

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for your consideration the report which has been made to me by the Railroad Securities Commission, appointed under the authority of section 16 of the act to create a Commerce Court, approved June 18, 1910 (36 Stat., 556). The report evidences for itself the careful consideration which it has received from the commission, and I heartily concur in the recommendations it contains and urge that appropriate action be taken to carry these recommendations into effect.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 11, 1911.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 162).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the requirements of chapter 1302, Thirty-second Statutes, page 483, "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans," approved June 28, 1902, the annual report of the Isthmian Canal Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 11, 1911.

REPORT ON ORDNANCE AND FORTIFICATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 130).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting the twenty-first annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ONEIDA INDIANS OF WISCONSIN (H. DOC. NO. 251).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the result of the reopening of negotiations with the Oneida Indians of Wisconsin for the commutation of their perpetual annuities under treaty stipulations, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact and conclusions of law filed by the court in the following causes:

David Hockensmith, administrator de bonis non of George W. Hockensmith, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 141); and The County Court of Randolph County, W. Va., v. United States (S. Doc. No. 142).

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

IMPROVEMENT OF RIVERS AND HARBORS (S. DOC. NO. 140).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the officers of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, transmitting resolutions adopted by that body favoring a continuance by Congress of its policy of annual appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, for continuing the contract system, and authorizing free tolls for American ships over improved waterways, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 13278. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across Caddo Lake, in Louisiana; and

H. R. 13988. An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics of tobacco.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a petition of the National Indian War Veterans' Association, praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to those who served the Government from 1865 to 1890, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Philadelphia Brigade Association, Grand Army of the Republic, of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Conference for Panama Canal Free Tolls for Coastwise Commerce, held at Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing free tolls through the Panama Canal for vessels engaged in domestic commerce between the ports of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

He also presented a memorial of the Federation of Labor, of Cleveland, Ohio, remonstrating against the repeal or modification of the present currency system, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the South Texas Seventh-day Adventist Church, of Houston, Tex., remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, praying for the ratification of all arbitration treaties now pending before the Senate and the approval of the Nicaraguan and Honduran conventions, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, praying for the ratification of all arbitration treaties now pending before the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Colorado, favoring the erection of a statue of peace at the entrance to the Panama Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a memorial of the Improved Paper Machinery Co., of Nashua, N. H., remonstrating against any change being made in the present duty on pulp and paper, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of C. W. Hannaford, of Portsmouth, N. H., and the petition of Frances Bather, of Dover, N. H., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a highway from Washington, D. C., to Gettysburg, Pa., as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 444, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, of Concord, N. H., praying for the abrogation of the present treaty between the United States and Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the George Street Chapel Sunday School, of Keene; of the congregations of the First Congregational Church of North Conway, of the First Baptist Church of Franklin, and of Rev. C. C. Garland, of Concord, all in the State of New Hampshire; of the Republican Club of New York City, N. Y.; and of the Delaware Peace Society, of Wilmington, Del., praying for the ratification of the treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Illinois, California, New York, Rhode Island, Delaware, Washington, and Massachusetts, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the Illinois National Guard, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pay for members of the Organized Militia, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 498, International Association of Machinists, of Beardstown, Ill., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 58, Switchmen's Union, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Chicago and Onarga, in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry lodges of the Order of B'rith Abraham of Chicago; of Local Lodge No. 232, Independent Western Star Order, of Peoria; and the congregation of Kehilath Anshe Mayriu of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present resolutions in the form of a petition which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of the people of Mississippi, held on Tuesday, November 21, at the capitol at Jackson, Miss., calling for the abrogation of our treaty with the Empire of Russia.

For more than a generation passports issued by our Government to American citizens have been openly and continually disregarded and discredited by Russia in violation of its treaty obligations and the usage of civilized nations.

During all that time, administration after administration, irrespective of party, has protested against this insult and humiliation, and Congress has on repeated occasions given emphatic expression to its resentment of the stain imposed upon our national honor. Diplomacy has exhausted itself in ineffectual effort to bring relief, for which a new generation is impatiently waiting.

The citizenship of every American who loves his country has in consequence been subjected to degradation, and it has become a matter of such serious import to the people of the United States as an entirety that this condition can no longer be tolerated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting, speaking in the name of many citizens of Mississippi, having at heart the preservation of the honor of our Republic and joining in generous emulation with citizens in all other States, to elevate its moral and political standards and to stimulate an abiding consciousness of its ideal missions among the nations of the earth; that the President of the United States, the Department of State, and Congress be respectfully and earnestly urged to take immediate measures in conformity with the express terms of the treaties now existing between the United States and Russia and in accordance with the law of nations to terminate such treaties to the end that if treaty relations are to exist between the two nations it shall be upon such conditions and guarantees only as shall be consonant with the dignity of the American people.

E. F. NOEL, Chairman.
FREDERICK TULLENS, Secretary.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New York, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN ASSEMBLY, September 20, 1911.

By unanimous consent, Mr. Cuiviller offered for the consideration of the house a resolution in the words following:
Resolution petitioning Congress to establish an Army post in the city of Albany, State of New York.

Whereas the city of Albany is considered the most important strategic point of defense on the Atlantic seaboard, located at the confluence of the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers and the Erie Canal, thereby connecting the city of New York, the greatest seaport in the United States, with the navigable Hudson River, the West Shore, and the New York Central lines, constituting the greatest rail and water line of communication in conjunction with the Erie, Lehigh Valley, and the Delaware & Lackawanna systems, which converge with the West Shore and New York Central, where the jugular vein of the Nation's commerce lies uncovered on the border of a foreign frontier.

Whereas the city of Albany stands at the junction of lines of communication to the east, west, south, and north, and constitutes a point from which United States troops could move to active defense with the least resistance; and it is the duty of each State to lend the assistance to the United States Government in the protection of the United States from a foreign invasion.

Resolved (if the senate concur), That it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of New York that the United States Government establish an Army post in the city of Albany; and the State of New York, through its legislature, will at all times patriotically render any assistance to the United States Government in the proper defense of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives in Congress from the State of New York be requested to use their endeavors to establish an Army post in the city of Albany at the next session of Congress, which convenes on the first Monday in December, 1911; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Member of the House of Representatives and Senators.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1911.

The senate returned the concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to establish an Army post in the city of Albany, with a message that they have concurred in the passage of the same without amendment.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE ASSEMBLY.

STATE OF NEW YORK, County of Albany, ss:

I, George R. Van Namee, clerk of the assembly, do hereby certify that I have compared the foregoing record of proceedings of the assembly of September 20 and 30, 1911, relative to the resolution therein set forth with the original thereof as contained in the original official copy of the journal of proceedings of the assembly of said dates and that the same is a true and correct transcript of said journal of proceedings in so far as the same relates to said resolution and of the whole thereof.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal this 3d day of October, 1911.

[SEAL.]

G. R. VAN NAMEE,
Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented memorials of sundry local lodges, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of New York City, Rochester, Brooklyn, Binghamton, Elmira, Niagara, Mount Vernon, Buffalo, Albany, and Syracuse; of local lodges, Independent Order Ahawas Israel, of New York City, Liberty, Brooklyn, and Sag Harbor; of local lodges, Independent Order B'rith Sholom, of New York City, Sag Harbor, Brooklyn, and Troy; of the Collegiate Zionist League, of New York City; of the First Brooklyn Roman American Congregation, of New York City; and of the James G. Blaine Club, of Harlem, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against certain treatment accorded American citizens by the Government of Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 175, International Longshoremen's Association, of North Tonawanda, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called Wilson bill to amend the laws governing seamen, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Randolph and Staatsburg, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called parcels-post bill, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of the American Group of the Société des Architectes Diplômés par le Gouvernement, and of the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, of New York City, N. Y., praying that the site at the western end of the Mall in the District of Columbia be selected for the so-called Lincoln Memorial, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the Conference for Panama Free Tolls for American Coastwise Commerce, praying for the enactment of legislation providing that vessels engaged in domestic commerce between ports of the United States be granted free passage through the Panama Canal, which was referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

He also presented a memorial of Winchester Post, No. 197, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the incorporation of the Grand Army of the Republic, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Palmer, Jamestown, and Buffalo, all in the State of New York, praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens, churches, and civic organizations of New York City, Utica, Dolgeville, Dobbs Ferry, Rochester, Geneva, Fort Byron, Wappingers Falls, Albany, Saugerties, and Amsterdam, all in the State of New York, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the First German Seventh-day Adventist Church of Brooklyn, N. Y., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRIGGS presented petitions of L. G. White, of Asbury Park; William C. Hendrickson, of Belle Mead; S. B. Renick and J. W. Smith, of Bloomfield; A. N. Roe, of Branchville; the First Presbyterian Church of Burlington; R. H. Blake and Lewis Buddy 3d, of East Orange; the Presbyterian and Lutheran Churches of German Valley; the Firesburg Congregation of Salem County; the West Side Presbyterian Church of Englewood; L. R. Laban, of Harlingen; the Methodist, Presbyterian, and Baptist churches of Highstown; the First Presbyterian Church of Jersey City; the Reformed Church of Lebanon; the Montclair Heights Reformed Church and Edgar S. Wiers, of Montclair; the Roseville Methodist Episcopal Church and the First Congregational Jube Memorial Church, of Newark; the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Park Ridge; the Board of Trade of Bound Brook; the conference of clergy of the Episcopal Church in the diocese of Newark; the Presbyterian Church of Barnegat; the Baptist Church of New Monmouth; Rev. R. F. Bresnahan, of Hamburg; B. C. Pond, of Paterson; the Religious Society of Friends of Plainfield; the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Phillipsburg; the Religious Society of Friends of Shrewsbury and Plainfield; the Inter-Church Federation of Salem County; Horace S. Osborne, of Upper Montclair; J. S. Johnson, Mrs. J. S. Johnson, Mary L. Knauff, Edward L. Truslow, and H. De Gehring, of Summit; the Union Place Methodist Episcopal Church, of Union Hill; Isaac Senzner, of Trenton; and the Calvary Baptist Church of Westwood, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States,

Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Hebrew Association of Elizabeth; the Congregation B'nai Jeshurun of Newark; the Temple of Israel of West Hoboken; Silk City Lodge and A. M. White Lodge, of Paterson; Newark City, Baron Rothschild, Independent Newark, Gerechtigkeits Lodge, of Newark; Lodge No. 375 of Morristown; Alliance Lodge, of Alliance; Carmel Lodge, of Carmel; Hoboken City Lodge; Atlantic City Lodge; Passaic City Lodge; North Hudson Lodge, of Union Hill; and Woodbine Lodge, Independent Order B'rith Abraham; the Essex County, Jesse Seligman, and Liberty Lodges, of Newark; the Bannert and New Paterson Lodges, of Paterson, Order of B'rith Abraham; and the Combiner, Botushaner Brotherhood, and Newark Young Men Lodges, of Newark; Liberty Lodge, of Norma; Maccabee Lodge, of Bridgeton; Camden City Lodge, of Camden; and Independent Bayonne City Lodge, of Bayonne, all of the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the treatment of certain American citizens by the Government of Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 497, of Portland; of Pine Tree Lodge, No. 500, of Bangor; and of Local Lodge No. 367, of Biddeford, all of the Order B'rith Abraham, in the State of Maine, praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Shoeworkers' Union of Augusta, Me., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Smoot printing bill, which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Bath, Me., and a petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Bangor, Me., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of the Delaware Peace Society, of Wilmington, Del.; of the Chamber of Commerce of Boston, Mass.; of sundry citizens of Waltham, Mass.; of the Board of Trade of Little Rock, Ark.; of the Baptist Ministerial Association, of Indianapolis; the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Peru; of the congregations of the three Evangelical Churches at the Union Thanksgiving Service, of La Grange; and of the Literary Club of Terre Haute, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Rev. M. Messing Lodge, No. 137, Order B'rith Abraham, of Indianapolis, Ind., and a petition of the Congregation of B'nai Israel, of Indiana Harbor, Ind., praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Journeymen Barbers' Union No. 14, of Fort Wayne, Ind., and a petition of the Beacon Lights, of Goshen, Ind., praying that an investigation be made into the condition of dairy products for the prevention and spread of tuberculosis, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Broward Post, No. 505, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, of Kendallville, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill and the repeal of the date of limitation of the so-called widow's pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Forty-ninth Indiana Regimental Association, at English, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called dollar-a-day pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAMBLE presented a petition of the State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of South Dakota, praying for the passage of the so-called parcel post bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of Trinity Episcopal Church, of Watertown; of the Union Thanksgiving Services of Sioux Falls; of the First Baptist Church of Ipswich; and of D. F. Jones, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Kilpatrick Post, No. 4, Department of South Dakota, Grand Army of the Republic, of Huron, S. Dak., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I present a resolution adopted by the Congregation of the Baptist Church of Repton, Ala., which I ask may lie on the table and be printed in the Record.

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

Whereas there are many millions of dollars being spent by our Government in the building and equipping of warships and in maintaining our Army and Navy; and

Whereas the Christian religion is a religion of peace and good will to all men: Therefore

Resolved, That we, the Baptist Church of Repton, Ala., in conference assembled, do give our unqualified indorsement to the passage of the arbitration measures now pending before the Senate of the United States, and hereby appeal to our Senators, Hon. JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON and Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, to use their influence in the passage of the aforesaid legislation.

W. N. HUCKABEE, *Moderator.*
W. S. DREDDEN, *Church Clerk.*

Mr. PERKINS. I present resolutions adopted by Encampment No. 162, Union Veteran Legion, of San Jose, Cal., which I ask may be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ENCAMPMENT NO. 162, UNION VETERAN LEGION,
San Jose, Cal., November 30, 1911.

To Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,
United States Senate:

In compliance with the resolutions of Encampment No. 162, Union Veteran Legion, adopted by a unanimous vote at its regular meeting on the 4th day of November, 1911, we respectfully transmit to you for your favorable consideration and your early and favorable action the following copy of said resolutions.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM A. COULTER, *Colonel.*
J. H. RUSSELL, *Adjutant.*

Whereas there is pending before the Sixty-second Congress three bills, H. R. 9837, one by Hon. J. M. HAMILTON, and S. 2006, entitled "A bill to create in the War Department and the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as 'the Civil War volunteer officers' retired list,'" etc.; and

Whereas a similar bill was reported favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House in the Sixty-first Congress (H. Rept. 1010): Now therefore

Resolved, That the colonel commanding this encampment be, and he is hereby, authorized and instructed to deliver to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California, and to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House and Senate, the following petition in behalf of our worthy comrades who will be beneficiaries under said bills.

ENCAMPMENT NO. 162, UNION VETERAN LEGION,
San Jose, Cal., November 4, 1911.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the surviving veterans of the Civil War, members of Encampment No. 162, Union Veteran Legion, who served from two to four years in the field or were wounded in the line of duty, respectfully and earnestly petition your Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and House, respectively, to make an early and favorable report on the bills referred to in the preamble and resolution above recited, and with equal earnestness we petition the Congress to pass such a bill at the earliest date possible.

The justice of and the necessity for such a bill are clearly and forcibly set forth in the able argument of Gen. A. B. Nettleton, now deceased, before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House in the Sixty-first Congress on February 24, 1910 (public document, "Civil War volunteer officers' retired list"), and in the report of the Committee on Military Affairs (H. Rept. 1010).

Your petitioners ask your attention to the petitions in favor of these and similar bills on the files of your respective Committees on Military Affairs from many thousand citizens and veterans, and among these petitions from judges of the supreme and superior courts and city and county officials setting forth the reasons why this measure should not be postponed for others less urgent.

Your petitioners respectfully but earnestly point out the injustice of further delay. Gen. Nettleton, their able advocate, and thousands of other veterans have passed away since the beginning of these efforts for just recognition, and though death may decimate their ranks it will not abate the censure for delay which will animate the thousands of their surviving sons and grandsons who now and hereafter will constitute the society of the Sons of Veterans and the Military Order of the Loyal Legion.

Respectfully submitted by Encampment No. 162, Union Veteran Legion.

WILLIAM A. COULTER, *Colonel.*
J. H. RUSSELL, *Adjutant.*

Mr. PERKINS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Sebastopol, Santa Cruz, Redding, and Mountain View, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the State Federation of Labor of California, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a battleship at the Mare Island Navy Yard in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the State Federation of Labor of California, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the exclusion from the United States of all Asiatic races, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of South Pasadena, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the fortification of the Los Angeles Harbor in that State, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Berkeley, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for building of a dry dock in San Francisco Bay, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Los Angeles and Oakland, in the State of California, remonstrating against the treatment accorded American citizens by the Government of Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Sacramento, and Ocean Park, all in the State of California, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KERN presented a memorial of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, praying that an appropriation be made of \$5,000 a year for two years, to be expended by the Bureau of Ethnology in special work for the preservation of the languages of the Indian tribes, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry citizens of Plymouth, Big Rapids, Detroit, Adrian, and Blissfield, all in the State of Michigan, praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a highway from Washington, D. C., to Gettysburg, Pa., as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of Grand Lodge, Independent Western Star Order, of Detroit, Mich., praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry members of the State National Guard of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the pay of members of the Organized Militia, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the extension of the parcels-post system beyond its present limitations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 10.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, do hereby submit for your consideration the following memorial:

Whereas for a long period of time controversies have arisen over the alleged trespass upon the Crow Indian Reservation of stock ranging upon the public lands of the United States contiguous to said reservation; and

Whereas settlers living adjacent to said reservation have been compelled to submit to the impounding of their stock ranging upon their own lands whenever the same would cross over the line and be found upon said reservation; and

Whereas the Crow Indians upon said reservation, acting under the direction of the agent and superintendent in charge, have been permitted to gather such stock and impound the same and exact a payment of \$1 per head before its release; and

Whereas recent events have disclosed a willingness on the part of said Indians to so gather stock actually ranging beyond the exterior boundaries of said reservation, and after driving the same upon the reservation to exact the payment aforesaid, by reason whereof serious controversies have arisen and much ill feeling has been engendered between said settlers and said Indians: Therefore

The Twelfth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana respectfully request the immediate passage of such legislation as will provide for the fencing of said Crow Indian Reservation upon the west and south sides thereof, the only sides of said reservation necessary to be fenced, the north and east sides thereof being protected by natural barriers.

W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.
W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 2, 1911.

Filed March 2, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, Governor.

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Montana, ss:

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of House joint memorial No. 10, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the fencing of the Crow Indian Reservation, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 2d day of March, A. D. 1911.

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

Done at Helena, the capital of said State, this 8th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Montana, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House joint memorial 8.

Memorial to Congress, praying for the enactment of legislation that will relieve the settlers on the public domain, wherein their improvements were destroyed by forest fires.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana (the Senate concurring), That whereas during the year A. D. 1910 extensive and devastating forest fires have destroyed the homes of large numbers of homestead settlers on the public domain and destroyed their improvements, live stock, and the fruits of their labor of many years; and

Whereas they are practically bankrupt and unable to comply with the rigorous demands of the Federal homestead laws, and as it is necessary for them to seek other labor and employment to support themselves and families, and of necessity must absent themselves from their homesteads; and

Whereas they can not, within the time allowed by the United States homestead laws, accumulate enough money to restore their homes, dwellings, improvements, and make their homesteads self-sustaining and comply with the requirements of said homestead laws: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, That we respectfully petition the National Congress to pass an act of Congress providing that final homestead proof be permitted to be made by all bona fide homestead settlers who have had their homes and improvements destroyed by forest fires and who have actually and continuously resided on said homestead lands for a period of at least two years immediately preceding the 1st day of November, A. D. 1910, and who have expended at least the sum of \$1,000 on said homesteads in placing buildings, fences, improvements, and orchards thereon, and in work upon and in cultivating the same, and that United States patents issue to such homestead settlers after making such proof, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by said act of Congress or by the Secretary of the Interior.

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of Montana to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

W. W. McDOWELL,
Speaker of the House.
W. R. ALLEN,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 2, 1911.

Filed March 2, 1911.

EDWIN L. NORRIS, Governor.

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, State of Montana, ss:

I, A. N. Yoder, secretary of state of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 8, praying for legislation that will relieve the settlers on the public domain wherein their improvements were destroyed by forest fires, enacted by the twelfth session of the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana and approved by Edwin L. Norris, governor of said State, on the 2d day of March, 1911.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of said State. Done at the city of Helena, the capital of said State, this 9th day of March, A. D. 1911.

[SEAL.]

A. N. YODER, Secretary of State.

Mr. MYERS presented a petition of Baron De Hirsh Lodge, No. 420, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, of Butte, Mont., praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BROWN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Neligh, Nebr., remonstrating against the extension of the parcels-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of State Lodge, No. 144, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of Omaha, Nebr., remonstrating against the treatment accorded American citizens by the Government of Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Retailers' Association, of Franklin, Nebr., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Beatrice, Falls City, Tremont, Verdon, David City, Omaha, Seward, Up-land, Auburn, and South Omaha, all in the State of Nebraska, praying for the construction of a highway from Washington, D. C., to Gettysburg, Pa., as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 5, Switchmen's Union of North America, of Omaha, Nebr., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wellington, Collier, and Logan, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Burton, Kans., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of McClusky, N. Dak., and a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Greatstone, N. Dak., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Heaton, N. Dak., and a petition of the Delaware Peace Society, of Wilmington, Del., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry members of the North Dakota National Guard, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the pay of members of the Organized Militia, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of General Alexander Hays Post, No. 3, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania, of Pittsburgh, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to incorporate the Grand Army of the Republic, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Vandergrift, Pa., remonstrating against the extension of the parcels-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of Hope Lodge, No. 210, of Pittsburgh; of Israel Isian Lodge, No. 380, of Johnstown; and of Iron City Lodge, No. 217, of Pittsburgh, all of the Order of B'rith Abraham, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the Monthly Meeting of Friends of Bristol; of the congregation of Hancock Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia; and of the congregation of St. Mark's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURNHAM presented petitions of the Delaware Peace Society; of the congregation of the First Baptist Church, of Franklin; of the Union Thanksgiving Service, United Churches, of Concord; of the George Street Chapel Sunday School, of Keene; and of the congregation of the First Congregational Church, of North Conway, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Frederick J. Rider, of Portsmouth, N. H., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of a highway from Washington, D. C., to Gettysburg, Pa., as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 444, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of Concord, N. H., praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NIXON presented a memorial of sundry bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Reno, Nev., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday in the post offices of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Young Men's Hebrew Association of Reno, Nev., praying for the abrogation of the treaty between the United States and Russia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Reno, Nev., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LORIMER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wenona, Ill., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Manhattan, Ill., remonstrating against the extension of the parcels-post system beyond its present limitations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Ministerial Association of Waukegan, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to further regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Metal Trades Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize the President to invite the International Congress of Social Insurance to hold its next triennial convention in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OVERMAN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Mayodan, N. C., remonstrating against the extension of the parcels-post system beyond its present limitations, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the following lodges of the Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, all in the State of Massachusetts, in favor of the abrogation of all treaties between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Pride of Fall River Lodge, Fall River.
 New Boston Lodge, Boston.
 Beverly Lodge, Beverly.
 Bay State Lodge, Chelsea.
 Progressive Lodge, Boston.
 Cape Ann Lodge, Gloucester.
 First Attleboro Lodge, Attleboro.
 New Bedford Lodge, New Bedford.
 Pride of Malden Lodge, Malden.
 Lawrence Independent Lodge, Lawrence.
 City of Homes Lodge, Springfield.
 Brai Zion Lodge, Worcester.
 Star of Fall River Lodge, Fall River.
 Greater Boston Lodge, Boston.
 Jefferson Lodge, Fall River.
 Pride of Brockton Lodge, Brockton.
 Pride of Liberty Lodge, Boston.
 Old Boston Lodge, Boston.
 Harmony Lodge, Chelsea.
 Hampden Lodge, Springfield.
 Lazarus Davis Lodge, Boston.
 Congress Lodge, Chelsea.
 East Boston Lodge, Boston.
 Cambridge Lodge, Cambridge.
 Crown of the East Lodge, Boston.
 Freedom Lodge, Malden.
 Anshey Dowig Lodge, Boston.
 Lord Beaconsfield Lodge, Boston.
 Jeasahjah Lodge, Boston.
 Educational Lodge, Boston.
 Plymouth Rock Lodge, Brockton.
 General Grant Lodge, Boston.
 Crown of Liberty Lodge, Boston.
 Haverhill Zion Lodge, Haverhill.
 Star of Boston Lodge, Boston.
 Rodphey Sholem Lodge, Holyoke.
 Merrimac Valley Lodge, Lawrence.
 King Edward Lodge, Boston.
 Sanders Lodge, Leominster.
 Taunton Lodge, Taunton.
 Pride of Boston Lodge, Boston.
 Pittsfield Lodge, Pittsfield.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the following lodges of the Order of B'rith Abraham, all in the State of Massachusetts, in favor of the abrogation of all treaties between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Harmony Lodge, Fall River.
 Star of Lawrence Lodge, Lawrence.
 Prospect Lodge, Boston.
 Unity Lodge, Boston.
 Fall River Lodge, Fall River.
 Paper City Lodge, Holyoke.
 Rabbi Jacob Joseph Lodge, Lawrence.
 Bay State Lodge, Boston.
 Freedom Lodge, Boston.
 William E. Russell Lodge, Boston.
 Knights of Liberty Lodge, Boston.
 Pride of Haverhill Lodge, Haverhill.
 Israel Lodge, Boston.
 Springfield Lodge, Springfield.
 Pride of Boston Lodge, Boston.
 President Roosevelt Lodge, Boston.
 Pride of Massachusetts Lodge, Boston.
 Worcester Lodge, Worcester.
 Crown of Massachusetts Lodge, Boston.
 The South End Boston Lodge, Boston.
 Ahawath Achim Lodge, Boston.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the following lodges of the Independent Order United Hebrews, all in the State of Massachusetts, in favor of the abrogation of all treaties

between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Pilgrim Lodge, Brockton.
Whaling City Lodge, New Bedford.
Paul Revere Lodge, Chelsea.
Louis Saklad Lodge, Boston.
Commonwealth Lodge, Fall River.
Progressive Lodge, Chelsea.
King David Lodge, Chelsea.
Friendship Lodge, Boston.
Revival Lodge, Worcester.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the Tower of Zion and Young Zionists, of Worcester, Mass.; the Hebrew Synagogue Agudas Achim, of Brockton, Mass.; and the Whaleman City Lodge, United Hebrews of America; Congregation Aharath Achim, Congregation Chesed Shell Emeth, Congregation Linath Hazedeck, and Max Levy Progressive Lodge, of New Bedford, Mass., favoring the abrogation of all treaties between the United States and the Government of Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 1150) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the General Conference of Congregational Churches and the Brotherhood of the Broadway Congregational Church, of Norwich; of the Methodist congregations of High Ridge and Sellecks Corners; the Methodist Preachers' Union of Housatonic Valley; and of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Rocky Hill, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the German-American Alliance of the State of Connecticut, praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the present immigration laws, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented memorials of the Local Section, Council of Jewish Women, of Hartford; of Julia Herzog Lodge, No. 221, Independent Order Western Star, of Stamford; of Local Lodge, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Hartford; and of the Congregation of Ados Israel, of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the treatment of certain American citizens by the Government of Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia presented petitions of Virginia Lodge, No. 120, Independent Order B'rith Shalom, of Norfolk; of Local Lodge, No. 181, Independent Order B'rith Shalom, of Lynchburg; of Virginia Lodge, No. 171, Independent Order Western Star; and of Local Lodge, No. 325, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of Portsmouth, all in the State of Virginia, praying for the abrogation of the present treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McCUMBER presented a petition of sundry ex-Union and ex-Confederate soldiers of the Civil War, of Clarksburg, W. Va., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of Local Lodge No. 443, of Eveleth; of Local Lodges Nos. 119, 175, and 381, of Minneapolis; of Local Lodges Nos. 133 and 337, of Duluth, order of B'rith Abraham; and of Local section, Council of Jewish Women, of St. Paul, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the abrogation of the present treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Retail Grocers' Association of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of Como Avenue Congregational Church, of Minneapolis; the St. Anthony Park Congregational Church, of St. Paul; and the Temple Emanuel Congregation, of Duluth; of members of the First Baptist Church, the Ministerial Association, and the Commercial Club of Brainerd; of the Union Meeting of Churches of Detroit; of the Union Thanksgiving Meeting of the Churches of Hawley; and of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Mankato, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CRANE presented petitions of the Massachusetts Peace Society, of the Board of Trade of Springfield, Mass., and of the congregation of the Second Congregational Church of Hol-

yoke, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WETMORE presented petitions of the congregations of the Shawomet Baptist Church, of Warwick; the Pawcatuck Congregational Church, of Westerly; and the Pilgrim Congregational Church, of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Providence, R. I., praying for the construction of a shore landing place in connection with the Harbor of Refuge at Point Judith, R. I., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 292, of Woonsocket, and of Local Lodge No. 330, of Providence, of the Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the abrogation of the present treaty between the United States and Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, of Westerly, R. I., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented memorials of the United Israelite Society, of sundry lodges of the Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of Milwaukee and La Crosse, and of the Grand Lodge Independent Western Star Order, of Sheboygan, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the treatment accorded American citizens by the Government of Russia, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of the congregation of the St. Adalbert Church, of Rosholt; of the Lay Electoral Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the First Congregational Church, of Lake Geneva; the Bohemian Brethren Presbyterian Church and the German Baptist Church, of Racine; the First Baptist Church of Oshkosh; the Christian Scientists Churches; and sundry citizens of Milwaukee, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of F. H. Hageman and Louis Fuldwerth, of Milwaukee, and B. Heinemann, of Wausau, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the construction of a highway from Washington, D. C., to Gettysburg as a memorial to Abraham Lincoln, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge, Pattern Makers' Association; the Federated Trades Council; and Local Union No. 18, International Longshoremen's Association, all of Milwaukee, in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to better the condition of seamen and the safeguarding of the lives of passengers, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the George D. Eggleston Post, Department of Wisconsin, Grand Army of the Republic, of Appleton, Wis., praying for the passage of the so-called old-age pension bill, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented memorials of the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal and the Congregational Churches of White-water, of the First Methodist and First Presbyterian Churches of Oconto, and of the Union Congregational Church of Green Bay, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for the ratification of the proposed arbitration treaties between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 27, Feeders, Helpers, and Job Pressmen, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to improve the condition of the seamen of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina presented petitions of sundry citizens of Columbia, S. C., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaties of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, of Sheldon, Wyo., and a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, of Cheyenne, Wyo., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the memorial of J. R. Manton, secretary and treasurer of the Congress of the Knights of Labor, of Albany, N. Y., remonstrating against placing wood pulp and print paper on the free list, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Florence, S. C., praying for the retention of the last paragraph of article 3 of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States, Great Britain, and France, which was ordered to lie on the table.

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH CULBERTSON CLAYTON (S. DOC. NO. 143.)

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred an address by Joseph Culbertson Clayton on "Some Aspects of the Constitution," presented by Mr. SUTHERLAND on the 5th instant, moved that it be printed as a document, which was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 3505) to purchase an oil painting entitled "The Death of Brevet Lieutenant Colonel Alonzo H. Cushing"; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 3506) granting an annuity equivalent to \$75 per month to officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have attained the age of 60 years and have been, or may hereafter be, awarded medals of honor for gallantry and heroism involving great personal peril, and authorizing the President of the United States to make rules and regulations for carrying the act into effect;

A bill (S. 3507) to grant an honorable discharge to C. Wilson Walker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3508) to correct the military record of Edward M. Warren;

A bill (S. 3509) to grant an honorable discharge to George W. Hopkins;

A bill (S. 3510) to correct the military record of Samuel Geissinger;

A bill (S. 3511) to correct the military record of Thomas Amick;

A bill (S. 3512) to grant an honorable discharge to Samuel Fogle (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3513) to correct the military record of Jacob Metzinger; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3514) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Conner;

A bill (S. 3515) granting a pension to Bernard Closkey;

A bill (S. 3516) granting pensions to soldiers confined in so-called Confederate prisons;

A bill (S. 3517) granting a pension to Emma A. Davis;

A bill (S. 3518) granting a pension to Laura V. Geissinger;

A bill (S. 3519) granting a pension to Bridget Petrie;

A bill (S. 3520) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor R. Evans;

A bill (S. 3521) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Elliott;

A bill (S. 3522) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Ferrier;

A bill (S. 3523) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Felton;

A bill (S. 3524) granting a pension to Addaline Frost;

A bill (S. 3525) granting an increase of pension to James J. Hasson;

A bill (S. 3526) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Helmbold;

A bill (S. 3527) granting an increase of pension to Christian Kinsley;

A bill (S. 3528) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Jarrett;

A bill (S. 3529) granting an increase of pension to John M. Rhoads;

A bill (S. 3530) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bisbin;

A bill (S. 3531) granting a pension to Marion L. Wilson;

A bill (S. 3532) granting a pension to Mary E. Burg;

A bill (S. 3533) granting an increase of pension to Hartman K. Wismer;

A bill (S. 3534) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Rhodes;

A bill (S. 3535) granting an increase of pension to David A. Buchanan;

A bill (S. 3536) granting a pension to Elizabeth Clampitt;

A bill (S. 3537) granting an increase of pension to William Cook;

A bill (S. 3538) granting an increase of pension to William R. Schaffer;

A bill (S. 3539) granting an increase of pension to William Sherwood;

A bill (S. 3540) granting an increase of pension to John Rockwell;

A bill (S. 3541) granting an increase of pension to John H. Wood;

A bill (S. 3542) granting a pension to Harvey Transue;

A bill (S. 3543) granting a pension to Della White;

A bill (S. 3544) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Hayes (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3545) granting an increase of pension to Hannah R. Mackie (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3546) granting an increase of pension to John S. Rodgers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3547) granting an increase of pension to William J. Wallace (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3548) granting an increase of pension to John Weaver (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3549) granting a pension to Robert J. Campbell (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3550) granting an increase of pension to John G. Myers (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3551) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Attreed (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3552) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Cooper Crawford (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 3553) granting an increase of pension to Charles Campbell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3554) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Dunlap (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3555) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Furry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 3556) to grant an honorable discharge to Reuben Seiler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3557) for the investigation and control of the chestnut-tree blight; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3558) to reduce postal rates, to improve the postal service, and to increase postal revenues; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3560) to transfer jurisdiction of the Washington Aqueduct, the filtration plant, and appurtenances to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3561) amending paragraph 6 of the act relating to the Metropolitan police force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 3562) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Patterson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 3563) directing the Postmaster General to credit John A. Bingham, former postmaster at Vandalia, Ill., in the sum of \$500 on account of stamps lost by burglary; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 3564) granting a pension to Cora Edith Tanner;

A bill (S. 3565) granting a pension to Lillian A. Grierson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3566) granting an increase of pension to Hiram S. Plummer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3567) granting an increase of pension to William N. Berkley (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 3568) granting an honorable discharge to John D. Durie; and

A bill (S. 3569) for the relief of Ralph Deremer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

A bill (S. 3570) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for determining the heirs of deceased Indians, for the disposition and sale of allotments of deceased Indians, for the leasing of allotments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 855); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 3571) to increase pension for total deafness;

A bill (S. 3572) granting an increase of pension to George T. Pollard (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3573) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Leach (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3574) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah W. Hancock (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3575) granting an increase of pension to Calvin W. Keefer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3576) granting a pension to Sarah Thomas (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3577) granting a pension to Clyde W. Duvall (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3578) granting an increase of pension to Milton Cobler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON:

A bill (S. 3580) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Henry A. Hawgood*; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3581) granting a pension to Andrew Knight;

A bill (S. 3582) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kuster; and

A bill (S. 3583) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Van Nest; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 3584) granting an increase of pension to John Sparks;

A bill (S. 3585) granting an increase of pension to William C. Emison (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3586) granting an increase of pension to Samuel S. Weaver (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

(By request.) A bill (S. 3587) providing for the payment of certain sums found due by the auditor of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia under the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1909, chapter 306; to the Committee on the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 3588) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brooks (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3589) granting a pension to Otto Paulson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3590) granting an increase of pension to David Johnson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3591) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McFarland (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3592) granting an increase of pension to James A. Todd (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3593) granting a pension to Tillie A. Courtney (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3594) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Sullivan (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3595) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hughes (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3596) granting an increase of pension to Jerry Butts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 3597) granting a pension to John Bell;

A bill (S. 3598) granting an increase of pension to Henry Blaise (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3599) granting an increase of pension to William C. Hart (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3600) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Priest (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3601) granting a pension to William A. Hickok (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3602) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Ellis (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3603) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dunham (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3604) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Hyde (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

(By request.) A bill (S. 3605) providing for the discontinuance of the grade of post noncommissioned staff officer on the active list of the Army and creating the grade of warrant officer in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3606) granting an increase of pension to John Clopine; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS (for Mr. KENYON):

A bill (S. 3608) for the relief of Robert McFarland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3609) granting a pension to Louise R. Davis;

A bill (S. 3610) granting a pension to Fannie L. McVey;

A bill (S. 3611) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Ruge;

A bill (S. 3612) granting an increase of pension to Gustus F. Johnson;

A bill (S. 3613) granting an increase of pension to Thomas N. Primm; and

A bill (S. 3614) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Summers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 3615) granting an increase of pension to Walter L. Donohue; and

A bill (S. 3616) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hemenway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

(By request.) A bill (S. 3617) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3618) to provide for the importation of illuminating and fog-signal apparatus for the Lighthouse Service free of duty; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 3619) relating to the anchorage of vessels in navigable water of the United States; and

A bill (S. 3620) to regulate radiocommunication; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3621) for the permanent improvement of the consular and diplomatic services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 3622) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 3623) granting an increase of pension to Josiah Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WORKS. I introduce a bill, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. Accompanying the bill is a short memorial, which I ask to have printed and referred with the bill.

The bill (S. 3624) granting to Allan C. Rush the right of way and other privileges for the construction of a suspension bridge across the waters of San Francisco Bay to connect the cities of San Francisco and Oakland, Cal., was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the memorial will be printed (S. Doc. No. 144) and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs to accompany the bill.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 3625) for the purchase or construction of a launch for the customs service at and in the vicinity of Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER:

A bill (S. 3626) granting a pension to Amelia Walker;

A bill (S. 3627) granting an increase of pension to William C. Williams (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bargerstock (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3629) granting an increase of pension to William C. Torrence (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3630) granting an increase of pension to John A. Montgomery (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3631) granting an increase of pension to James Henry Albert (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a bill relating to the Panama Canal tolls. I will say it is the bill introduced in the last Congress by the late Senator Frye, of Maine. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

The bill (S. 3632), to provide for the payment of tolls and transit charges of public vessels of the United States and merchant vessels of the United States passing through the Panama Canal, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

By Mr. LORIMER:

A bill (S. 3633) for the relief of Helen M. Kennicott; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3634) granting a pension to Melissa J. King;

A bill (S. 3635) granting an increase of pension to Frank Biermann (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3636) granting a pension to John August Bohman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 3637) to confer jurisdiction upon the district court of the United States for the northern district of California to determine in equity the rights of American citizens under the award of the Bering Sea arbitration of Paris and to render judgment thereon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A bill (S. 3638) for the relief of Norton P. Chipman; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 3639) for the relief of Bernard G. Dingler and others, lately laborers employed by the United States military authorities under the Quartermaster's Department at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3640) to amend certain sections of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and to provide for the designation of fleet staff officers in the Navy;

A bill (S. 3641) to provide for the deposit in the Treasury of the United States of moneys unclaimed by next of kin belonging to deceased inmates of the naval home or derived from the sale of their personal effects, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3642) to amend the act of January 25, 1895, as amended by the act of March 3, 1901, relative to the administration of oaths;

A bill (S. 3643) to provide for the examination for promotion of officers of the Navy by a single examining board, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3644) to provide for a reserve of personnel for the United States Navy and Marine Corps and for its enrollment;

A bill (S. 3645) to amend the law providing for the payment of the death gratuity as applicable to the Navy and Marine Corps; and

A bill (S. 3646) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the administration of justice in the Navy," to amend section 1624 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 3647) granting an increase of pension to Fredericka Trilley;

A bill (S. 3648) granting an increase of pension to John A. Boulger; and

A bill (S. 3649) granting an increase of pension to James Gallagher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 3650) for the relief of heirs of Rufus Avery, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 3651) for the relief of Gilbert Wilkerson and Jeremiah Sparks, alias Dave Sparks; and

A bill (S. 3652) for the relief of the estate of John Westley Eubanks, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3653) granting an increase of pension to Silas Wilder (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3654) granting an increase of pension to John A. Doan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRANE:

A bill (S. 3655) granting an increase of pension to Maria L. Miller;

A bill (S. 3656) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. B. Knox; and

A bill (S. 3657) granting an increase of pension to Matthew O'Halloran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 3658) for the relief of J. N. Whittaker; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3659) granting a pension to Sarah F. Maynard;

A bill (S. 3660) granting a pension to Roland B. Horsley;

A bill (S. 3661) granting a pension to Walter S. Buchanan; and

A bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to Rachael Chambers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 3663) granting an increase of pension to Ozro M. Hale (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3664) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Brown (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3665) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Lile (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3666) granting an increase of pension to George M. Conner (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3667) granting an increase of pension to Dennis McCarty (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3668) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Nott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3669) granting an increase of pension to Edward Seaton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3670) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Skelton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3671) granting an increase of pension to Elijah H. Spencer (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3672) granting an increase of pension to Edwin E. Austin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN:

A bill (S. 3673) granting pensions to Lola B. Hendershott and Louise Hendershott; and

A bill (S. 3674) granting a pension to Dora D. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 3675) to correct the military record of John A. Patterson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 3676) granting an increase of pension to Manlius Holbrook (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3677) granting an increase of pension to John A. McPeeters (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3678) granting an increase of pension to John G. Smith (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3679) granting an increase of pension to Abner E. Armstrong (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3680) granting an increase of pension to Malchi Baughman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3681) granting an increase of pension to Hiram R. McCord (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3682) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon Petree (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3683) granting an increase of pension to James Petree (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3684) granting an increase of pension to William Lyman Chittenden (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 3685) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its existing Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 3686) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to permit the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Coal Co. and the Eastern Coal & Mining Co. to exchange certain lands embraced within their existing coal leases in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nation for other lands within said nation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 3687) granting an increase of pension to Robert S. Kariho (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 3688) granting an increase of pension to Andrew McDonald (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURNHAM:

A bill (S. 3689) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Underhill;

A bill (S. 3690) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Carbee;

A bill (S. 3691) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose A. Stiles;

A bill (S. 3692) granting an increase of pension to Francis E. Stevens; and

A bill (S. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Charles Morgrave; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) relating to cotton statistics; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

UNIVERSITY OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. GALLINGER. On the 8th day of May last I introduced for the late Senator from Maine, Mr. Frye, a bill (S. 2056) to establish the University of the United States, which was referred to the appropriate committee. I have been requested to introduce a bill with some changes from the one I formerly introduced, and I ask permission to have the former bill indefinitely postponed and that this bill be referred to the proper committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2056 will be indefinitely postponed and the bill now introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire will be read twice by its title.

The bill (S. 3559) to establish the University of the United States was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the University of the United States.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS.

Mr. BURTON. By request I introduce a bill to amend section 1 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in relation to oaths, which I ask to have read at length, and I present a brief accompanying memorial, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3579) to amend section 1 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in relation to oaths was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

A bill (S. 3579) to amend section 1 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to oaths.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended by adding to the words "the requirements

of an oath shall be deemed complied with by making affirmation in judicial form" the following clauses:

The form of the oath which may be taken or administered in the courts or elsewhere under the laws of the United States shall be as follows:

First. "In the presence of Almighty God I do solemnly promise (or declare)," etc. And it shall not be lawful to add to any oath the words "so help me God," or any imprecatory words whatsoever.

Second. The manner of administering oaths shall be by requiring the person making the same to hold up his hand in token of his recognition of the solemnity of the act, except in those cases wherein it shall appear that some other mode is more in accordance with the religious faith of the swearer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and without objection the accompanying memorial will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, the undersigned, believing that the imprecatory words "so help me God" and those of like import in the oaths which have long been administered in our courts are but little understood by the majority of those who take them, while they are not essential to the true intent of the oath as now interpreted and add nothing to the solemnity thereof, would hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to pass the annexed act, providing a form which has been used for more than 10 years past in the State and United States courts sitting in Maryland.

Thos. J. Morris, United States district judge for the district of Maryland; Wm. F. Stone, collector of customs; J. Barry Mahool, mayor of Baltimore, Md.; Ira Remsen, president Johns Hopkins University; Charles J. Bonaparte, late Attorney General of the United States; Edgar Allan Poe, city solicitor, Baltimore City; Geo. Whitelock, attorney at law and United States commissioner on uniform State laws; Charles E. Thwing, president of Western Reserve University; Evan H. Hopkins, attorney at law.

THE AMERICAN TOBACCO CO. ET AL.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Wednesday of this week, immediately following the routine morning business, I will address the Senate, if it will hear me, upon the importance of securing a review by the Supreme Court of the United States of the decree lately entered by the Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York in The American Tobacco Co. case, and upon a bill for that purpose, which I now introduce.

The bill (S. 3607) to give the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States to certain organizations or persons in the suit of the United States v. The American Tobacco Co. et al. was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire that the bill lie upon the table until after he addresses the Senate?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am quite willing that it be referred at this time to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED RAILROAD IN ALASKA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I propose to offer to the bill (S. 3124) to provide for the leasing of coal and coal lands in the Territory of Alaska. The proposed amendment provides for the construction and operation of a Government-owned railroad in Alaska. I ask to have the amendment printed and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, having charge of that bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

THE ARLINGTON ESTATE, VIRGINIA.

Mr. PERKINS submitted an amendment proposing to transfer and place under the control and jurisdiction of the Navy Department for use for naval purposes certain Government land in Alexandria County, Va., known as the Arlington estate, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 164), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, and to have the same printed for its use, 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 of the Senate.

NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOME, SANTA MONICA, CAL.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Thursday next, immediately after the routine morning business,

I will submit some remarks in support of Senate resolution No. 160, providing for the investigation of the Soldiers' Home, at Santa Monica, Cal., and upon the general subject of the obligation of the Government to the veterans of the Civil War.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13988) to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics of tobacco was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Census.

The bill (H. R. 13278) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Caddo Lake, in Louisiana, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I desire to call up Senate resolution 159, regarding a legislative program during the present session. I would like to make a brief statement explanatory of the resolution, without interruption, and at its close I shall ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

At the last extra session of Congress I offered a resolution providing for a legislative program, declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that legislation should be enacted upon nine subjects, and that seven other subjects should be considered by the appropriate committees with a view to legislative action at the next regular session. This resolution was debated from time to time, but was not acted upon; but of the nine subjects covered by it, six were taken up by Congress and disposed of, namely, (1) the reciprocity bill; (2) the enlargement of the free list of importations; (3) the reduction of duties in the wool, cotton, and steel schedules; (4) the publicity of campaign expenditures; (5) the election of United States Senators by popular vote; and (6) the admission of Arizona and New Mexico, although in several instances the action of Congress became inoperative through the veto of the President.

A NEW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.

Last Thursday I offered in the Senate a new resolution, declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that during the present session the appropriate committees should consider and Congress should enact legislation upon 13 subjects, 4 of them under the head of tariffs and taxation, providing for a reduction of excessive duties in the wool, cotton, and steel schedules; the enlargement of the free list; the gradual reduction of prohibitory duties; and an increase in the corporation tax sufficient to make up any deficit in revenue as a result of the reductions of customs duties; 3 under the head of interstate commerce, providing for the physical valuation of railroads as a factor in rate regulation, preventing stock watering, and providing for an interstate trade commission, with power over interstate trade similar, so far as practicable, to those possessed by the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding interstate transportation; and several other subjects, relating to reform in our banking system, the development and regulation of our rivers by cooperation of the scientific services and the cooperation of the Nation with the States in both plans and works, the protection of our natural resources against monopolistic control, the upbuilding of an American merchant marine by free entry to all ships, wherever built, the construction of an auxiliary navy, to be used in time of war in aid of our fighting ships and in time of peace in service through the Panama Canal and establishing new routes of commerce with foreign countries through lease to shipping companies; and, finally, the reduction of our military expense to a sum not exceeding \$200,000,000 annually for our Army and Navy through the aid of a military board to be selected by the President.

THE INITIATIVE IN LEGISLATION.

Under our form of government the initiative in legislation is given by the recommendation of the President, acting under his constitutional power. But this initiative means little unless the party to which the President belongs is in power in both Houses and unless the President is the leader of a harmonious party. Neither of these conditions exists to-day. The House is Democratic whilst the executive departments and the Senate are under Republican control, but in the Senate the dominant party is so divided against itself that harmony of action does not exist upon important matters.

In England and other countries where a responsible ministry exists the initiative in legislation is given to it, and it is charged with the responsibility of framing Government measures which are submitted to the legislative body and supported by such ministry through all the stages of legislative action.

Under our form of government there is no responsible ministry, and the initiative for legislation rests entirely upon the individual members of the Senate or of the House. It is true that under the custom of the parties the Speaker of the House and the leader of the dominant party in the Senate,

with the aid of trusted leaders, have had much to do with shaping legislation; but under the new era all such power is practically taken away from the Speaker and his powers now are simply those of a presiding officer, who is supposed to preside fairly and impartially over a bipartisan House. The Senate has also gone through a radical change. It is now a self-governing body, free from oligarchical control. It has emancipated itself from individual and committee tyranny and to-day the committees are regarded simply as the servants of the Senate and the Senate as a body is master of its own business.

THE OPINION OF THE SENATE SHOULD BE ORGANIZED FOR THE INITIATION OF LEGISLATION.

Under present conditions of lack of harmonious support of the President's recommendations by his party and lack of harmony of partisan control between the two bodies, the claim is publicly made, both by members of the two bodies and also by prominent journals and periodicals, that this Congress is to be fruitless of results; that nothing will be done except politics; and that both the President and the two legislative bodies, insensible to the demands of the country for needed legislation, will simply shape their action with a view to getting some advantage during the next campaign.

I can not imagine anything that will tend so much to diminish the confidence of the people in their political representatives as such a result; and this, too, at a time when the popular discredit of and lack of faith in their political representatives is more shaken than at any time during the history of the Republic; so much so that, wherever the matter is tested, the people are showing a disposition to take into their own hands through the direct primary, the initiative, the referendum, and the recall the exercise of sovereign powers which they have been accustomed to freely intrust to their duly accredited representatives.

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE.

It needs no argument to show that a system of legislation which is based simply upon the initiative of an individual Member of the Senate or of the House will not be productive of substantial results. No bill upon any important question can pass unless there is not only a powerful public opinion backing it, but also a legislative opinion backing it; and no single individual can voice the views of an entire legislative body. In the first place, he is compelled to frame a bill with all its details, and he must then introduce it and push it before the proper committee. If he happens to be a member of such committee he has some show, but even then his pathway is beset with difficulties unless he has behind him an expressed public opinion of the legislative body to which he belongs, insisting upon its speedy consideration and report. If he does not happen to be a member of the committee to which his bill is referred, the difficulties are largely increased.

Among the thousands of bills that are introduced it requires not only extraordinary enthusiasm, but even extraordinary egotism, to push a Representative on to the assertion that his measure, above all others, requires prompt consideration. Such an attitude is likely to be resented by his associates and the very best measure may lie neglected, even though the opinion of the legislative body, if called into expression, would be strongly for it.

TIME OF DETERMINING PROGRAM.

The next question comes up as to the time of legislative expression. It is clear that this should be early in the session, as a guide to the committee and a guide to the legislative body itself, for when it determines early in the session that certain subjects are to be considered and acted upon the right of way is established and the way made clear.

One of the commonest devices for delaying a reform measure is that of permitting it to be swamped under a mass of varied legislation. Unimportant measures are pushed to the front, private bills block the way, and the legislative body thus becomes the victim of its own lack of system and the confusion of its methods.

WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED.

It was with a view, therefore, to organizing the opinion of the Senate that I have introduced this resolution. I have grouped together a number of questions concerning which, in my judgment, public opinion is made up, many of them indorsed in party platforms, containing the solemn pledges of Members of both parties to the enactment of such legislation. I do not claim for myself infallibility of judgment in the selection of these subjects. It is quite probable that there may be others of equal or perhaps of greater importance, but my resolution offers the opportunity to cure its defects by the addition of such other measures by amendment to my resolution, and it also gives the Senate an opportunity to exclude from consideration any of the subjects to which I have referred. By a process of exclusion

and inclusion we can in a few days get a definite expression of opinion by the Senate as to what subjects it considers important ones for immediate action. The resolution can be so framed as not to commit those who vote upon it definitely to support it as a whole or in its several details. It simply calls for an expression of opinion as to the matters that are important for consideration and an outline of the general view of the Senate as to the form of the measures.

As yet, Mr. President, there is little before the Senate for its action, and there will probably be little until some time after the holidays. We are now meeting only at 2 o'clock because of the lack of legislative business, and we are adjourning for intervals of two or three days on account of the same lack. I therefore suggest that no more appropriate time could be secured for the consideration of this resolution; that we can take it up section by section for amendment or adoption, and that a final vote can be had at an early day.

Now, Mr. President, without asking for the reading of my resolution, which is on the desks of Senators, and requesting merely that it be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, and that it be regarded as the unfinished business until it is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada joins two requests together. Without objection, the Chair will present them separately. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD as a part of his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The resolution (S. Res. 159) submitted by Mr. NEWLANDS on the 7th instant is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that during the present session the appropriate committees shall consider and Congress enact legislation upon the following subjects:

THE TARIFF AND TAXATION.

First. The reduction of the excessive duties in the wool, cotton, and steel schedules.

Second. The enlargement of the free list.

Third. The gradual reduction of all duties of a prohibitory character by a fixed percentage per annum until the importations of products under such duties equal one-tenth of the total domestic production of similar products.

Fourth. A graduated increase in the corporation tax upon corporations whose net profits exceed \$50,000 per annum, sufficient to make up any deficit in revenue caused by reduction in customs duties.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Fifth. Providing for the physical valuation of railroads engaged in interstate commerce by the Interstate Commerce Commission as a factor in rate regulation.

Sixth. Preventing stock watering by corporations engaged in interstate commerce.

Seventh. Providing for an interstate trade commission, in which shall be merged the officials, powers, and functions of the Bureau of Corporations, with powers of investigation, correction, and recommendation regarding corporations engaged in interstate trade, similar, so far as practicable, to those conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission regarding corporations engaged in interstate transportation.

BANKING.

Eighth. Providing for uninterrupted interstate exchange, the protection of bank depositors, and the minimizing of bank panics by adequate requirements regarding capital and reserves of the individual banks by the organization of a national reserve association in each State, in which the national banks and the State banks engaged in interstate exchange, complying with national legislation as to capital and reserves shall be stockholders, such association to have such of the powers proposed by the National Monetary Commission to be conferred upon a central national reserve association as are necessary or advisable; such State associations to be brought into federation through a national banking commission fairly representative of the different sections of the country, part of which shall be selected by such associations and part by the President of the United States, such board to be advisory to Congress and to the President.

RIVER DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION.

Ninth. Providing for the cooperation of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, the Reclamation Service, the Forest Service, the Geological Survey, the Weather Service, and other scientific services of the National Government, and the cooperation of the National Government with the States, in devising and carrying out comprehensive plans for the regulation of river flow with a view to the promotion of navigation, the prevention of destructive floods through the preservation of forests, the storage and use of flood waters for the irrigation of arid lands and for the development of water power, the reclamation of swamp lands, and the establishment of terminal and transfer facilities, and providing a fund ample for continuous work, such comprehensive plans to be framed under the direction of a board of experts, of which the Chief of Engineers shall be the chairman, the various works under such plans to be conducted under the national services to which the jurisdiction now pertains.

Tenth. Providing for the protection of our natural resources in timber, coal, iron, and oil against monopolistic control.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Eleventh. Providing for the upbuilding of the American merchant marine by free entry to American registry of all ships, wherever built.

AUXILIARY NAVY.

Twelfth. Providing for the construction of auxiliary ships for our Navy, to be used in time of war in aid of the fighting ships and in times of peace in establishing necessary service through the Panama Canal and new routes of commerce to foreign countries through lease to shipping companies; such legislation to involve the temporary

diminution of the construction of fighting ships and the substitution of auxiliary ships, with a view to the creation of a well-proportioned and efficient Navy.

MILITARY EXPENSES.

Thirteenth. For the more efficient administration and cooperation of the Army and Navy and the reduction of the total Army and Navy expense to not exceeding \$200,000,000 annually through the aid of a board of Army and Naval officers, to be selected by the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. I object.

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

Mr. NEWLANDS. Before that motion is put, may I state that to-morrow I will move that the Senate take up the resolution for consideration until its final disposition.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Illinois withhold his motion for a moment, so the Senator from Idaho may present a matter?

Mr. CULLOM. I will.

PROPOSED CHILDREN'S BUREAU.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 252) to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the children's bureau, now upon the calendar under Rule VIII.

This bill, Mr. President, is the same as that which the Senate passed at its last session, after some considerable discussion and some amendments offered in the Senate. The bill was passed, and this bill is the same as the bill which we amended and finally passed in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent for its consideration at this time.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill. It proposes to establish in the Department of Commerce and Labor a bureau to be known as the children's bureau, to be under the direction of a chief, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive an annual compensation of \$5,000. The bureau is to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life, especially the questions of infant mortality, the birth rate, orphanage, juvenile courts, desertion, dangerous occupations, accidents and diseases of children, employment, legislation affecting children in the several States and Territories, and such other facts as have a bearing upon the welfare of children.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the bill now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent was given for its consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. My attention was diverted for a moment, or I should undoubtedly have objected to its consideration. It is bad enough for any government to assume supervision of children, but for the Federal Government to do it, it seems to me, is utterly indefensible. But of course as it is before the Senate we will have something to say about it in another way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I suppose it is a waste of time to detain the Senate with a protest against legislation of this kind. We have for a hundred years or more left these matters concerning children to the proper authorities, which are the mothers, fathers, and guardians, and in that hundred years we have reared such children as the Senator from Idaho; and a system which has produced him does not need much apology or much amendment. We have produced the greatest race of men and women that ever blessed any land in the history of the world, and as for my part I am not willing to invoke the Government's aid in this greatest of all work.

Men who are familiar with the course of legislation understand perfectly that these matters come first in the shape of requests for statistics, and they are invariably followed then by legislation. Unless the Congress of the United States intends to predicate some legislation upon these statistics, then it has no right to appropriate the public money for their collection.

Another six years will find not the Senator from Idaho I hope—though I hope another six years will find him in the Senate—but as certain as he remains here he will find that some other Senator will be asking this body to enact legislation

intended to cover some phase of the child life of this Republic. And the Congress will pass it unless the Congresses to come in the next few years are wiser than the Congresses which have gone in the last few years.

There is no subject under heaven that Congress is not now asked to legislate upon, and very few upon which Congress refuses to legislate. The first Congress which assembled under the Constitution of this Republic passed less than a hundred bills. Indeed, sir, as I now recall there were less than a hundred bills introduced; and we must not forget that that Congress was required to put into operation the greatest governmental experiment in all history. During the last Congress—for the record for this Congress has not yet been made up—there were 40,000 bills introduced. Think, Mr. President! A Republic 125 years old with 40,000 things left undone that ought to have been done. What a hopeless picture it presents! And, sir, if now after having attempted to supervise everything else we enter the home and supersede the authority of the mother and the father and undertake to subject their children to the supervision of the Federal Government, then, indeed, we may despair.

When I took the floor I intended to talk past the morning hour so as to carry this bill over. But as I have been speaking I am tempted by a kind of curiosity to refrain and let it come to a vote and see if the Senate of the United States is ready to pass a bill of this kind.

Mr. HEYBURN. 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:

Bacon	Clarke, Ark.	Lorimer	Shively
Bailey	Crawford	McCumber	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Cuberson	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Cullom	Martin, Va.	Smoot
Bourne	Curtis	Martine, N. J.	Stephenson
Briggs	Dixon	Myers	Taylor
Bristow	du Pont	Nelson	Thornton
Brown	Gallinger	O'Gorman	Tillman
Bryan	Gardner	Overman	Warren
Burnham	Gore	Owen	Williams
Burton	Gronna	Page	Works
Chamberlain	Heyburn	Percy	
Chilton	Hitchcock	Perkins	
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Rayner	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. WATSON] is necessarily absent from the city.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-three Senators have responded to their names. A quorum is present. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understand that the measure called up by my colleague during the morning hour is now the order of business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was called up by unanimous consent.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understand.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. And it is being considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. HEYBURN. The morning hour has expired. I merely wanted to know by what means the bill came over from the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning hour does not expire until 4 o'clock.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; it is the first hour that has expired. I was somewhat confused by reason of the change in the hour of meeting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. I understood that the Senator from Texas intimated he would speak further on the subject.

Mr. BAILEY. No; Mr. President, I had intended to do that when I took the floor, but I concluded to see the sense of the Senate tested on it. I yielded the floor so as to see the vote.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I should like to see the sense of the Senate tested upon this question, and I had that in mind when I asked for the presence of a quorum. There is a very meager attendance of the Senate to pass upon a question of this kind, which involves the organization of a new branch and a new character of government. I should dislike to see such a question disposed of under existing circumstances.

This measure on its face proposes the establishment of a bureau, the salaries of which amount to \$25,000 a year. We do it in rather a careless, offhand manner. It seems to me, aside from the financial proposition, as suggested by the Senator from Texas, there is a principle involved in it that ought to receive more than the mere passing consideration of the body.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to his colleague?

Mr. HEYBURN. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I did not anticipate that there was any desire to debate the bill at length when I called it up. I have no wish, of course, to prevent discussion. Perhaps the Senate did not expect the bill to be called up to-day, and I am quite willing to convenience those who desire to discuss it, if Senators so desire. While I will not insist upon proceeding to-day I shall feel that within a reasonable time the bill ought to be brought up again.

Mr. CULLOM. If in order, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HEYBURN. I do not care to yield the floor for a motion of that kind until I have completed what little I have to say. I took the floor for the purpose of establishing a status for this proposed legislation, and before we lay it aside, as I will be necessarily absent for a day or two, I desire to have some status established for the bill so that we will know what we may expect.

I am not going to discuss the bill at length, but I am very loath to see the matter come to a vote under the circumstances. It is one of those bills whose only recommendation is its title. Such bills are not infrequent. If you introduced a measure here, "Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is in favor of the eternal salvation of mankind," it would doubtless be passed because people would not dare to vote against it. Introduce a bill here for the protection of the children of the country and the title is such as to warn Senators against declaring themselves as not being in favor of that kind of legislation.

I had sincerely hoped that the Senator from Texas would develop the ideas he suggested, because I am in accord with his views so far he has expressed himself. Personally I did not desire to enter upon the discussion of it, not feeling quite equal to it physically, but I must be equal to the performance of a duty when it is thrust upon me.

Briefly, Mr. President, I desire to suggest that this class of legislation has been growing upon us; that is to say, the frequency of and insistence for this class of legislation seem to be growing with accelerated speed. The jurisdiction established over the children of mankind in the beginning of the human race has worked out very well. It is in accord with the rules of nature. It is based not upon duty but upon the human instinct that establishes the principle upon which all duties rest. The mother needs no admonition to care for the child, nor does the father. The exceptions to that rule are such as those to the rule against the taking of human life. We have laws providing for the punishment of those who destroy human life, but as compared with the human family the instances in which it is necessary to invoke them are rare.

This has another element wrapped up within it that we ought not to lose sight of. While upon the face of this measure it merely provides for the taking of statistics, the accumulation of knowledge, yet we know from other measures which have been introduced, some from the same source, that it contemplates the establishment of a control, through the agencies of government, over the rearing of children. There are other measures now pending in committees of this body going much further, going to the extent of interference with the control of a parent over the child. I believe I read on Saturday a bill which has been introduced that prevents the employment of any child under 16 years of age, without any accompanying provision for the maintenance of the parents who, by reason of age or infirmity, can not provide for their own wants. That is what I call a poorhouse bill. It is a bill that would result in the necessity of aged or infirm parents going to the public almshouse, notwithstanding there were strong, hustling sons 14 and 15 years of age.

These suggestions arise out of any consideration that may be given to this class of legislation. It is the class of legislation that I object to, because as yet this bill does not enter into details to an extent which would enable one to criticize it, except upon the general principle involved in it. We have sometimes an oversupply of sympathy, or that which is supposed to be based upon sympathy for our fellow kind, sympathy for the children whose condition in life is not as favorable as that of some other children. Our sympathies are human; you can not avoid them; but those clothed with the responsibility of government must be on guard against being swept away on unsafe seas in legislation.

This is not a proper subject for legislation. It is a police measure. If children are not cared for within the recognized rules of humanity, or if they are neglected in violation of pro-

visions of law, then the police department of the Government may deal with it.

A few weeks ago I read in one of the papers of this city an account of an attempt that was made to take children away from the parents, who were recently foreigners, because the committee did not approve of the manner in which the children were being raised and cared for. The development of the facts showed that the children were being reared and cared for according to the rules that had always existed among that class of people of that nationality. And yet the old saying that old bachelors' and old maids' children are better cared for than anybody else's arose in my mind as being a suggestion worthy of some consideration.

Now, Mr. President, anxious as I am that the sense of the Senate may be tested, I sincerely hope that no final action will be taken upon this class of legislation. No one can be more sympathetic than I am with the needs, the welfare, and the comfort of the children of the country, but I am not willing to substitute any other control for that of the parent. I would control the parents, if necessary, when they would violate the recognized rules of the domestic establishment. I would control the parents, but I would do it through the police laws of the land, the local laws. This is no question for the General Government to take up; it is a question of local legislation, if it is one for legislation at all.

What will it be next? Every imaginable scheme that may afford a hook upon which to hang a bill seems to be conjured up. I will not speak in disrespect of proposed legislation introduced by any Senator, but I think a little more conservative and careful consideration to the purposes of legislation, to the functions of the General Government, would avoid the embarrassment and the labor involved in the consideration of a great many of these measures, the thousands of bills, which are proposed. The homes of the country are best protected through the local environment and functions. Are we to create, as this contemplates, in every State and Territory and corner of the United States a nursery that shall pass upon the wisdom of the mothers and the fathers of the land? Are we, as this contemplates, to appoint Federal officers to superintend the nurseries of the country or the cradles of the poor? Are we through this agency to attempt to say what school of medicine shall be invoked for the assistance of the child that is ill? Are we to provide that some one may step in and be substituted for the parent in the care of the child merely because of a difference of opinion? I think not. I think we had better go slowly. This is very early in the session. It is the first day upon which any attempt has been made at legislation, and a measure of this kind which establishes, or attempts to establish, a new principle of government should not be forced to a final vote thus early in the session. I do not believe that Senators have given the attention to this matter which should be given to it before action upon it. I admit the committee, doubtless, has given serious consideration to it. It is a pathetic subject. It is one difficult to oppose. No one would oppose the principle of caring for the children. It is only a question as to who shall perform this function and how it shall be performed and the extent to which the Government may interpose itself between the wisdom of the parent and the conditions which surround the child.

My heart has been moved all my life by the pathetic conditions which confront every man, but I am not convinced that legislation by the Congress of the United States can afford any remedy against the frailties of judgment or the conditions which surround the human family in this regard.

We have most of the information called for in this measure. We get it through the census. We can now, through the census, without any further legislation or extension of the power of the Government, add to the information to the full extent called for by this measure. That class of census work may go on at any time. We may by resolution instruct the Census Bureau to acquire all of this information, and we need no other legislation than that; but this bill proposes to establish a bureau and to fix salaries.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that those Senators who are present here to-day will not assume to foreclose this question against a consideration and a vote by a full Senate. I shall not vote for it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, do I understand that my colleague wishes to discuss this matter further at some other time.

Mr. HEYBURN. No; I will vote on it. That is all.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know, then, why we should not have a vote upon the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho whether there is any special reason for assigning this proposed bureau to the Department of Commerce and Labor? Would it not be better to assign it to the Interior Department? That department now has charge, I think, of most of the charities with which the Government is associated in any way, and its very name would indicate that it should have jurisdiction over such organizations as are contemplated by the bill.

Mr. BORAH. That was a matter which had consideration before the committee, and the bill was originally drawn in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Nevada, but after considerable hearing, both from the departments and from the people who have given this matter a great deal of consideration, it was changed. But, Mr. President, since the Senator from Nevada has asked the question, another Senator has requested that the bill go over, and, as I have said, it having been called up rather suddenly, I do not desire to urge it against any Senator's personal request. That request having been made, I will not urge the bill to a vote to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will go over.

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, with reference to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 60) providing for the termination of the treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States of America and Russia, concluded at St. Petersburg December 18, 1832, when introduced by me, I asked that it lie on the table with a view of submitting some remarks on it before reference to a committee. An arrangement, however, has been made for a hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on Wednesday next. In view of that, I ask that the joint resolution be taken from the table and referred to that committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

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

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1911, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1911.

SUPERVISING INSPECTOR, STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE.

John K. Bulger, of California, to be supervising inspector, first district, Steamboat-Inspection Service, Department of Commerce and Labor, vice John Birmingham.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Eugene P. Nute, of New Hampshire, to be United States marshal for the district of New Hampshire. (A reappointment, his term expiring Dec. 18, 1911.)

James M. Yeager, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (A reappointment, his term expiring Dec. 20, 1911.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Levin Hicks Campbell, jr., of New York, late midshipman, United States Navy, to be second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from December 2, 1911.

PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

Serafin Manuel Montesinos, of Porto Rico, to be second lieutenant in the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from December 8, 1911.

Pedro Angel Hernandez, of Porto Rico, to be second lieutenant in the Porto Rico Regiment of Infantry, with rank from December 8, 1911.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

The nomination of Newton Napoleon Polk, of Tennessee, for appointment as second lieutenant of Cavalry, which was submitted to the Senate on December 7, 1911, withdrawn, and nominate him for appointment as second lieutenant of Field Artillery, with rank from October 7, 1911.

REAPPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Whipple, Paymaster General, to be Paymaster General with the rank of brigadier general for the period of four years beginning January 1, 1912, with rank from Janu-

ary 1, 1908. His present appointment will expire by limitation December 31, 1911.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Philip Andrews, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a period of four years from the 1st day of January, 1912.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Wolcott E. Hall to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 26th day of October, 1911, to fill a vacancy.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Harry J. Lawton to be postmaster at Fellows, Cal. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

DELAWARE.

John W. Brown to be postmaster at Newark, Del., in place of Delaware Clark, deceased.

ILLINOIS.

John W. Allen to be postmaster at New Windsor, Ill. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Edwin Drury to be postmaster at Wilmette, Ill., in place of Edwin Drury. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Mary F. Marsh to be postmaster at Bowen, Ill., in place of Mary F. Marsh. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Isaac Newland to be postmaster at Colchester, Ill., in place of Isaac Newland. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

David F. Wilcox to be postmaster at Quincy, Ill., in place of David F. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

INDIANA.

Juanita Bond to be postmaster at Oaktown, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

IOWA.

James Beard to be postmaster at Mount Ayr, Iowa, in place of James Beard. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

William Horsfall to be postmaster at George, Iowa, in place of William Horsfall. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

Charles H. Read to be postmaster at Avoca, Iowa, in place of Charles H. Read. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

William C. Williams to be postmaster at Atlantic, Iowa, in place of William C. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 29, 1910.

LOUISIANA.

Joseph T. Labit to be postmaster at Abbeville, La., in place of Joseph T. Labit. Incumbent's commission expires December 12, 1911.

MAINE.

Malcolm B. Folsom to be postmaster at Greenville, Me., in place of Lindley H. Folsom, resigned.

Ellery W. Wentworth to be postmaster at Winthrop, Me., in place of Ellery W. Wentworth. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1911.

MARYLAND.

William B. Cutshall to be postmaster at Woodsboro, Md., in place of Morris L. Smith, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George Bliss to be postmaster at West Warren, Mass., in place of George Bliss. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1911.

Alfred G. Cone to be postmaster at Haydenville, Mass., in place of Alfred G. Cone. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Richard J. Considine to be postmaster at Whitman, Mass., in place of Richard J. Considine. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Frank W. Goodwin to be postmaster at Marblehead, Mass., in place of Benjamin F. Martin, deceased.

MICHIGAN.

Edwin L. Clapp to be postmaster at Centerville, Mich., in place of Edwin L. Clapp. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Peter Johnson to be postmaster at Thompsonville, Mich., in place of Peter Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

James Millen to be postmaster at White Cloud, Mich., in place of John Harwood. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1911.

Harry E. Potter to be postmaster at East Jordan, Mich., in place of Frank A. Kenyon, resigned.

Fred Wade to be postmaster at Saugatuck, Mich., in place of Fred Wade. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Robert J. West to be postmaster at Deckerville, Mich., in place of Robert J. West. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

MINNESOTA.

William T. Callahan to be postmaster at Long Prairie, Minn., in place of William T. Callahan. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1910.

MISSOURI.

Homer Calkins to be postmaster at Pacific, Mo., in place of Sebastian Netscher, removed.

Elizabeth Cornwall to be postmaster at Rolla, Mo., in place of Elizabeth Cornwall. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

MONTANA.

Raymond E. Northey to be postmaster at Sidney, Mont., in place of Arthur E. Northey, resigned.

NEBRASKA.

Carl A. Anderson to be postmaster at Wausa, Nebr., in place of Carl A. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Ethel Hopkins to be postmaster at Oakland, Nebr., in place of Ethel Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

Clayton Kellam to be postmaster at Franklin, Nebr., in place of Clayton Kellam. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

Edward H. Mack to be postmaster at Bancroft, Nebr., in place of Edward H. Mack. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

NEVADA.

Michael J. Moore to be postmaster at Rhyolite, Nev., in place of Michael J. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Lewis W. Davis to be postmaster at East Jaffrey, N. H., in place of Lewis W. Davis. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Alpheus Lester Faunce to be postmaster at Somersworth, N. H., in place of Alpheus Lester Faunce. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1911.

Andrew J. Hook to be postmaster at Warner, N. H., in place of Andrew J. Hook. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

NEW JERSEY.

Lewis A. Waters to be postmaster at Madison, N. J., in place of Lewis A. Waters. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1911.

NEW YORK.

Henry C. Lyman to be postmaster at Sherburne, N. Y., in place of John H. O'Brian, resigned.

Elbert E. Makepeace to be postmaster at Alexandria Bay, N. Y., in place of Elbert E. Makepeace. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1911.

Warren Salisbury to be postmaster at Bladell, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

Myron E. Stephens to be postmaster at Gardiner, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1911.

Theodore F. Tompkins to be postmaster at Yorktown Heights, N. Y. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

OHIO.

John H. Culhan to be postmaster at Washington Courthouse, Ohio, in place of John H. Culhan. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

William E. Moulton to be postmaster at Canal Fulton, Ohio, in place of William E. Moulton. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1911.

OREGON.

Edwin S. Abbott to be postmaster at Seaside, Oreg., in place of Edwin S. Abbott. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Marshel E. Merwin to be postmaster at Independence, Oreg., in place of Marshel E. Merwin. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1911.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry W. Fabian to be postmaster at Economy, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

Pearl T. Feist to be postmaster at White Haven, Pa., in place of William A. Feist, deceased.

Mertie T. Gillies to be postmaster at Devon, Pa., in place of Mertie T. Gillies. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1911.

Frank R. Hammond to be postmaster at Bolivar, Pa. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

William V. Marshall to be postmaster at Berlin, Pa., in place of William V. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired February 15, 1911.

William E. Moody to be postmaster at Tremont, Pa., in place of William E. Moody. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1911.

Joseph F. Naugle to be postmaster at Meyersdale, Pa., in place of Joseph F. Naugle. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1911.

Thomas K. Pullin to be postmaster at Confluence, Pa., in place of Thomas K. Pullin. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1911.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Fred Huston to be postmaster at Gregory, S. Dak., in place of Fred Huston. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

TEXAS.

Harry R. Gray to be postmaster at Bonham, Tex., in place of Laura Martin. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

William Gilford to be postmaster at Thornton, Tex., in place of William Gilford. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

George H. Griffin to be postmaster at Milford, Tex., in place of George H. Griffin. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

Otto Heilig to be postmaster at New Braunfels, Tex., in place of Otto Heilig. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

J. S. Noble to be postmaster at Como, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

Sloan Simpson to be postmaster at Dallas, Tex., in place of Sloan Simpson. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

Henry O. Stansbury to be postmaster at Rosebud, Tex., in place of Henry O. Stansbury. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

Terrell O. Taylor to be postmaster at Hempstead, Tex., in place of Terrell O. Taylor. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1911.

Frank S. Way to be postmaster at Taylor, Tex., in place of Carrie E. Hoke. Incumbent's commission expired January 22, 1911.

UTAH.

Samuel Judd to be postmaster at St. George, Utah, in place of Samuel Judd. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

WASHINGTON.

Alphonso F. Learned to be postmaster at Port Townsend, Wash., in place of Alphonso F. Learned. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Edson S. Phipps to be postmaster at Mount Vernon, Wash., in place of Edson S. Phipps. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Carey W. Stewart to be postmaster at Quincy, Wash., in place of Carey W. Stewart. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Maude Volz to be postmaster at Washtucna, Wash. Office became presidential October 1, 1911.

Lewis C. Weik to be postmaster at Odessa, Wash., in place of Lewis C. Weik. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Henry N. Bradley to be postmaster at Charles Town, W. Va. (late Charlestown), in place of Henry N. Bradley. (To change name of office.)

Thad T. Huffman to be postmaster at Keyser, W. Va., in place of Thad T. Huffman. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1911.

Ernest L. Love to be postmaster at Grafton, W. Va., in place of Ernest L. Love. Incumbent's commission expired December 5, 1911.

Josephine B. Marks to be postmaster at Walton, W. Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Thomas E. Pownall to be postmaster at Romney, W. Va., in place of Thomas E. Pownall. Incumbent's commission expired December 9, 1911.

WISCONSIN.

Samuel W. Everson to be postmaster at Lodi, Wis., in place of Samuel W. Everson. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

Edwin F. Ganz to be postmaster at Alma, Wis., in place of Edwin F. Ganz. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1911.

Henry C. Gier to be postmaster at Mount Horeb, Wis., in place of Henry C. Gier. Incumbent's commission expires December 11, 1911.

P. M. Jacobson to be postmaster at Burlington, Wis., in place of Fred J. Buell, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 11, 1911.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Truman H. Aldrich, Birmingham.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Edward C. Mansfield, Boston.

NEW JERSEY.

Edward S. Perry, Orange.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, December 11, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O God, the Father of all souls, help us with perfect faith and confidence in Thee as the inspiration of every great thought and noble deed to take up the work of the hour with brave, honest, generous, susceptible hearts and willing minds, that Thy purposes may be fulfilled in us; for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 9, 1911, was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BORLAND, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for three weeks, on account of official business.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] offers a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 835.

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining be authorized to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary in the conduct of its business during the Sixty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague, whether the committee needs to have printing done?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I will state that I think they do. They are having some hearings on bills and matters of that kind.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

RAILROAD SECURITIES COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 256).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for your consideration, the report which has been made to me by the Railroad Securities Commission appointed under the authority of section 16 of the act to create

a Commerce Court, approved June 18, 1910 (36 Stat., 556). The report evidences for itself the careful consideration which it has received from the commission, and I heartily concur in the recommendations it contains and urge that appropriate action be taken to carry these recommendations into effect.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 11, 1911.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 162).

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the requirements of chapter 1302, Thirty-second Statutes, page 483, "An act to provide for the construction of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans," approved June 28, 1902, the annual report of the Isthmian Canal Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 11, 1911.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

LARCENY OF PUBLIC PROPERTY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 1081.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 1081) to provide for punishment for larceny of public property from the workhouse and the reformatory of the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever any property of the United States of America, or of the District of Columbia, either or both, or in the custody or control of the said United States or the District of Columbia, either or both, or in the custody or control of the officers, agents, or employees thereof, respectively, in any State or Territory of the United States other than the District of Columbia, which has been or shall be loaned, delivered, given, purchased, provided, or obtained, for use at, about, or in either or both the workhouse or the reformatory of the District of Columbia, or which has been or shall be used or employed in any manner at, about, or in either or both said reformatory or workhouse, shall be brought into the District of Columbia, or any other place within the jurisdiction of the United States, by any person who shall feloniously take and carry away the same under circumstances which constitute larceny in the District of Columbia, as provided in the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, and the amendments thereto, shall be and continue larceny in the District of Columbia, or in any place within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky if it is the intention, according to the copy of this bill, to strike out everything that the Clerk read?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes; and offer a substitute, which the Clerk seems not to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following, viz: "That Subchapter II, Chapter XIX, of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto a new section to be known as section 836a, which shall read as follows:

"SEC. 836a. Any person who by the commission outside of the District of Columbia of any act which, if committed within the District of Columbia, would be a criminal offense under the laws of said District, thereby obtains any property or other thing of value, and is afterwards found with any such property or other such thing of value in his possession in said District, or who brings any such property or other such thing of value into said District, shall, upon conviction, be punished in the same manner as if said act had been committed wholly within said District."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the House committee has seen fit and deemed it best to strike out all after the enacting clause and write a substitute. It will be seen from the Senate bill, on the first page, lines 10 and 11, that it would be made an offense for a person to dispose of property which had been "loaned" to him or which had been "given" to him, and the Senate bill applied only to the misuse of Government property. The House committee has offered in lieu of that bill one which makes the offense generally applicable not only to public property but to all kinds of property.

The bill which the House reports as a substitute for the Senate bill is very similar to the one which has been adopted in Alabama, and to one that has been adopted in Kansas, to one that has been adopted in Tennessee, to one that has been adopted in Montana, to one that has been adopted in New York, to one that has been adopted in Missouri, and to one that has been adopted in the State of Michigan.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield a few minutes to me?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. How many minutes does the gentleman desire?

Mr. MANN. Five minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the purpose of this bill is to provide a law by which a man who seizes District property outside of the District, say at Occoquan, and brings it into the District, may be punished here. Is not that the primary purpose of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would say to the gentleman that that was the primary purpose of the Senate bill, but the House committee has seen fit to make it applicable to all kinds of property, as I have already said, whether Government property or even individual property, following the precedents set by the number of States that I have set out.

Mr. MANN. It is a very laudable purpose. I have never had much occasion to give attention to the practice of criminal law, and hence I speak with a good deal of diffidence on this subject. I am not sure but that the bill needs amendment, or that the substitute needs amendment.

The bill proposes that if anyone brings property into the District, property stolen outside the District, and the property is found in his possession in the District he shall, upon conviction, be punished in the same manner as if said act had been committed wholly in said District. It does not denounce the bringing of property into the District as a crime, except by providing that upon conviction—upon conviction of what? Stealing the property outside the District; is that the part of the crime that is denounced in the District? It is perfectly patent, I take it, that if a man feloniously takes property outside the District in a place that is under the jurisdiction of the United States he can only be punished for that crime in that district where he committed the crime and not in the District of Columbia. In the first place, the man can only be punished under the Constitution once for the same crime. In the second place, he must be tried in the district where the crime was committed.

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

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Is it not true that where a larceny is committed in a given place—your State or mine—the party may be convicted in the county where the original taking took place, or in any county where he is found in possession of the property? In other words, is it not a new taking wherever he is found? Is not that the law in most of the States, and is not that what we have provided here?

Mr. MANN. That is what we are getting at because we can not do that. I think that is the law in some of the States, but we have not the power to say that if a crime is committed in Virginia on property under the jurisdiction of the United States that a crime shall be punished in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. No; but can not you say that since the continued possession is a repeated taking of the property, that having it in his possession here amounts to a larcenious taking, and that he may be punished for the larceny in having it in his possession?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If the gentleman from Illinois will allow me, I will say that I believe it is admitted to be the criminal law that when an act of larceny is committed in any place, that wherever the stolen property may be taken by the thief, it is treated as a continuation of the act of larceny, and that is particularly so in the States. To remove any doubt on that subject the Commissioners of the District asked for the passage of this bill, so that there may be no doubt about it.

Mr. MANN. I understand. I think it is possible to prepare and pass a bill that will cover the case, but I am calling the gentleman's attention and the attention of others who are more familiar with the criminal code than I am to ascertain whether or not the point suggested by my mind is or is not correct. It will be noticed that the bill does not denounce having property in possession in the District of Columbia as a crime. It provides that upon conviction—upon conviction of what? The original felonious act in taking the property or the bringing it into the District?

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield—

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. My recollection of the law is that where a party is guilty of larceny in a State or in one county and he brings the stolen property into another county, the act of bringing it in with the felonious intent in itself constitutes a crime without regard to the other crime which has already been committed.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to say that what the gentleman from New York says would apply where the property is taken from one county to another county in the same State, but one State can not make it a felony for the commission of offense in another State. It seems to me that the gist here of the crime is having authority to punish for bringing the stolen property into the District.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, it is not the crime in another county that is punished; it is the crime of bringing the stolen property into the new county.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand in this particular case we are legislating for the District, which ought to be compared to a State, and not to one county as it is from another county in the same State. We can not pass a law that will have that effect.

Mr. PAYNE. If you bring stolen property from Illinois to New York, knowing it to be stolen, the man is not punished in New York for the original larceny, but for the complete crime of bringing stolen property into New York. That is the rule of common law.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but it is not the commission of the crime in Illinois that makes it an offense in New York. It is the bringing of the stolen property into the State of New York that makes the crime.

Mr. PAYNE. The crime consists in separating the owner from the property.

Mr. MANN. That is just it, separating the owner from the property; and under the Constitution you can not punish in the District of Columbia that crime when it is committed outside of the District of Columbia. If the crime is bringing the property into the District of Columbia, it seems to me we ought to declare that that is the crime. This bill simply says that any person committing outside of the District an act which would be criminal in the District, the property being afterwards found in the possession of the person in the District, shall upon conviction be punished in the same manner as if the act had been committed wholly within the District. Convicted of what? He can not be convicted of the original felony in the District, because the Constitution provides that he shall be tried in the State in which the felony was committed. As it seems to me, there is no crime denounced here for bringing the property in the District, and I raised that question to the gentleman as to whether it would not be desirable at least to add after the word "shall" in line 24 of page 2 the words "be guilty of a crime." I am not sure that that would be sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would say to the gentleman that I do not believe it absolutely necessary, or necessary at all, but if in his judgment it would make the bill better, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. MANN. I would prefer that the gentleman did not take my judgment in the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I assure the gentleman that I am perfectly willing to take his judgment.

Mr. MANN. Because I am not as familiar with prosecutions under the criminal law as many gentlemen on the floor of the House who have been prosecuting attorneys; but it seems to me that a court might say that here was an effort on the part of Congress to provide for a conviction in the District of Columbia of a crime committed outside of the District of Columbia—something which we have not the power to do under our Constitution, and if you want to punish a person for bringing property into the District, then we ought to denounce that as a crime.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am perfectly willing to do that, but I believe that lines 17, 18, and 19, on page 2, completely and effectively do that, because they make "any act committed outside of the District" a crime if committed in this jurisdiction, and is a crime in the District, provided the property is brought here.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman will readily see that under this act a man might take property outside of the District of Columbia, where it was not a crime, because it says here it is only a crime if when taken within the District it is a crime. There may be cases where the same law does not apply outside of the District.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That was advisedly done.

Mr. MANN. I take it for granted that that was advisedly done. I am not complaining about that.

Mr. TAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. TAGGART. I will ask if this bill was drawn or examined by the prosecuting officer of the District of Columbia?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This substitute was prepared in the presence and with the approval of one of the assistant corporation counsel for the District.

Mr. TAGGART. Was the question then discussed as to whether or not it was possible for Congress to denounce as a crime what might not be a crime within the State in which the act was committed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That feature was discussed, and the assistant corporation counsel agreed that that was what was wanted and that it was entirely legal.

Mr. TAGGART. If I read this act correctly and understand its meaning, it would be possible under this act to convict a man of bringing into the District of Columbia property which he might have lawfully acquired outside of the District of Columbia, for the reason that the manner in which he acquired it outside of the District would be unlawful within the District, and although he might come here with property that he had lawfully acquired, the manner of his acquiring it, not being lawful within the District, he could be convicted of a crime. Making it a crime to bring property feloniously or criminally acquired into the District is beyond question, but the right of Congress to declare that certain acts shall be a crime within the limits of a State outside the District is a different matter; and without wishing to express any opinion, although I have had some experience as a prosecuting officer, I would say that it would be a matter that would require a great deal of investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I would say to the gentleman that this act undertakes to make a punishable offense out of what might be only a breach of trust in another State.

If he continues in that and comes into the District of Columbia, and it is an offense under the laws of the District of Columbia, then it is desired here to treat it as an offense against the laws of the District of Columbia, whereas the taking of Government property, for instance, down at the prison at Occoquan, owned by the District, may in the State of Virginia be only a breach of trust.

Mr. MANN. As I understand the purpose of this bill, in the first place, it was not under the laws of Virginia possible to punish, say, the taking of property belonging to the District of Columbia in Virginia. I am not sure what would be the effect of the bill if the man should obtain property in a State which in the District of Columbia is punished as a fraud, whereas in a State from which the property was obtained it was not punished as a fraud, and then brings that property into the District of Columbia. Under the terms of this bill the man would be subject here to punishment for having in his possession property in the District of Columbia which outside of the District of Columbia he had acquired under the law.

Mr. KOPP. Do not we have cases to-day, as in the case of marriages, for instance? We have a case where a couple are married in one State and it is a perfectly valid marriage, and the couple may move into another State and there be convicted of a crime. Now, is not that parallel where the continued possession of the property is a continued taking, and when a person enters the District of Columbia is not it a retaking and therefore a violation of the law?

Mr. MANN. Oh, I have no doubt it is within our power to declare what is a crime within the District of Columbia, and declare the bringing of property, under certain conditions, in the District is a crime.

Mr. KOPP. Even if acquired validly in another place. Does not that answer the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. Possibly. That would not go to the power so much as to the fairness of the legislation.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Suppose there was no law in Virginia against the crime of forgery, and suppose somebody should forge a note in Virginia and bring it over here into the District of Columbia? Would it not be competent to make the possession of that forged note, a willful possession of the forged note, a crime in the District of Columbia, although it could not be punished under the laws of Virginia?

Mr. MANN. I should think very likely. However, that does not go to the question I have raised which is to attempt to punish in two districts the same crime. If the purpose is to punish in the District of Columbia for having possession of property, it seems to me that that ought to be denounced as a crime; and I simply call attention again to the gentlemen who are familiar with these things as to whether it is not advisable to add as an amendment on page 2, line 24, after the word "shall," insert the words "shall be guilty of a crime," so it will read, "and is afterwards found with any such property or other such thing of value in his possession in said District, or who brings any such property or other such thing of value

into said District, shall be guilty of a crime, and upon conviction be punished," and so forth.

Mr. PAYNE. Does the language of the proposed act in any way refer to felonious intent as regards the owner of the property or simply having it in his possession? I might come in here with a carpetbag—

Mr. MANN. The act provides that the original taking must have been a crime, if committed in the District of Columbia, substantially.

Mr. PAYNE. That is all that is required?

Mr. MANN. That is all.

Mr. PAYNE. Nothing about the man bringing it into the District of Columbia knowing it had been stolen?

Mr. MANN. There is nothing about bringing it knowingly to the District, but it must have been knowingly in the first place, because otherwise it would not have been a crime.

Mr. PAYNE. It has no language regarding any criminal knowledge or intent on his part?

Mr. MANN. There is none, but he must have been the original perpetrator of the crime.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, the original thief?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will.

Mr. KOPP. I notice the title of this act was taken from the Senate bill. The Senate bill referred exclusively to Government property. Should not the title now be amended, inasmuch as it includes larceny of other property?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It can not be amended until after the bill is passed.

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

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I move to amend the title of the bill so it will read: "An act to provide for the punishment of larceny in certain cases."

The SPEAKER. Without objection the title will be amended as suggested by the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the amendment reported. I did not hear it.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act to provide for the punishment of larceny in certain cases.

Mr. KOPP. It is not larceny that we are punishing. It is bringing property into this District which was stolen somewhere else.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Just one moment, Mr. Speaker. I move that the title of the act be as follows:

An act providing for the punishment of persons in possession of stolen property in the District of Columbia, having stolen the same in another State or Territory.

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

The amendment to amend the title was agreed to.

SALE OF POISONS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to call up the bill H. R. 8619.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky calls up the bill H. R. 8619, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8619) to amend "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906.

Be it enacted, etc., That the second proviso in section 11 of "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Provided further, That the above provisions shall not apply to sales at wholesale by jobbers, manufacturers, dental-supply houses, and retail druggists to retail druggists, hospitals, colleges, scientific or public institutions, and dentists in the actual practice of their profession."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to enable dentists, hospitals, colleges, and institutions for scientific purposes to purchase their drugs by wholesale from jobbers, instead of upon prescription of a physician from the retail pharmacists. It accomplishes that, and we believe nothing more, and consequently ask its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and, having been read a third time, was passed.

INSURANCE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to call up the bill (H. R. 12738) to amend the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia regarding insurance.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12738) to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia regarding insurance.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 652, chapter 18, Code of Law for the District of Columbia, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the word "District" after the word "to" in line 1, and by striking out the words "organized under the laws of" in line 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the words "transacting business in," so as to read:

"Sec. 652. Inquiries as to companies.—It shall be the duty of the said superintendent of insurance to ascertain whether the capital required by law or the charter of each insurance company or association transacting business in the District of Columbia has been actually paid up in cash and is held by its board of directors subject to their control, according to the provisions of their charter, or has been invested in property worth not less than the full amount of the capital stock required by its charter; or, if a mutual company, that it has received and is in actual possession of securities, as the case may be, to the full extent of the value required by its charter; and the president and secretary of such company or association shall make a declaration under oath to said superintendent, who is hereby empowered to administer oaths when hereby required that the tangible assets exhibited to him represent bona fide the property of the company or association, which sworn declaration shall be filed and preserved in the office of said superintendent; and any such officer swearing falsely in regard to any of the provisions hereof shall be deemed guilty of perjury and shall be subject to all the penalties now prescribed by law in the District of Columbia for that crime."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to change section 652 of the code. The code as it now exists reads this way:

It shall be the duty of the said superintendent of insurance to ascertain whether the capital required by law or the charter of each insurance company or association organized under the laws of the District of Columbia has been actually paid up.

If this bill is passed it will read this way:

It shall be the duty of the said superintendent of insurance to ascertain whether the capital required by law or the charter of each insurance company or association transacting business in the District of Columbia has been actually paid up.

Or, in other words, it puts upon the same footing the companies which are organized under the laws of the District of Columbia and those which are organized under the laws of the various States which companies are doing business in the District of Columbia. It puts them all exactly upon the same footing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. As much as he desires.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, at the request of the superintendent of insurance of the District of Columbia, leads me to think that the gentleman from Kentucky does not fully appreciate what the bill does.

The present law makes provision for companies organized outside of the District of Columbia doing business in the District of Columbia on certain terms, and provides further as to companies organized in the District of Columbia that they shall make report to the superintendent of insurance of the District of Columbia. At present an insurance company organized in the District of Columbia is required to report to the superintendent of insurance the amount actually paid up in cash and held by the board of directors, subject to control according to the provisions of the charter, or the amount invested in property worth not less than the full amount of the capital stock required by its charter, and so forth.

And it provides, further, that the president and secretary of the said company shall make a declaration under oath to the superintendent, who is empowered to administer oaths when required, and that the tangible assets exhibited to him represent bona fide all the property of the company or association, and so forth. Now, it is proposed seriously by the superintendent of insurance of the District of Columbia that if a company organized in London desires to do business in the District of Columbia the president and secretary of that company shall come to the District of Columbia once a year, I believe, and make oath before the superintendent of insurance here. He is the only one authorized to take the oath. It is proposed that the superintendent of insurance here shall send to London and examine, not whether the company has complied with the requirements of Congress as to a foreign company doing business here, but in reference to all of its investments.

Now, certainly that can not be seriously proposed. The control of local authorities over a company organized under local law is one thing. It is quite a different thing to go into the entire control of a foreign corporation. We have legislation—I do not know whether or not it is fairly restrictive—in regard to foreign corporations doing business in the District; but if it

is not, and we have some law on that subject, we ought to reform that law. But to say that an insurance company organized in Omaha, for example, can not do business in the District of Columbia unless it sends its president and secretary here to make a sworn oath before the superintendent of insurance is to adopt a restrictive policy as to insurance which can not be followed in this country without a very detrimental effect.

Suppose we say in Illinois that no company organized in the District of Columbia or outside of the State shall do business in the State unless the president and secretary of the company appear and make an oath before the superintendent of insurance of the State of Illinois. Why, they would have to have a president and secretary of the insurance company whose main duty it would be to travel around the country and make sworn oaths. Certainly the gentleman from Kentucky does not believe that ought to be done. Is not that the effect of this? Is not that what it does?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. In answer to what the gentleman has said, I wish to say that I always have the greatest respect for his interpretation of anything that is submitted to this House, and most usually I find him right upon matters of construction and technicality. But in this I find him wrong.

Mr. MANN. Well, I hope so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This does not say that the president of an insurance company in London shall have to come to the District of Columbia and here make oath, but it says this:

And the president and secretary of such company or association shall make a declaration under oath to said superintendent.

That statement could be written, subscribed, and sworn to in England or in any State in the Union, and transmitted by mail to the superintendent of insurance in the District of Columbia. The next sentence gives the superintendent the right to administer an oath, a power he does not now have, so that those who live here, when they go to the superintendent to file their reports may make oath before him, while those who subscribe and swear to that report elsewhere can do so before an officer authorized to administer an oath at that place.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman is correct. The bill says that "the secretary and president of the company shall make a declaration, under oath, to the said superintendent, who is hereby empowered to administer oaths." I take it that the object of that is to make them make the oath before the superintendent of insurance here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This does not say that. He can make the oath and transmit it to the superintendent here.

Mr. MANN. Then it goes ahead and prescribes further: that he shall be guilty of a crime in the District of Columbia if he swears falsely. For what? For falsely making an oath in London?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that if one wants to come into the District of Columbia with a wildcat insurance company, then he should be subject to all the laws of the District of Columbia if we can gain jurisdiction over him; but if he makes a false statement and swears to it in London, the gentleman must not presume for a moment that the District of Columbia or even the United States could ever get jurisdiction over him to try him unless he came here.

Mr. MANN. That would depend upon whether the jurisdiction covered such a matter. I do not know whether it does or not, but you can acquire jurisdiction here if the act is valid, but you can not if a man makes a false statement in San Francisco, providing the gentleman is correct as to whom he shall make the oath before. I take it that the intention of the act was to provide that the oath should be made before the superintendent of insurance here, and if falsely swearing here he would be guilty of perjury here. Now, what is the result? Does the gentleman think that he could be punished here for making the oath in San Francisco?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We have just passed a bill that I hoped would reach it.

Mr. MANN. No; that bill would not reach it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I hoped it would.

Mr. MANN. It clearly would not, for that relates to property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It says, "Any act which would be criminal under the laws of the District."

Mr. MANN. Yes; but you would have to find property on the man first before you punished him. You clearly could not punish him here for false swearing in San Francisco.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then, if we can not, he is not injured.

Mr. MANN. But we are injured in passing such a law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think not.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman from Kentucky would ever have drawn such a bill himself. Does the gentleman believe that after a company has complied with all the

laws of the District as to the doing of insurance business that the superintendent should go into other States to make an examination of all the investments, capital, and property of the company? How many inspectors will it take to do that? How many insurance companies are doing business in the District of Columbia? This provides:

It shall be the duty of the said superintendent of insurance to ascertain whether the capital required by law or the charter of each insurance company or association transacting business in the District of Columbia has been actually paid up in cash and is held by its board of directors subject to their control, according to the provisions of their charter, or has been invested in property worth not less than the full amount of the capital stock required by its charter; or, if a mutual company, that it has received and is in actual possession of securities, as the case may be, to the full extent of the value required by its charter.

Now, we make the requirement first, as I understand it, that a foreign company doing business here shall comply with the provisions that we put upon it to do business here. If it complies with those provisions, why do we undertake to examine everything it does in reference to property? It is quite certain that in this country, with as many States and jurisdictions as we have, it is not practicable for every State to go into the entire business of every insurance company. States usually make provisions designed to safeguard the policy holders in their own States, as we do in the District of Columbia. I am inclined to think that the superintendent of insurance—although I do not have the honor to know him personally—when he drew this bill slightly slopped over.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky) there were—ayes 21, noes 34.

So the House refused to engross the bill for a third reading.

SUPPORT AND MAINTENANCE OF BASTARDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of District bills.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas in the chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I call up bill H. R. 13041, to provide for the support and maintenance of bastards in the District of Columbia. I move that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, before general debate begins I wish to give notice that at the proper time I shall offer an amendment on page 1, line 7, section 2, to strike out the five words "who is pregnant with child." And also in line 9 to strike out the word "are" so that when the bill is discussed it may be discussed along those lines.

I shall also at the proper time, on page 2, line 18, after the word "brought" and before the word "before," move to insert two words "for trial." Also on page 2 in line 23, after the word "appearance" and before the word "in," I shall move to insert the two words "and trial." And on page 3, line 4, after the word "law," to insert a new sentence to read as follows:

In all prosecutions under this act the accused shall, upon his demand therefor, be entitled to a trial by jury; otherwise the trial shall be by the judge.

Then, on page 6, line 8, I desire to add a new sentence:

And the court, in its discretion, may order payments to be made by delinquent fathers at the precincts wherein they reside through the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia.

That provision is written at the suggestion of Judge De Lacey, of the juvenile court.

Mr. Chairman, about two years ago a bastardy bill was introduced into this House. At that time that bill contained less than a dozen lines. In those dozen lines it was endeavored to lay out a procedure for bastardy proceedings, to inflict a penalty, and to collect the judgment. That was deemed by the District Committee at the time as being inadequate. Since that time this bill has been prepared, and from time to time, even up until to-day, efforts have been made to perfect it, until now it is believed that this bill gives to the District of Columbia a good bastardy law. The District of Columbia now is without one, and until this bill is adopted, or one similar to it, there will be no bastardy law in the District. For that reason its immediate passage is urged.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other person desires to be heard in general debate general debate will be closed, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That any unmarried woman who is pregnant with child may go before the clerk of the juvenile court, District of Columbia, or if therein she has been delivered of a bastard child, or (if that be her place of legal residence) if she was delivered thereof outside of the said District, at any time within two years after the birth of the bastard, and accuse any person residing in said District of being the father of the child. Before issuing a warrant, the clerk shall examine the mother of such bastard child, under oath, concerning her residence and her marriage or single condition when the child was begotten; where and when she was delivered of such child; and if she was delivered of the child outside of the District, of the reason thereof, and reduce her statement to writing, and sign same as clerk. If, however, the clerk shall fail to reduce the statement to writing, or if it should be lost, such failure or loss shall be no cause for dismissing the warrant. Or such warrant may be applied for by the Board of Charities of the District or any person as next friend of the said bastard under 2 years of age.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 7 and 8, page 1, strike out the words "who is pregnant with child."

In line 9, page 1, strike out the word "or" after the words "District of Columbia."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the purpose of this amendment to prevent a woman who is pregnant from bringing proceedings; or, in other words, to confine the procedure only to cases where the child has been born?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is the intention of the amendment. I would say to the gentleman from Kansas that after a discussion of that subject with the judge of the juvenile court, he thought it best to strike that out, for the reason that if a woman should complain that she has been pregnant for 30 days only, then the proceedings would have to be held up in some way for eight months at least, and we could see no way of properly caring for a proceeding of that kind.

Mr. JACKSON. Why hold up the proceeding for eight or nine months?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Suppose it should turn out that the woman was entirely mistaken, and that she was not pregnant?

Mr. JACKSON. This is a proceeding to try the parentage of the child.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. In addition to that, we thought it would open up too many avenues for blackmail.

Mr. JACKSON. This is a proceeding by which the paternity of the child may be determined, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Provided the woman is with child. Under your suggestion that could be done any time before the birth of the child. It could be done when she would claim that she was with child only a week or 10 days.

Mr. JACKSON. If the gentleman will pardon me, it seems to me that the point is this: That you are providing here very properly for a semicriminal proceeding to arrest and try the father of a bastard child. If you cut off the right of the mother, and it is in her interest that the proceeding is usually provided for, to try him before the child is born, you give the father eight or nine months in which to escape.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that this bill not only provides for the ascertainment of that fact, but also to hold the father for the support of the child.

Mr. JACKSON. Before the birth of the child?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes. That is one of the reasons we have cut this out.

Mr. JACKSON. Where is that provision?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That is further along in the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Very well. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I think the gentleman will find that this is the best bill that can be obtained under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 8, page 1, the words "of the" after the word "court" in place of the comma.

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

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

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman from Kentucky, where it provides "That any person residing in said District, being accused of being the father," and so forth, just what is residing in the District?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I asked the draftsman of the bill for some information upon that subject myself, and his explanation of it was that if the paternity of the child could not legally be inquired into here it could be in some State or place other than in the District.

Mr. MANN. For instance, we have a very large number of Government clerks in Washington not residents of Washington. Possibly they reside here, but they claim some other place for their residence. I wondered if the gentleman who prepared the bill thought all those would be reached under the term "residing in the District," if such occasion should arise?

Mr. DYER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois what section that is in?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is on page 1, at the bottom, line 13. I will say to the gentleman that when I first read the bill my mind immediately turned to that very thing. I have done a good deal of reading upon the question as to who is a "resident" of the District of Columbia, and I find it a most perplexing one.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman has had it up for consideration—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It is one I would rather the courts determine than to determine it myself.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. KAHN. Does not the gentleman recognize that if they are where the court has jurisdiction here in the District that would probably meet his views? If he resides in the District and can be served with a process of the court, though he lives here in the District for the time being, is not that serving the purposes of the law?

Mr. MANN. Well, of course it is very unusual, I think, in laws of this kind, to put in the term "residing," and I did not know what the purpose was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. We could not use the word "citizen."

Mr. MANN. Plainly a person would not be covered by that.

Mr. KAHN. But if he is within the jurisdiction of the court, do not you get the very thing you are after? He can be haled before the judge, and he can not get out of the jurisdiction of the court by claiming that he is a resident of some other State.

Mr. MANN. But he is not guilty of a crime unless he resides here; he is not guilty under this act unless he resides here. But if the gentleman has had it up for consideration I have nothing further to add. On page 2, line 6, the provision is, "if she was delivered of a child outside of the District, of the reason thereof"—I suppose the word "of" should come out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I take it for granted so, since my attention is called to it.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the second "of," in line 5, page 2, where it comes after the word "District."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "of" in line 6, page 2, after the word "District."

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That on such examination, if the child be yet living and under 2 years old, a warrant shall be issued by the clerk, directed to the United States marshal, or to the major and superintendent or any member of the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia, requiring the person accused to be arrested and brought before the judge of the juvenile court, District of Columbia, who may require the accused to enter into bond, with good surety to the United States of America, in a sum to be fixed by such judge, not to exceed \$2,500, for his appearance in the juvenile court, District of Columbia, on the first day of the next term thereof, and to perform the judgment of said court. If the person accused shall fail to give bond required of him, the judge shall forthwith commit him to the Washington Asylum and Jail, there to remain until he enter into the required bond or otherwise be discharged by due process of law.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do.

Mr. DYER. Why does the gentleman fix that as under two years' old? Should not the limit be raised up to, say, five years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I find on examination of similar statutes in other States that three years seems to be the longest time permitted, and in many States it is less than two, in a great many States only one year, and this is a com-

promise in that respect as to time. I do not believe it should be left open for too long a time within which a woman would discover she has been aggrieved, so it seems to me that two years is ample time.

Mr. DYER. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in line 18, after the word "brought" and before the word "before," I move to insert the words "for trial"; and in line 23, after the word "appearance," insert the words "and trial."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 18, page 2, after the word "brought," insert the words "for trial," and in line 23 insert, after the word "appearance," the words "and trial."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Chairman, at the conclusion of that section, page 3, line 4, I move to add the following:

In all prosecutions under this act the accused shall, upon his demand therefor, be entitled to a trial by jury; otherwise the trial shall be by the judge.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "law," in line 4, at the end of section 3, insert:

"In all prosecutions under this act the accused shall, upon his demand therefor, be entitled to a trial by jury; otherwise the trial shall be by the judge."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That if the accused shall fail to appear, the bond for his appearance as aforesaid shall be forfeited and execution issued thereon; and the trial of or other proceedings in the cause shall, nevertheless, proceed as though he were present; and the court shall, upon the verdict of the jury, make all such orders as it shall deem proper as though the accused were in court. In any event, if the accused acknowledge in open court the paternity of such child, or if the finding of the jury be against the accused, the court, in rendering judgment thereon, shall make an order for the annual payment, until the child be 14 years of age, of such sum of money, in such installments, monthly or otherwise, and in such manner, as shall to the court seem best, and shall also make such order for the keeping, maintenance, and education of the child as may be proper; and in case of forfeiture of the appearance bond, the money collected upon the forfeiture shall be applied in payment of the judgment against the accused; and if any balance remains after the payment of the said judgment, it shall be covered into the Treasury, through the collector of taxes, to the credit, half and half, of the District of Columbia and the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on page 3, at the end of line 12, I move to insert the three words "at the trial."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of line 12, on page 3, the words "at the trial."

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That when the defendant shall have been confined for 10 days, solely for failure to make the payments required or to enter into the bond as ordered, such defendant may make application in writing to the judge of the juvenile court, District of Columbia, setting forth his inability to make such payments, notwithstanding his desire to do so or enter into such required bond, upon which application of the judge of the juvenile court, District of Columbia, shall proceed to hear and determine the matter. If on examination it shall appear to the court that such defendant is unable to make such payments or to execute the required bond and that he has no property exceeding \$20 in value, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on execution for debt, the judge shall administer the following oath: "I do solemnly swear that I have not any property, real or personal, to the amount of \$20, except such as is by law exempt from being taken on civil process for debt by the laws of the District of Columbia, and that I have no property in any way conveyed or concealed or in any way disposed of for my future use or benefit. So help me God." Upon taking such oath such prisoner shall be discharged from imprisonment only, but not from his obligation as such putative father to support his child; and the judge of the juvenile court, District of Columbia, shall give to the superintendent of the Washington Asylum and Jail a certificate setting forth the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, on page 5, in line 10, I move to strike out the word "he" between the two words "help" and "God" and insert in lieu thereof the word "me."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, after the word "help" and before the word "God," strike out the word "he" and insert the word "me."

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

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

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if this section does not practically nullify the whole law?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It simply gives the man a right to avail himself of the insolvent debtor's oath. Without that he could be put in prison and kept there forever.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand; but under the provision I referred to especially would he not avail himself of this when he had been in jail only 10 days? Will not most of the irresponsible people, people who could pay if they wanted to, if they were willing to work and pay, avail themselves of this provision; and the law as a whole will not do any good?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. He is not relieved from the judgment by that if property can be found.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand that a judgment against that class of men is not of any value. Judgment runs against them all over the United States, wherever they may go.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that without that a man could be put in jail and be kept there until he rotted.

Mr. FOCHT. Why not make it three months, as provided in the Pennsylvania law?

Mr. JACKSON. In our State it is one year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say to the gentleman that I discussed that very proposition with the judge of the juvenile court, the draftsman of this bill, and he and I and the rest of the committee agreed that it would be better that this man have his liberty and go to work rather than be a charge upon the District of Columbia and the Federal Government, and that his earnings would then be within the reach of the juvenile court.

Mr. JACKSON. The law is very liberal in providing that he may make an annual payment at such times as the court may order. It is practically in the hands of the judge without this provision. But to relieve a man and allow him to get an absolute release from the jail sentence or the process of the court by serving 10 days in jail is ridiculous, it seems to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If the gentleman will notice, after the oath there appears in the language of the bill the following:

Upon taking such oath the prisoner shall be discharged from imprisonment only, but not from his obligation as such putative father to support his child.

Mr. JACKSON. I understand that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That gives him the opportunity to go and earn wages.

Mr. JACKSON. Why not make the whole law enforceable by civil judgment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This gives him 10 days, and it can be repeated when each installment falls due if he fails to pay.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, if I am in order, I would like to move that in line 16, section 6, the words "ten days" be stricken out and the words "six months" inserted in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MANN. That period is too long.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, section 6, in line 16, strike out the words "ten days" and insert the words "six months."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that what he says may be true; that it is too long. I have not investigated the matter here, but in States where I have had practice in the courts—and I am borne out in my statement by gentlemen around me—the period runs from three months to one year. I know of no State now where a man can absolutely relieve himself from the process of the court by serving only 10 days.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The period for insolvent debtors in my State is 10 days. Under the Federal statutes I believe it is 30 days.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman is putting this just on the basis of a civil debt. The gentleman is waiving the entire right of the United States to maintain a criminal process in such cases, and it becomes practically a matter of civil process. If you make it 10 days, you might as well make it a matter of civil justice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Under the Federal statutes the insolvent debtor's oath, even for illegal distilling, can be taken at the end of 30 days, and the defendant is discharged. But this bill, in express terms, leaves him still liable for the support of the bastard child, and this practice can be repeated when another installment falls due and is not paid.

Mr. JACKSON. Make it 30 days or 6 months or something substantial. Do not make it a farce.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. This is not a farce. If the gentleman thinks it is a farce to go to jail for 10 days, I do not agree with him.

Mr. JACKSON. So far as men who do not have property are concerned, under this act, they will avail themselves of this provision, and no relief can be had.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. A delinquent's wages would be taken by the juvenile court immediately after he went to work. But we insisted that he be given the opportunity to go to work as soon as possible, and that the Government be relieved of him as a public charge.

Mr. JACKSON. I will ask the gentleman, for the purpose of obtaining information, if the man's wages are not exempt?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Not except as to the payment of the fine.

Mr. JACKSON. This proposes to exempt him with \$20.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. JACKSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky), there were—ayes 18, noes 16.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. That the juvenile court of the District of Columbia is hereby given jurisdiction in all cases arising under this act as well as concurrent jurisdiction with the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in all cases arising under the act approved March 23, 1906, entitled "An act making it a misdemeanor in the District of Columbia to abandon or willfully neglect to provide for the support and maintenance by any person of his wife or of his or her minor children in destitute and necessitous circumstances."

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, at the end of line 8 I move the following amendment:

And the court, in its discretion, may order payments to be made by delinquent fathers at the precinct wherein they reside, through the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "circumstances," in line 8, page 6, add the words: "And the court, in its discretion, may order payments to be made by delinquent fathers at the precinct wherein they reside, through the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia."

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and the bill, with the amendments, be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be adopted.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask the gentleman to withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly I withhold it for the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON. Where is the provision the gentleman referred to awhile ago, giving a pregnant woman the right to bring this action? The gentleman referred to it in reply to my first question. Where is it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I thought I clearly stated to the gentleman that that was stricken out.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman also said there was some proceeding here by which she could be protected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. No. I said to the gentleman that there is no provision for the institution of proceedings until the birth of the child.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that, as the act reads, a man has all the time after he becomes aware that he is about to become the father of a bastard child to leave the District, and get out of the jurisdiction of the court before the child is born?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. That was the very question—his becoming aware—he would have no premonitions.

Mr. JACKSON. I suppose he must see the child before he is aware that he is its father.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. There should be no provision for the proceeding until the birth of the child. We think that closes many avenues to blackmail.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13041) to provide for the support and maintenance of bastards in the District of Columbia, and had directed him

to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not they will be voted upon in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, a motion to reconsider the several votes by which the various bills relating to the District of Columbia were passed to-day was laid on the table.

PENSIONS.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 1, granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 1, commonly known as the Sherwood pension bill.

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 further consideration of House bill No. 1, with Mr. FOSTER of Illinois in the chair.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in legislation involving expenditures such as are contemplated under the proposed bill this House does not sufficiently recognize that the money thus to be expended must be taken from the remainder of the people.

From one end of this country to the other we have complaints of the high cost of living. This high cost comes in large measure from our tariff system, a system which to my mind places burdens upon shoulders least able to bear them. It seems to me that these large expenditures, which make necessary the extraordinary revenues that have to be raised by our tariff, are not considered with sufficient care.

It is true that those who risked their lives that the Union might be preserved are entitled to great consideration. It is also true that there are many millions of people no less patriotic, no less deserving of sympathy, that are now suffering under the burdens imposed because of the heavy taxes levied under our cowardly, indirect system. If this money that some of us propose to appropriate could be taken out of the undue accumulations of the privileged among us, I, for my part, would have no objection to its appropriation. We wish to be generous. We wish to recognize the services of these veterans, but when we stop to consider that this bill calls for from \$40,000,000 to \$75,000,000 a year which must be taken from the average of our people, which must come from what is charged them in the cost of living, then we should see to it that we do not, under the guise of patriotism or apostrophes to the flag, place increasing burdens upon those who in toil and suffering must pay these charges.

We are not here to act on our own generous impulses with money not our own. We are here to administer trust funds. We can not alleviate all the want in our country. We can not redistribute the wealth of our country without being accountable for the way in which we do it. It seems to me that in this world of but relative justice we have been generous to our veterans. They have had more consideration than any other class of our people. We can not pay them for being patriotic, for patriotism is not purchasable. We have done much more to alleviate their needs than we have done for others equally worthy. We can not by appropriations cure all the hardship of all our people.

To my mind the old woman who has brought up a family and finds herself in her old age a subject of charity is no less deserving of our attention than are these veterans. We can not pension her. I hope some time we may. We never can have old-age pensions or an adequate system of social justice until the time comes when we have some method whereby we can levy taxes upon privilege and take away the earnings of privilege.

The time will come when out of the product of the competent and the efficient the portion now paid to privilege will go to the amelioration of the condition of the superannuated and the crippled. I for one can not vote for the tremendous appropriation of public funds contemplated in the Sherwood bill or the Sulloway bill, because I realize that it must mean an increased burden placed by our indirect system of taxation upon the least favored of our people that shows itself in the higher cost of living. I hope that when this measure comes to a

vote that there will be a roll call, and I hope and trust that after the roll is called and all of us have voted, that no man can confess, even to himself, that his vote on this vastly important measure had any connection whatever with the fortunes of his political party or with his own political fortunes. If any man votes so that he must in honesty make this confession, even to himself, he thereby admits that he has been false to his oath of office, and by such confession he will by his own insincerity be insulting those at whose supposed behest he aids in passing such legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, The House having resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1, known as the Sherwood pension bill, I feel that representing the district that I do I should at least give to the Congress of the United States the views I entertain relative to this bill.

I have tried to be in the life I have spent up to date conscientious; I have never hesitated, with reference to any matter of public concern in which I as a citizen felt interested, to speak out in meeting. I fully realize that the Sherwood pension bill means a vast expenditure of public funds. I realize that the majority in this House, who is responsible to the country for the legislation which emanates from this body of the Government, being responsible to the whole people of the country, that I as a humble member of the majority side of this House have to assume my individual responsibility with other Congressmen.

I realize that in the extreme southern part of this country there are certain Democrats who may not feel kindly toward this measure. I realize that in the extreme northern section of this country there are certain Republican Members of this important body who likewise do not feel very much concerned in the measure and are against it. As I look at this bill, it is a matter that addresses itself to us individually and to our individual conscience. While we are very much interested in the preservation of the financial responsibility of this Government, which transacts its business somewhat on the plan that an individual carries on his business in life, no man wants and no man ought to want to see the Treasury depleted, especially in an unworthy cause. Let us provide for an income tax, and all will be well.

Many of you will be surprised, doubtless, and especially those who may know something about my environment in life, at the position I take with reference to this bill. In my district there are some 2,500 ex-Union soldiers, and they are deserving citizens. There are about 7,000 voters, themselves, their sons, and sons-in-law, nearly every one of whom, at least the great majority of whom, usually have been voting the straight Republican ticket, until the old men have been neglected and fed on broken promises until they have made up their minds to change conditions for the general good of the country they fought for and still love, and in thousands of instances they are voting, and have been in recent years, the Democratic ticket. They saved this Government, and now before they die they are going to "clean out the money changers."

My oldest brother was four years in the southern army; went in when he was a boy 15 years of age. He was in the Battle of Antietam, the Battle of Seven Pines, Cedar Creek, Cross Keys, Wilderness, Cold Harbor, and the Bloody Angle. He was in a number of the most important engagements fought out during the Civil War. My father, when he was obliged to leave home, told my mother that he did not think the South could succeed, and it was a serious question whether it should succeed. My brother went off to school at Lewisburg, now a part of my district. When the drums beat and the bugle call was sounded, he, in his tender years of 15, went to volunteer, but was not large enough or strong enough to go in as a private and carry his gun and army supplies. He wanted to then go in the cavalry. He followed for a week before they took him in. He was a part of the time with Stuart, a part of "Stonewall" Jackson's command, and sustained the reputation of being a brave and good soldier among his comrades. I am his youngest brother. He offered up his young life for that which he believed was right at the time in the sight of God and was willing to die for the cause which was lost. Peace to his memory and ashes.

My conscience dictates to me that there is not a man within the sound of my voice who would to-day want to see this Republic divided against itself. I am here, and if it is the last vote I ever expected to cast in this Congress, it is going to be in behalf of the old soldier, and I am going to vote for the Sherwood pension bill. [Applause.]

Why so? As the southern soldier fared, of course, his fare was very much more inadequate than that of the Union soldier. They had to cut brush to sleep on, sleep on logs and fence rails

to keep out of water and ice, in the sunshine, rain, mud, snow, and slush, and so did the men on the Union side. God protect us from such experiences and reunite us into closer bonds of brotherhood and let the deal past bury its brave and patriotic dead. Enable us to look to the future with renewed hopes of greater love of country and of our fellow men, that in the ages to come and go the history of the chivalry, bravery, and manhood of this Republic, of the southern men and northern men, may be looked back upon by the generations of this land with sentiments of good will and pride, blending the ambitions of all to make this the grandest country and the noblest people on earth.

The Union soldiers were better provisioned than the southern soldiers, and I remember before that oldest brother, whose memory I revere, took his departure to the great beyond, across the river of time, after the great conflict had been ended, he said to me on one occasion in talking about pensions:

Brother, the Union soldiers deserve more than this Government is able to pay them. The southern soldiers deserve more at the hands of this Government than up to date it has been willing to concede them.

A few days before I left to come to this session of Congress an old Union soldier, blind as the result of injuries received during the conflict, for he was there during four years, came hobbling into my office in Charleston. A man was with him. A number of people were there. I said, "What can I do for you?" He stuck out his hand, for he could not see, and said, "Is this Adam?" I said, "Yes." He said, "This is Frederick Carel, from St. Albans." Around his shoulders were entwined the arms of Henry McFarland, a southern soldier, living at Charleston. He came to me and he said, "Adam, let me appeal to you to help Frederick Carel get his pension. I know he was a brave soldier, because in the Virginia campaign he ran me and I ran him. We shot at each other then, but we are friends now." To me this was an affecting scene.

During my campaign I had occasion to go through a certain wilderness section of my district where but few, if any, candidates had theretofore been. I stopped by the wayside and saw a man who appeared to me to have been sick for a year. He was pale and careworn and was physically diseased and disabled. I thought I would stop long enough, without telling him who I was, to drop a word of cheer in his cup of sorrow. I said, "My friend, you seem to have had a bad spell of sickness." He feebly said, "No, sir; I am not sick." I said, "What is your trouble?" His reply was, "I was shot through the hips at the Battle of Seven Pines." I took it for granted that he was in the southern army. I said, "Well, my brother was there. What side were you on?" He said, "I was in the Union Army." I said, "What is your trouble that you are sitting in a chair?" He said, "I have not walked for nine years. After being shot through the hips I was in hospitals for three years. I recovered to the extent that I could walk on crutches. Finally I walked with canes, and then finally I dispensed with them. Nine years ago I got hurt again and my old trouble came back, and I have not walked a step since that time." I asked him how much pension he was getting, and he said, "Not anything," although he was expecting to hear from his claim. It occurred to me, after I had somewhat investigated the case, that if his statement be true, which I have not yet completely verified, seeing the poverty with which that man was surrounded, seeing his poor wife who had had to attend to his wants during those nine long and weary years as if he were a baby, seeing his emaciated condition, that if he were shot through the hips at the Battle of Seven Pines in defense of his flag and Government his condition ought to appeal to all men.

The Union soldiers would resent the imputation that this is a gift to them. I would like to see the Member of this important body who would say to the contrary that he would spill his blood, lose his life, property, and all rather than see this Government divided against itself.

I want to say to my Democratic brethren on this side of the House, and I wish every one of them here to hear it, that this is not a bill of charity, but, as I heard a southern Member of this body say a few days ago, we are simply paying a debt that this Government owes to those old men. [Applause.] I have never lost, except for the time being, anything in my life for being liberal. I would rather withstand the criticism of men who disagree with me, I would rather withstand the scathing articles that insolent newspaper writers may be pleased to visit upon me, I would rather resign my seat in this great body, than, feeling as I do, that these people are entitled to have this Government pay the debt it owes them, to vote against this bill. Something was said by a distinguished Member from Chicago the other day to the effect that men were political cowards. I regretted to have heard that statement made, because I know there are broad, conscientious, honest, patriotic men in this body who will vote for the passage of this bill, reconciling their consciences in the sight of God and man, be-

lieving that when they vote for the passage of this bill they are voting in the interest of justice and humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I want to see this bill go through this House. Lots of those old Union soldiers voted against me—many of them voted for me. Everyone who voted for me knew he was voting for a southern man and a straight Democrat, but they thought I was their friend, and in this they made no mistake. Perhaps, if ever my head is stuck above the waters in the future, some of the rich men of my district or of my State may criticize me for what I have done, but by the eternal God, I am responsible, first, to myself, my own conscience—and my conscience dictates to me that we should pay the debt that the American people as a whole, North, East, South, and West, owe to all of the men who opposed the army my brother was in, all together causing the blood and carnage that swept over this country and brought about the misery and poverty in every direction all over this land; I say, pay them, pay them the debt, and pay it while they live. [Applause.]

And I do not know that before I get through with my term of this Congress but I shall vote, though the world may say it is wrong, even for an old-age pension bill, where men are so enfeebled in life that they can not take care of themselves. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to further trespass upon either the Chairman or the time of the House, since my time is up, I should like the privilege of revising and extending my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to yield the balance of the time allotted to me to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has 30 minutes remaining, which he yields to his colleague [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, of that time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. STEPHENS] five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have asked for time at this hour instead of to-morrow during the five-minute amendment time, that I might not delay for a single moment the giving of further pension relief to the deserving veterans of the Union Army. I would not be true to my own manhood, I would not be true to my own constituency, I would not be true to my country if I did not favor adequate care and comfort for every surviving hero of the sixties. The seventh congressional district of California has a larger population than any other congressional district in the United States, and perhaps a larger veteran citizenship, too. I am here advocating with all the strength I have the passing of such legislation as shall make the fullest possible payment of the debt our country owes to its preservers.

I do this because I believe it to be my duty, and I deem it an honor and a privilege to be permitted to work in such a cause at this time. The legislature now in session in California will, according to recent California newspapers, so redistrict the State as to place by far the larger part of my present veteran constituency in another district. This will not cause me to change my vote, for I am, from principle, in favor of fulfilling all our obligations toward them.

Suppose many years ago, during a fire which was consuming your house, your neighbor had rushed in and saved your wife, your children, and yourself from death. Suppose, also, that he had saved for you everything necessary for your future livelihood and happiness, and that with what he had saved you had in the years since been enabled to build up a great fortune. And suppose that to-day, because of injuries sustained on that eventful night so long ago, your neighbor had become in need of more care and comfort than his old age would permit him to earn. Then would it not be your duty to provide for him at least a moderate amount of comfort out of your superabundance? I think it would, and I think that to-day our country stands in this position toward the old soldiers. My country, your country, our country, now so prosperous in North and South, in East and West, must provide reasonable comforts for the men who almost 50 years ago marched forth to fight for its unity and preservation.

I shall favor the Sherwood bill as it is, if it can not be changed, for I am for pension relief now. However, I would like to change it some and shall vote for several amendments.

That part of section 1 which under this bill prohibits all in receipt of \$25 or more per month from admission to National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and which prohibits

Government aid to State or Territorial homes receiving pensioners drawing \$25 or more per month should be stricken from the bill.

Pensioners under this bill should have the same soldiers' home privileges as pensioners under any previous act. If a pensioner under any other act can avail himself of a soldiers' home, he should have the same right under this act.

I would like to see included in it something for the veterans of the Mexican War. [Applause.] I would like to see taken out of it any reference to the income of a veteran.

If you leave it in hundreds of veterans will be deprived of relief, perhaps until too late, while the question of income is being determined. If you leave it in, is the amount of income to be passed upon at each quarter—every time a pension check is issued?

I understand the cost of ascertaining and determining incomes under this act would be greater than the amount of pensions paid to the comparatively few well-to-do old soldiers—so strike out all of section 3 and allow all who are deserving a just reward.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dixon of Indiana in the chair). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, opposition to the passage of the bill in its present form may be placed in two classes, that which is friendly and that which is unfriendly. There are many who earnestly desire legislation of the general character contemplated by this bill who believe it loosely drawn and unwise in some of its provisions. They will do everything in their power to secure the passage of a better bill, if it can be done, and at least to amend the present bill to relieve it of its objectionable features. But they are entirely favorable to the general object and purpose of the bill, and while they would prefer the Sulloway bill will vote for this bill, as they hope it will be amended, rather than to see all such legislation fail at this time.

Opposition of the other class goes to the merits of the bill and is fundamental and vital. If the objections raised by the gentlemen who represent this class are of worth, no law of this kind ought to be enacted and this and all further pension legislation should fail. It is only fair that these objections should be as carefully considered as time will permit.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED—UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UN-AMERICAN.

It is claimed that pensions based on military service are unconstitutional and that the policy of granting them is un-American. The argument against the constitutionality of the pension laws is based on the fact that no express power is granted Congress to pass such laws. But the implied powers of Congress are as substantial and as real as are the express powers. The Constitution was ordained and established to promote the general welfare and to provide for the common defense. It would be difficult to conceive of an act more efficient in providing for the defense of a country than to commit it to a liberal pension policy.

The best defense our country has is not its forts and arsenals, nor its Army or Navy, but the patriotism of the people. With an Army of 80,000 men and a militia reserve of 120,000, we still are weak, judged by military standards. We are strong only in our second reserve of patriotic citizenship, from which volunteer armies can be recruited when need arises. But to make enlistments prompt, and to secure the best material, our Government must deal not only justly, but generously, with those who serve. The record of the past is the promise of the future. The enlistments of to-morrow will be largely influenced by the action of to-day. In this country we must depend absolutely on the patriotism of our citizens to repel foreign invasion or suppress domestic insurrection. Public policy demands a most liberal spirit in dealing with the soldier. To be fair, to be generous, to be even lavish, and to go far beyond the strict requirements of justice would be a wise and good investment looking toward the "common defense," because it would tend to insure a ready response to any call the Government might make.

Sir Henry Maine, in his profound work on "Popular Government," said:

The first necessity of a state is that it should be durable. * * * Next, perhaps, to the paramount duty of maintaining national existence comes the obligation incumbent on democracies, as on all governments, of securing the national greatness and dignity * * * and the government which fails to provide a sufficient supply of generals and statesmen, of soldiers and administrators * * * is a government which has miscarried.

Even a nation which hopes to aid in the abolition of war can sanction that doctrine. Generals and soldiers will be necessary for many years to come, and increasingly difficult to obtain. It will be a wise and statesmanlike policy for the Government to deal so fairly, justly, and even generously with those who thus serve her that such service will be encouraged and dignified.

As to whether or not a pension policy is un-American a short historic review will determine.

HISTORIC SKETCH—PRE-REVOLUTIONARY LEGISLATION.

Pension legislation is a part of American history from colonial times to the present. To secure enlistments in the military expeditions against the Indians the Colonies promised pensions to those who should be disabled and to their families if they should fall in the conflict. Probably the first pension law enacted in America was passed in 1636 by the Pilgrims at Plymouth, which provided that any man who should be sent forth as a soldier and should return maimed should be maintained competently by the Colony during his life. In 1718 Rhode Island enacted a remarkably comprehensive pension law. It provided that every officer, soldier, or sailor, employed in the Colony's service, who should be disabled by loss of limb or otherwise from getting a livelihood for himself and family or their dependent relatives, should have his wounds carefully looked after and healed at the Colony's charge, and should have an annual pension allowed him out of the general treasury, sufficient for the maintenance of himself and family or other dependent relatives. The law further provided that if any person who had the charge of maintaining a wife, children, parents, or other relatives should be slain in the Colony's service, these relatives should be maintained by a yearly pension from the general treasury.

In the beginnings of the Revolution and before there was any organized central government the separate Colonies promised pensions as an inducement to enlistment. The Revolutionary Government followed the Colonies, and passed pension laws to encourage enlistments. During the gloomy winter at Valley Forge in 1778, Washington urged Congress to pass more liberal pension laws. To do so he said:

Would not only dispel the apprehension of personal distress at the end of the war, from having thrown themselves out of professions and employment they might not have in their power to resume, but would in a great degree remove the painful anticipation of having their widows and orphans a burden on the charity of their country should it be their lot to fall in its defense.

REVOLUTIONARY WAR.

The first Congress in 1789 provided for the continuance of the pensions granted by prior acts.

In 1792 Congress passed a general disability pension act, which provided the courts should determine the disability and rating. The courts declined for the most part to act, for the reason that it imposed administrative acts on judicial officers. Congress in 1793 amended the act, and again in 1803, giving the Secretary of War the power of final decision in the allowance of claims. In 1805 a supplementary act was passed providing that those who had, because of their service, at any period since the war become so disabled as to render them unable to secure a subsistence by manual labor should receive the benefits of the prior pension acts. In 1806 all former enactments were repealed and a new and comprehensive pension act was passed. It provided for the continuance of pensions granted under prior acts, and granted in addition pensions to all volunteers, militia and State troops, who had served against the common enemy in the Revolutionary War. Increases were authorized when justice required. In 1816 the rate of a full pension for a private was increased from \$5 to \$8 per month.

In 1818 the first service pension act was passed. It provided that every person who had served for nine months in the Revolutionary War and was, by reason of his reduced circumstances in life, "in need of assistance from his country for support," should receive a pension. For officers the rate was \$20 per month and for privates \$8.

In 1828 Congress granted full pay for life to the surviving Revolutionary officers.

In 1832 an act was passed granting full pay for life to all officers and soldiers who had served for two years and a proportional amount to those who had served six months either in the Continental or State troops, volunteer or militia, or in the Navy.

President Madison in 1815, in a special message to Congress, recommended more liberal pensions to Revolutionary soldiers, saying:

The feelings of conscious patriotism and worth will animate such men under every change of fortune and pursuit, but their country performs a duty to itself when it bestows these testimonials of approbation and applause, which are at once the reward and the incentive of great actions.

In the history of these laws we find a constant development of new and liberal principles. At first invalid pension provisions were made. These were broadened and extended, until in 1818

a law was passed based on service and indigence. Then finally came the pure service pension law of 1832. Later widows' pensions were granted those who were married prior to or during the war. Then the time of marriage was extended to 1794, then to 1800, and finally all limitation was abolished.

The Revolutionary War ended in 1783.

It was 35 years after, that the first limited service act was passed.

It was 49 years after, that a full service pension act was passed.

WAR OF 1812.

At the outbreak of the War of 1812 half-pay provisions were made.

In 1816, \$8 a month was promised for private soldiers and a proportionate increase for officers.

A general service pension was not granted until 1871. It provided that all surviving soldiers and sailors who had served 60 days should receive a pension of \$8 a month for life.

MEXICAN WAR.

In the act declaring war with Mexico a provision was inserted promising those volunteers wounded or disabled in the service the same pension benefits as those provided for the Regular Army.

In 1887 a limited service pension act was passed. It provided that every person who had served 60 days, and who was 62 years of age, or was disabled, should receive a pension of \$8 a month.

In 1893 this was increased to \$12 a month to those totally disabled and destitute.

The benefits of the act of February 6, 1907, were also granted to those who had served 60 days or more in the War with Mexico.

The soldiers of the War of 1812 and of the Mexican War were also granted land warrants amounting to 63,500,000 acres, or nearly 100,000 square miles, an area nearly twice as large as Iowa and nearly 50 per cent larger than all New England.

CIVIL WAR.

Three days after Sumter had been fired upon President Lincoln called Congress in session. July 22, 1861, a law was passed authorizing the enlistment of 500,000 volunteers. Among the provisions of this law was one that all volunteers who might be wounded or otherwise disabled in the service should be entitled to the benefits conferred on persons disabled in the Regular Army.

July 14, 1862, an act passed by Congress was approved by President Lincoln, providing pensions for those disabled by reason of wounds received or disease contracted while in the service of the United States and in the line of duty. The rates varied from \$8 to \$30 a month. It was a very comprehensive act, and included benefits for widows and dependents. It was practically unopposed.

In 1864 an act was passed fixing rates for certain specific disabilities.

These acts were extended and liberalized by the acts of 1866, 1868, 1870, and 1873.

In 1879 the arrears act was passed.

June 27, 1890, the dependent pension law was passed. It provides that all persons who had served 90 days and who were disabled from performance of manual labor should receive a pension not to exceed \$12 per month. It is a limited-service pension bill.

In 1904 an Executive order was issued by President Roosevelt that in the adjudication of pension claims under the act of June 27, 1890, it should be taken and considered as an evidential fact that a claimant who had passed the age of 62 should be disabled one-half and entitled to \$6 per month, and after 65 years at \$8, after 68 years at \$10, and after 70 years at \$12 per month.

The acts of April 24, 1906, and March 4, 1907, provided that the age of 62 years and over should be considered as permanent disability, and medical examinations in such cases were not required.

The order and acts referred to were substantially superseded by the act of February 6, 1907.

This act grants pensions to persons who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War or 60 days in the Mexican War and were honorably discharged, with rates as follows: \$12 per month when 62 years of age, \$15 per month when 70 years of age, and \$20 per month when 75 years of age.

This is only an outline sketch of previous legislation in the United States. It is not intended to be complete. More than 200 general-pension laws and more than 1,000 private acts were passed before the Civil War. Many others than those mentioned have been passed since. It will be noticed that in a general way pensions have been first granted for wounds and other disabilities received in the service and in the line of duty.

After the lapse of years the next step has been to grant a limited-service pension conditioned on the showing of need. The third and last step has been a full-service pension granted to all survivors of the war. Thus in both the Revolutionary and Civil Wars the first step was taken during the wars. The second step was taken following the Revolutionary War, in 1818, or 35 years after the war closed. It was taken following the Civil War in 1890, or 25 years after the close of the war. The third step was taken with regard to Revolutionary pensions in 1832, or 49 years after the war ended. We hope the parallel may be continued by final action on the pending legislation in 1912, or 47 years after the close of the Civil War.

A liberal pension policy has been the established custom of the Nation. If we shall now enact the present legislation, we shall but follow the precedents; we shall but continue the policy approved by Washington, Madison, Jackson, Lincoln, and all the Presidents, without exception; we shall but carry out the declared principles of every great political party that has appealed to the American people; we shall but do that which every great American statesman throughout our history has declared to be the duty and the obligation of the country to its defenders in all its wars.

PRINCIPLE VICIOUS.

It is claimed by those who represent the opposition that the principle is vicious, because it puts a money valuation on patriotism. "These are debts," it is said, "that can not be settled across the counter." "The most sacred obligations are those that can never be paid." "There can be no material recompense for loyalty, patriotism, devotion to country, or a heroic discharge of duty." These are high-sounding phrases, and seem to make other considerations appear sordid and mercenary. But they are not valid objections to pensions. We know that any great service can never be adequately paid. But we are not relieved of our duty nor any obligation by saying, "Your service is of such an exalted character that we never can compensate you, therefore we will pay you nothing."

It is true that patriotism can not be purchased. But a true patriot may make material sacrifices which can be and should be paid for in dollars and cents. It is a constitutional guaranty that if the Government takes a man's property he is entitled to compensation. But a man's time is property, his health is property, his service is property. It has been suggested that the enlistment was a contract for service for which the salary received was a complete payment. But this was not the nature of the transaction, as both parties understood. What was paid was merely an allowance for passing needs. The Government never regarded it as an enforceable obligation, and paid it in depreciated currency. The soldier enlisted often without knowledge of the amount he would receive. But in any event half price or less is not full payment. Granted that it was all the Government then could pay. It is not all the Government now can pay; and such obligations are not barred by any statute of limitations.

FRAUDS.

It is said the Pension Bureau is "honeycombed with fraud." A distinguished man in public life is asserted to have said that the pension list had become a "roll of dishonor." A writer in one of our leading magazines writes a continued series of assaults, under the title "The pension carnival." He declares that to-day every pensioner is a "suspect." He says the pension rolls "are packed with unworthy and perjured names." He selects a lot of cases whose fraudulent character has been shown, and then declares that these are characteristic of the others. It is no doubt true that there have been fraudulent claims secured. The Government has been defrauded in the Pension Department, just as it has been in the Post Office Department, and in the Internal Revenue Department, and in every other department of the Government. But we do not talk of abolishing those departments because of such facts. We seek to discover and punish the fraud. Those who have evaded taxation for the support of the Government have cheated it out of much more than all the pension frauds put together. Those who have defrauded the Government out of her custom dues and internal revenues have taken much more. The Government is active and vigilant in the discovery and punishment of pension frauds as it is of other offenses, and there is not an old soldier who would not only wish, but would gladly aid in the punishment to the utmost limit of the law of all those who thus defraud and rob the Government.

If the pension list is a roll of dishonor because some unworthy names are found thereon, then the church register is a roll of dishonor, then every sacred cause that has brought to its service the courage, devotion, and sacrifice of men since the dawn of history is dishonored. No just cause can be dishonored because unworthy men espouse it. They dishonor only themselves who are guilty of dishonor.

WE HAVE DONE ENOUGH.

It is said that our Government has already done more than any other government on earth, and that is enough. It may be admitted that we have done well. But that is not the question. The question we have now to determine is, Have we fulfilled our obligation? Have we done already all that we ought to do? Other nations have their obligations, and we have ours; and we can not measure our duty by their performance. Here all stand upon an equality before the law. In time of public danger and of war the obligation of service rests upon all. But all do not serve. Some do, and the benefit of their service and sacrifice goes to all. Common justice requires that those who made the sacrifice and thus saved the Nation for the benefit of all should in some way be recompensed for what they have done over and above what their neighbors have done. If, out of every five men, one goes to service and one stays at home, the one who goes does service for all, and if he dies his family have suffered a loss—an especial loss—for which they should be compensated. And if he is maimed, or disabled, or has lost his health, justice requires that his loss be made good, and in either case it is not a gift or a charity, it is a compensation.

Thirteen or sixteen dollars per month was less than farm hands received during the war. Those who performed the commonest kind of labor could earn more by staying at home than by serving their country, to say nothing of hardships and dangers. Every skilled mechanic, farmer, business, and professional man could have earned many times the amount allowed by the Government if he had stayed at home. Difference in wages, added to the privation, exposure, and hardships of a soldier's life are estimable losses for which compensation should be made.

All this is upon the assumption that all who returned from the war were as sound physically as they would have been had they stayed at home. Perhaps some did. If their service was very short and their lives fell in pleasant places, it is conceivable that some returned sound and well. But it is a well-established fact that very few returned sound and well. Changed and trying climatic conditions, lack of scientific knowledge and appliances for securing sanitary conditions, constant exposure, impure food and insufficient clothing, lack of medical advice and attendance, want of medicine and poor hospital service—all these were the common experiences of a soldier's life. Any considerable length of service under these conditions brought certain physical impairment. Not a single one of the great generals of the war are now living. Of the 131 major generals of volunteers only two are now alive. Of the 446 brigadier generals only 19. Of the more than 3,000 colonels of regiments, less than 200. Of the 2,750,000 men who enlisted during the war less than half a million survive.

The pension roll is long, but so was the war. The amount paid is large, but large also was their service and their sacrifice. The country has been liberal to the soldier. But the country has not been more liberal to the soldier than was the soldier to the country. He gave up his devoted service, his sacrifice, if need be, his life. That was the measure of his liberality. The country has been generous, it is true. But so was the soldier. He gave up his home, comfort, ambition, his life work—everything as an offering on the altar of his country. That was the measure of his generosity.

When the war broke out the total value of the property of the Nation was but \$20,000,000,000. Now it is \$150,000,000,000. We are rich, rich beyond even the dream of possible national wealth. Our resources are incalculable. Our income is what you will. To add but a few millions for but a few years in payment of such an obligation would not be an appreciable burden, and it would be an incalculable blessing.

It is said the average age of the soldiers now living is 71 years. If so, their average expectancy of life is but 7 years. Seven years will relieve us. Seven years will close the actual, the rest is history. Gentlemen who have spoken here are profuse in their praises of the loyalty and devotion of the soldiers, but they do not want them to have any more money.

Pericles, who had been chosen by the Athenians after the battle of Marathon to deliver the oration in honor of those who had fallen, in his opening sentence said, "I should have preferred that, when men's deeds have been brave, they should be honored in deed only." I propose that course to our friends now. Rather than the praise of words, let us have the honor of deeds—deeds that shall bring comfort to distress, relief to poverty, and joy to sorrowing hearts

TIME FOR ACTION.

It is now nearly a half century since the close of the war. Not one in five of those who enlisted are now living. President Cleveland is regarded as having been unfriendly to pension legislation, yet in 1887 he signed one of the most liberal pension bills ever enacted, granting pensions to all survivors of the

Mexican War who had served 60 days in Mexico or en route thereto. In the same year, in his veto to the dependent pension bill, he said: "Never before in the history of the country has it been proposed to render Government aid toward the support of any of its soldiers based alone upon a military service so recent, and when age and circumstances appeared so little to demand such aid. Hitherto such relief has been granted to surviving soldiers few in number, venerable in age, after a long lapse of time since their military service, and as a parting benefaction tendered by a grateful people." This was in 1887, or only 22 years after the close of the war. If 1887 was regarded as a period "so recent," if 22 years was regarded as not "after a long lapse of time since their military service," what shall we say of 1912, or 50 years after their military service? In the lives of men that surely constitutes "a long lapse of time." And if they were not "venerable in age" in 1887, what shall be said of them in 1912, when their average age will exceed man's allotted space of threescore years and ten? If a "parting benefaction" is to be "tendered by a grateful people," it ought to be done speedily, or there will not be even the specified "few in number" left to receive it.

POLITICAL COWARDS.

It has been said on the floor of this House that Members vote for pensions because they are cowards and are afraid of the soldier vote. With singular inconsistency it is suggested, on the other hand, that Members need no longer fear the soldier vote, because it has become a negligible quantity and politicians can afford to disregard it. I am satisfied that, for the most part, Members vote their honest convictions on this and on other questions. I am also satisfied that if the desire of the voters of America was known it would be overwhelmingly in favor of liberal pension legislation. Those who favor such legislation can rest assured that they really represent the wish of the great body of their constituents without taking into consideration the soldier sentiment.

A REAL NEED.

It is impossible for gentlemen opposing this legislation to realize its actual and pressing need. They think of it only as another "raid on the Treasury," as but a cowardly surrender to an impertinent demand. Certainly these men do not desire, and would not permit, if they but realized it, thousands of the soldiers of the Republic to suffer in poverty and to die in want. And yet such are the existing conditions. Let me read to you some extracts from letters recently received:

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

J. C. Baker, of Knowlton, Iowa, writes:

If ever there was need of a bill, there is need for one now. We have with us an old soldier now working on the section of the Chicago Great Western Railway for his daily bread. He served in the Seventy-seventh Illinois Regiment. He was in Libby Prison 17 months. He is ruptured and wears a truss all the time. He is not the only one; we have others, crippled and suffering. Think what these men have done for us. They gave us our liberty; let us give them theirs.

C. A. Conger, Seymour, Iowa, writes:

If a good bill could be passed now it would be of inestimable benefit to nearly all the old soldiers. And it should become a law speedily, as the Civil War soldiers are passing away rapidly. To see one's comrades suffering and in need is not a pleasing thought to us, and we hope Congress will do its duty.

J. D. Lankton, Sidney, Iowa, writes:

We are out with a searchlight looking for our friends. We wonder how many of the men who now oppose us would have been willing to have taken our places from 1861 to 1865. The old boys are being mustered out very rapidly, and it won't be very long until it all will be over. Death is thinning our ranks so fast that it will be impossible for us to keep up the organization of our post very long.

J. C. McDonald, Cincinnati, Iowa, writes:

Many of our soldiers are needy, and the present allowance they are drawing is inadequate for their support. At the rate they are dying, if a considerate Government intends to further remember them, it must do so soon, or to very many of them it will be everlastingly too late. If Congress pursues its usual dilatory tactics there will soon be none to benefit.

A. B. Johnston, Clearfield, Iowa, writes:

If the Government intends to do anything it should act soon. It will only be a short time at best until they will all have answered the last roll call. We have many who are in great need of assistance. We hope Congress will do all it can for us.

H. Towns, Hamburg, Iowa, writes:

We can not understand why Congress, which seems so willing to spend millions on almost anything, should hesitate to do justice to the old soldiers. We voted, nearly to a man, to pay the bankers and bondholders, and we still believe we were right. But we don't believe it right that the old soldiers who saved the Nation should now suffer for the necessities of life, as so many of them do.

A. N. Keys, Creston, Iowa, writes:

Our ranks are thinning fast, and there is much suffering and need. Almost a half century has passed since the war closed. As a result of our victory we are the greatest and richest nation on the face of the earth. We have nearly paid our national debt, and are prosperous. The soldiers remaining are all old men. Their earning powers

are gone. The Government is amply able to do a good part by them. It ought at least to be as generous with its money as we were with our lives.

A. S. Carr, Murray, Iowa, writes:

Our post has taken no action as to which pension bill is best. What every old soldier desires is a bill that will give the greatest measure of relief to so many of our comrades and their widows who, in their old age, have so little of this world's wealth, and are drawing so small a pension that they actually suffer for the necessities of life. But months pass and nothing is done, and during that time large brigades of heroes have gone to the great beyond. This to me is the most damnable method of economy ever inaugurated by any government on earth.

Capt. Frank M. Davis, Corning, Iowa, writes:

There are many broken-down old veterans, 75 years old and more, who have no one to care for them, who can hardly manage to live now. They live lonely lives with little to comfort or cheer their declining years. If a little more money will brighten those years let a rich and great country—rich and great because of his service—give it to him.

S. H. Hedrix, Allerton, Iowa, writes:

There is a division of opinion as to the merits of the Sherwood and Sulloway bills. But all agree that the real important thing is action. There is much real suffering and want that early action will alleviate.

Levi W. Armstrong, Randolph, Iowa, writes:

There are 19 old soldiers here and most of them are poor men, 15 out of 19 dependent on their pensions. We do not doubt the friendship of the lower House for the old soldier, but we have some doubts about the Senate and the President.

J. C. Pence, of Creston, Iowa, writes:

The Democrats are going to do great things for us old boys. Let them be up and about it or we will soon all be gone to a place where there is no politics, and pensions will not be needed.

Capt. George W. Wycoff, Cincinnati, Iowa, writes:

Whatever is done must be done soon if it does any good. It is now 50 years since the war began, and to parley longer about different bills is simply mockery.

Edward Spence, Lucas, Iowa, writes:

Do the best you can and do it quickly for there are so many in need. I am on the board of relief and know of many who are in pitiful condition.

J. S. Noble, New Market, Iowa, writes:

We hope something substantial can be done soon, for quite a number of the old boys here are very needy, as they are entirely dependent on their small pension.

T. S. Crozier, Russell, Iowa, writes:

If something is not done soon we will not need help. Since Congress has been talking about these bills five of our post have died and four more are now on their deathbeds. We do hope something can be done soon.

Jasper Fisher, Braddyville, Iowa, writes:

If you can not get one bill, work for the other. There will not be any left soon to legislate for at the rate they are dying now. Not one in a thousand can make a living by day's work of those who are left, and they are really in need of help from the Government.

E. F. Allen, Decatur, Iowa, writes:

We feel that what is done should be done now while we need help, for we are getting fewer in number every day. Soon we will need help, for we will be gone. There are many who are in actual need, and we hope that Congress will not longer delay the matter.

W. D. Kinser, Moravia, Iowa, writes:

As you will see by our post roster we are getting old and will require pensions but a short time. Our post when organized was 50 strong. We have 15 now, and they are feeble old men. I do not know of one who can do a day's work.

I. W. Abbott, New Market, Iowa, writes:

We have 43 old soldiers; 15 out of the 43 have to dig coal for their bread and butter. Surely the Government could grant a little increase to help these men in their need. And what are they going to do when they can't work?

The issue is not involved nor obscure. Fifty years ago these men whom it is proposed shall be the beneficiaries of this legislation responded to their country's call as volunteers to serve in war for the preservation of the Union. They did so under conditions of singular disinterestedness and with unselfish devotion to their patriotic duty. They saved the Nation. They restored the Union. They brought us into an era of unexampled prosperity and lasting peace. Many of them, most of them, are now dead. The remnant, less than 20 per cent of the original number, are still living. They are all old men; many of them, most of them, broken in health, suffering from disease, crippled in body. Many of them, most of them, can not now earn a living by manual labor. Many of them, most of them, are straitened in circumstances. Some are dependent on private charity or suffering because deprived of the ordinary comforts of life.

Under these circumstances what is our duty and what ought to be the standard on which our action should be based? Some of us have established a standard which satisfies our judgment and our conscience. It is that such provision shall be made as will prevent as far as possible that heroic remnant from being

subjected to such conditions during the few remaining years of their lives. More than this is not contemplated and less than this is not justice.

Gladstone, speaking of the war, said:

The convulsion of that country between 1861 and 1865 was perhaps the most frightful which ever assailed a national existence. The efforts which were made on both sides were marked. The exertions by which alone the movement was put down were not only extraordinary, they were what would antecedently have been called impossible.

That is the measure of true statesmanship of the service rendered by the soldiers of the Civil War. Is it unjust to claim that our treatment of them should be commensurate with the greatness, the dignity and the value of their accomplishment?

I join with other gentlemen on the floor of this House in expressing the wish that before the holidays we can send the news to the veterans of the Union that a liberal pension bill has passed Congress and been signed by the President. It would carry greater Christmas cheer and joy into more homes in America than any other act we could do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada. Mr. Chairman, we, as the Representatives of a great Nation, are at this time engaged in the discussion of a most important question, one that is second to none that ever has or ever will be presented to the American people. It is a question that each Member of this House should look upon as entirely foreign to politics. As we look around this vast Chamber, sacred with the memories of many notable debates on this same question by great men, and see here and there a survivor of that dread civil conflict, some on this side of the House and some on that, some who fought for the preservation of the Union and some who fought against; each, however, believing he was in the right and willing to risk his life, his home, his fortune, his all upon it, we are all the more reminded of the unanimity with which reasonable pension legislation should be enacted. I like the splendid example that is being set by many of our southern colleagues. I like the atmosphere that pervades this Chamber during our deliberations. It is patriotic. It is inspiring. It shows that the Nation is a united Nation, and that while the affairs of state, so far as this House is concerned, are virtually under the control of the men from "Dixie Land," they are willing to give the victors of that Civil War their rights as defenders of the Nation's flag. [Applause.]

It would be a shame and an outrage to "play politics" over the deathbed of our dying soldiers. Their ranks are thinning fast, and in a few more years the last survivor of that great family conflict will fail to answer as the roll is called.

Over 35,000 failed to respond to their names during the call of the roll for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1911. They did valiant service for their country, and when the war was on, and brother took up arms against brother, father against son, sister against sister, they offered up all that life held near and dear to them and went forth to fight for the preservation of this Union, willing to give their all to the cause in which they believed. The State I have the honor to represent did more to end that bloody conflict than any one thing recorded in American history.

I therefore take a pride in calling to your attention the part Nevada, the "Battle Born" State, played in the settlement of the Civil War. [Applause.] As I remarked on the floor of this House during the debate on the admission of Arizona and New Mexico, President Lincoln had concluded that the United States Constitution should be amended so as to abolish slavery, and, to use the words of that eminent authority, Mr. Charles A. Dana:

This was not only a change in our national policy, it was a most important military measure. It was intended not merely as a means of abolishing slavery forever, but as a means of affecting the judgment and the feelings of those in rebellion. It was believed that such an amendment to the Constitution would be equivalent to new armies in the field, that it would be worth at least a million men, that it would be an intellectual army that would tend to paralyze the enemy and break the continuity of his ideas.

To thus amend the Constitution required that the proposed amendment be ratified by three-fourths of the States. When that question came to be considered the administration found that of the States it could rely upon it was one short of the necessary number. The genius of President Lincoln solved the problem. He would create a State out of the Territory of Nevada for the purpose and rely on the patriotism of her people to ratify the amendment. In March, 1864, the question of allowing Nevada to form a State government came up in the House of Representatives. There was strong opposition to it, but Mr. Lincoln threw into the breach the potent force of the administration and the measure was carried. Mr. Dana, then Assistant Secretary of War, and one of the President's confi-

dential advisers, quotes Mr. Lincoln as saying, shortly before the vote was taken:

Here is the alternative—that we carry this vote or be compelled to raise another million, and I don't know how many more, men, and fight no one knows how long.

It will thus be seen that the patriotism of the Nevada people was equal to the occasion, and to-day the pension outlay is thousands upon thousands of dollars short of what it would have been had not Nevada taken the stand she did. Scattered here and there over the 109,700 square miles of our territory are soldiers who were parties to that conflict, and many of them are to-day in absolute need of legislation which will provide them with the necessities of life, and I would be false to my colors if I did not urge immediate action in their behalf. [Applause.] I wish that it were possible to amend this bill. It should be amended in many particulars, and I shall support or offer some amendments. I hope our friends on the other side of the House will not insist on running this bill through in its present form, but will put that old political "steam roller" of theirs in the shed and unite with us in the passage of a bill which will not only be a credit to the Nation, but a boon to those enfeebled old veterans who have passed the summit of life and are now on the down grade. What about our Mexican War veterans? How have you provided for them? There are not many of them. I believe that there are but two now living within the borders of our State. One of them marched on foot all the way from Fort Leavenworth to Los Angeles, and as I have stood by and seen him with faltering steps and trembling limbs, bearing aloft the American flag on Memorial Day in the long march to our "city of the dead," I have thought of how much we owe to him and those others who like him have served their country long and well.

The most we can give them is a mere pittance to what we owe. We owe them at least enough to keep the wolf away from their doors during their last days, and when the final call is sounded to give them a decent burial beneath the sod they loved so well and which they fought to preserve for our children and our children's children for generations yet to come. Each year the veterans of that awful struggle are growing less and less. In a few more years their activities will live only in our memories. It is but meet and proper that we should all, sons of the men who wore the blue as well as the sons of the men who wore the gray, unite in the passage of a bill which will reflect the sentiment of a united people, regardless of our political affiliations. I am for immediate relief for those people, and we can not conscientiously delay the matter longer. True, we have been the most liberal Nation on earth so far as pensions for our soldiers are concerned, but is there a man in this building who begrudges one cent we are spending upon them, their widows, and their orphans? That awful war, awful because of its family nature, called forth the strong and sturdy sons of both the North and the South. The Southern States are doing a noble work in pensioning their Confederate soldiers, and would that the Northern States would likewise add to the pensions that the Union soldiers now receive. To them we owe our very existence as a Republic and to them we should show that we are a grateful people and worthy of the blood they shed.

The "bloody shirt" is buried and the southern people are as patriotic to-day as any people in this Nation. I have never seen more patriotic gentlemen than many of my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle. If war were to be declared with a foreign power to-day, I dare say that the South, as they did during the war with Spain, would furnish us an example of true patriotism. Yes, patriotism, that lofty power which leads men onward in their lofty aims to serve their country; that deep devotion which knows no bounds; no East, no West, no North, no South, but finds its highest development in that civilization born in the holy air of freedom and nurtured in the "cradle of liberty."

I take it that some statistics fresh from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions may be of interest in this discussion, and with your permission I will ask the following table of pensioners on the roll June 30, 1911, and June 30, 1910, be inserted in the RECORD:

Pensioners on the roll June 30, 1911, and June 30, 1910.

	1911	1910	Gain.	Loss.
Revolutionary War:				
Daughter.....		1		1
War of 1812:				
Widows.....	279	338		59
Indian wars:				
Survivors.....	1,387	1,500		113
Widows.....	2,629	2,822		193
War with Mexico:				
Survivors.....	1,639	2,042		403
Widows.....	5,982	6,359		377

Pensioners on the roll June 30, 1911, and June 30, 1910—Continued.

	1911	1910	Gain.	Loss.
Civil War:				
Act Feb. 6, 1907—				
Survivors.....	356,830	362,433		5,603
General law—				
Invalids.....	112,063	121,561		8,518
Widows.....	67,509	70,587		3,078
Minor children.....	385	445		60
Mothers.....	1,877	2,391		514
Fathers.....	278	368		90
Brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters.....	353	300	53	
Helpless children.....	508	533		25
Act June 27, 1890—				
Invalids.....	59,991	78,601		18,610
Minor children.....	3,983	4,009		26
Helpless children.....	375	335	40	
Act Apr. 19, 1908—				
Widows.....	228,198	220,826	7,372	
Army nurses.....	406	442		36
War with Spain:				
Invalids.....	23,383	22,783	600	
Widows.....	1,217	1,183	34	
Minor children.....	326	330		4
Mothers.....	3,032	3,072		40
Fathers.....	522	512	10	
Brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters.....	9	7	2	
Helpless children.....	1	2		1
Regular establishment:				
Invalids.....	13,757	13,180	577	
Widows.....	2,799	2,727	72	
Minor children.....	149	136	13	
Mothers.....	1,066	1,011	55	
Fathers.....	152	152		
Brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters.....	8	7	1	
Helpless children.....	5	8		3
Total.....	892,698	921,083	8,829	37,814
Net loss.....				28,985

The first act passed by Congress concerning pensions was a resolution passed August 26, 1776, promising invalid pensions to those who were disabled during the Revolutionary War. Several subsequent acts were passed from time to time enlarging the provisions of the invalid pension laws, but the first general-pension law granting service pensions was not adopted until the 18th day of March, 1818. In 1820 Congress passed what was known as the "alarm act," because of the large and increasing number of claims that were being filed, but the "alarm" seems to have been a "false alarm," for the old ship of state has kept on her course and survived a number of wars since then, with plenty of money to pay her bills and plenty of men to man the guns. The man who goes forth at his country's call "to arms" is certainly made of the "stuff" that makes a nation great, and is entitled to a living pension in his declining years. Far be it from me to lift my voice other than in support of immediate yet fair and reasonable pension legislation.

The following table, which I take from the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the number of pensioners in each State and Territory, each insular possession, and each foreign country on the roll June 30, 1911, and the amount paid therein during the fiscal year 1911:

States or Territories.	Number.	Amount.
Alabama.....	3,648	\$596,445.74
Alaska.....	83	15,468.02
Arizona.....	838	139,171.20
Arkansas.....	10,567	1,642,605.59
California.....	29,531	5,067,136.23
Colorado.....	9,138	1,619,447.75
Connecticut.....	11,201	1,872,539.05
Delaware.....	2,555	454,244.10
District of Columbia.....	8,241	1,471,964.53
Florida.....	4,747	815,836.77
Georgia.....	3,386	543,352.41
Idaho.....	2,563	438,064.66
Illinois.....	61,374	10,833,222.50
Indiana.....	54,290	10,281,779.61
Iowa.....	31,402	5,098,518.38
Kansas.....	34,725	6,169,168.06
Kentucky.....	23,701	4,157,678.90
Louisiana.....	6,369	1,024,613.60
Maine.....	15,894	2,946,461.42
Maryland.....	12,015	2,132,611.17
Massachusetts.....	37,301	6,271,153.27
Michigan.....	37,508	6,803,461.80
Minnesota.....	15,217	2,663,654.03
Mississippi.....	4,066	724,561.82
Missouri.....	44,277	7,875,111.93
Montana.....	2,438	404,917.85
Nebraska.....	14,635	2,507,084.41
Nevada.....	415	69,970.12
New Hampshire.....	7,102	1,324,358.53
New Jersey.....	20,978	3,490,412.71
New Mexico.....	2,134	391,671.69
New York.....	75,182	13,172,308.83
North Carolina.....	3,807	654,072.49
North Dakota.....	1,780	333,087.17

States or Territories.	Number.	Amount.
Ohio.....	86,474	\$15,638,286.83
Oklahoma.....	12,318	2,179,264.47
Oregon.....	8,239	1,360,963.81
Pennsylvania.....	85,572	14,646,640.04
Rhode Island.....	5,049	849,318.43
South Carolina.....	1,924	302,562.44
South Dakota.....	5,333	1,055,579.05
Tennessee.....	17,311	3,190,810.87
Texas.....	9,143	1,504,851.68
Utah.....	1,110	190,883.54
Vermont.....	7,214	1,413,376.88
Virginia.....	8,313	1,489,553.80
Washington.....	11,005	1,521,604.85
West Virginia.....	11,388	2,044,688.65
Wisconsin.....	21,323	3,845,894.64
Wyoming.....	985	165,667.09
Total.....	886,444	156,307,131.53
INSULAR POSSESSIONS.		
Hawaii.....	80	14,858.40
Philippines.....	60	16,629.12
Porto Rico.....	36	5,820.00
Panama.....	2	192.00
Total.....	178	37,499.52
FOREIGN COUNTRIES.		
Algeria.....	1	108.00
Argentina.....	16	2,852.50
Australia.....	103	18,364.90
Austria-Hungary.....	36	6,418.80
Azores.....	6	1,089.00
Bahamas.....	4	792.00
Barbados.....	2	216.00
Belgium.....	24	4,279.10
Bermuda.....	6	1,044.00
Bolivia.....	1	180.00
Brazil.....	4	698.00
British East Africa.....	1	144.00
British West Indies.....	3	298.00
Bulgaria.....	1	148.40
Canada.....	2,712	483,539.60
Cape de Verde Islands.....	1	96.00
Ceylon.....	2	594.00
Chile.....	12	2,268.00
China.....	18	3,209.40
Comoro Islands.....	1	120.00
Costa Rica.....	4	517.50
Cuba.....	60	10,696.80
Danish West Indies.....	2	324.00
Denmark.....	51	9,062.30
Dominican Republic.....	2	241.00
Dutch West Indies.....	6	948.10
England.....	486	86,650.80
Egypt.....	3	330.00
Fiji Islands.....	1	(¹)
France.....	76	13,549.67
Germany.....	532	95,853.33
Greece.....	8	1,941.41
Guatemala.....	3	465.00
Haiti.....	1	108.00
Honduras.....	2	252.00
Hongkong.....	3	597.00
India.....	17	3,031.10
Ireland.....	462	82,370.60
Isle of Man.....	3	395.50
Isle of Pines.....	2	372.00
Italy.....	61	10,875.39
Jamaica.....	7	1,876.20
Japan.....	34	6,060.20
Korea.....	1	36.00
Liberia.....	7	912.00
Madeira.....	1	345.00
Malta.....	2	324.00
Mexico.....	189	33,705.70
Netherlands.....	10	1,668.00
Newfoundland.....	4	612.00
New Zealand.....	16	2,847.50
Nicaragua.....	2	288.00
Norway.....	77	13,725.10
Panama.....	34	6,048.90
Paraguay.....	1	240.00
Peru.....	14	2,496.10
Portugal.....	5	828.00
Russia.....	18	3,197.60
Salvador.....	1	144.00
Samoa.....	1	96.00
Scotland.....	86	15,333.67
Seychelles Islands.....	1	216.00
Siam.....	1	144.00
South Africa.....	11	1,728.00
Spain.....	3	432.00
St. Helena.....	1	144.00
Sudan.....	1	473.57
Sweden.....	81	14,443.10
Switzerland.....	68	12,126.40
Tasmania.....	2	2,332.93
Tonga Islands.....	2	432.00
Turkey.....	20	3,565.00
Uruguay.....	4	909.60
Venezuela.....	1	144.00
Wales.....	31	5,526.30
Total.....	5,476	978,471.98

The greatness and strength of any nation lies in its citizenship. The higher the standard of that citizenship the greater and stronger will be the nation. Citizenship without patriotism is one of which it is difficult for Americans to conceive. Our soldiers had the patriotism and would fight again if necessary for the preservation of this Union, and they would not do it for hire, either. They are not asking for a price to be set upon their patriotism; they are only asking, now that the cause for which they so valiantly fought has been successfully terminated, that the Government of which they are a part should come to their assistance and make more light the burdens which disease and advancing old age have brought down upon them. Sitting by the fireside in many a cabin throughout the length and breadth of this land to-day, waiting, only waiting, for the final summons, is many an old gray-haired veteran praying for immediate action by this House. A nation's standing at home and abroad is rated by the treatment of its citizens. When the present generation sees old soldiers who have fought and bled and suffered the privations of life that this Nation might survive going to their final resting place, poor, decrepit, and oftentimes unwept, unhonored, and unsung, it is very apt to cause a distrust of the gratitude of the Nation itself and to dampen the ardor of its future citizens. God grant that whatever feeling of that sort may have been engendered it will pass away and that the generations of to-day and to-morrow will be as patriotic and willing to battle for the Nation's honor as those gallant soldiers who have responded every time the Nation made the call. What about our Spanish-American War veterans? They, too, responded loyally and did signal service for their country. Many of them sleep in lonely graves across the ocean; they gave up their lives for home and country. Many of the survivors of that war are to-day as much in need of assistance as the veterans of any war in which we have been engaged. Why wait for generations before providing for them, their widows, and their orphans? I hope this bill will be amended so as to provide for the Mexican veterans and the Spanish-American War veterans, and that some of the unreasonable provisions will be stricken out so that we may all unite in the passage of a nonpartisan pension bill and send a Christmas greeting to the old soldiers throughout the land. In conclusion let me say that we can give no better object lesson to the world than the one of providing for the comfort and maintenance of our men who responded to the call when our country was in danger.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] such time as he may require.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the majority propose this early in the present session to pass a pension bill. The present bill is in some respects a good measure, and if I were sure it was not possible to get a better bill, I would vote for it, because I am and have always been in favor of any legislation proposing more liberal pensions for the survivors of the Civil War. This bill should be amended. The proviso that no one in receipt of a pension of \$25 or more shall be entitled to admission or residence in the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and that no State or Territorial home for disabled soldiers and sailors shall receive any aid from the General Government on account of any person who shall be in receipt of a pension of \$25 per month or more should be stricken out. It is unjust and unfair, and I indorse all that has been said in criticism and denunciation of it.

Section 3 should also be eliminated; first, because it is unfair; and, second, because it would probably cost more to administer the law with section 3 in it than the amount of the pension that would be paid under the provision. It would necessitate proof being furnished in every case that the applicant did not receive a net income of \$1,000 or more, putting claimants to great expense and necessitating long delay in the adjudication of claims that should be disposed of speedily, and must necessarily be in thousands of cases, in order to do the claimants any good, as the statistics tell me they are dying at the rate of 100 per day, and, of course, as time passes the death rate will be very much greater.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, we should not consider what some other body may do with a bill that we pass. The other body is responsible for what it may do, and we should assume the full responsibility of our position and pass a bill in accordance with our best judgment, and, it seems to me, that if we do this that we will adopt as a substitute for the pending bill the Sulloway bill, which was passed in the last Congress and which, in my opinion, is a more just measure and in every respect more liberal than the Sherwood bill. It proposes to recognize the survivors of the Mexican War, and certainly there is no reason why the survivors of that war should not receive the benefits of the legislation which we propose to enact for the

survivors of the Civil War. One of the reasons why I am in favor of the enactment of a more liberal pension law than we now have upon the statute books is because we are now by private bills conferring special favor upon a few old soldiers when hundreds of others are just as worthy, and perhaps in many instances more worthy, than some who by reason of their activity or through the good fortune of having a friend here or elsewhere is enabled to get relief through a private bill. I assume when the bill that will be reported by this committee and finally passed by the House becomes a law that then, to a large extent, Congress will not be called upon to grant increases of pension by special act, and that only such cases as do not come within the existing law will be considered.

There is no occasion for my taking up the time of the committee in expressing my sentiments toward this proposed legislation or eulogizing those who will be affected thereby, as during my service as a Member of this body I think I have demonstrated my friendship and regard for the old soldiers of the country, and they who know me best know that I have never failed to respond when I could be of service to them; and I therefore hope that the present bill may be amended as I have suggested and that it will pass this House to-morrow and that the other body will consider it promptly, with a view to having it placed upon the statute books before the holiday recess as a Christmas greeting to those who will be beneficiaries under its provisions. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] 10 minutes.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, before making some observations regarding the merits of the Sherwood pension bill, I wish to congratulate the Democratic Members on the other side of the aisle who feel that there devolves upon this House a great obligation; and while the bill which has been presented by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is not all that is expected by those more friendly to pension legislation than some of the Democratic or southern Members, yet I wish to extend congratulations for the reason that I can comprehend why many Members from the South might feel that they do not have reason for being in favor of pensions for our soldiers.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, even in my own State—that grand Commonwealth that contributed more of wealth, of suffering, of blood, and of life for the erection of the Republic, and then for its preservation, than any other State in the Union—from Pennsylvania and my district came Gen. Hulings with his brave Logan Guards, the first to arrive in Washington, but even there the citizenship was not all of one accord with respect to that great contest.

I have in my possession a letter written to my father, who was a preacher and a pronounced Unionist, in which the declaration of warning was made to him that if he preached one more Union sermon like the one he preached on the Sunday previous he would preach no more; but he continued preaching just the same. There were people in the North who did not believe in the contest, who said, "Let the South go"; and I doubt seriously whether there was a universal comprehension and clear insight into the real meaning and consequences of the great contest until it was given utterance by that great leader of men—one of God's ambassadors and prophets—Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] Abraham Lincoln felt about that contest that men could die, but they could not be defeated. He said in his immortal speech at Gettysburg that these men must not have died in vain. He said more. He said that thing which causes me to-day to appeal for these veterans. He said there, in essence, that the result of this mighty conflict would determine whether men anywhere were capable of self-government and independent sovereignty. And that finally is what actuated and stimulated and aroused the patriotism of the North and caused the South to be conquered. It was to be determined, with the world an audience and gazing upon the awful conflict, whether we as brothers should live in peace together.

So, therefore, these men who went to the front did not go in the hope of conquest and of plunder. They were not like Blucher, who stood on London Bridge after Waterloo and, beholding the great city, was asked what he thought of it, and exclaimed, "Great God, what plunder!" There was no plunder for those men who marched down this Avenue and across the river to the conflicts of the Civil War. There was only one thing that actuated them, and that was the highest, the noblest, and the sublimest patriotism.

My friends, it is an historic tradition, if not a fact, that Alexander, long before the Christian era, when his soldiers became enfeebled or were wounded, sent them back to their Macedonian homes with the order that they should be received with all honor and supported by the government. Then there is the example of the world's greatest soldier, if not statesman, who, as he sat dying on the barren rock of St. Helena, indicted

a will, and, although he did not have a dollar in the world, he bequeathed untold millions to his grenadiers and his soldiers, and the gratitude of France paid every dollar. Such was the love of Napoleon for his men of the battle line; such was the love of France for the men who brought so much glory to her eagles and tricolor.

And how many men were there who were shot to death and who received no consideration, or even a decent burial? Countless unknown and unmarked graves offer the answer. I know of an instance in my own county where a father stood on the veranda of his home and saw four boys go down the lane and turn into the great highway, which highway led to eternity, for they never came back. Those four boys were never pensioned. What of the unnumbered thousands who have died and never received a dollar? Patriotism this, which, noble, sublime, pierces the skies and reaches to heaven.

Here we have a few old men left, tottering and trembling, not asking for charity—no, but that their Government shall discharge a sacred obligation. That is what we want for them—the discharge of an obligation made by Lincoln himself when they went to the front.

I trust that Gen. SHERWOOD will eliminate from his bill the thousand-dollar restriction, inasmuch as he calls this a service bill. The fact that he limits the bill in its application with respect to the thousand dollars makes it anything but a service-pension bill. I hope, too, that there may be added at least \$20 per month for the widows of the soldiers. Ah, my friends, not least among those who suffered the agonies and tortures of that war were the women at home.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. As a friend to the legislation, and in the interest of the widows, does not the gentleman believe that it would be safer for them and the veterans under this bill to let that bill which is pending before the committee, and, as I am informed, will be reported to the House, stand on its own merits rather than to endanger this bill by putting it onto this?

Mr. FOCHT. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Missouri. I am expressing my views now, as I may not get an opportunity to express them on that bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in sympathy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I do not want to increase the limits of this bill for fear that those opposed to the other bill may vote against this and so defeat it.

Mr. FOCHT. I am in perfect accord with the gentleman from Missouri. I wish to say that I have gathered from expressions of gentlemen on the majority side, Democrats North and South, that it was their purpose, at this time, to permit us to wind up the pension business; that is to say, by the passage of this bill, to put it in such shape as to no longer require medical examinations and investigations of every description, untold ramifications, and complex details which are very expensive, costing two or three million dollars a year—that there should be a final and complete winding up, giving the soldier not 50 or 75 cents a day, but enough to sustain human life.

Now, I want to say something in answer to anybody and everybody who makes the assertion that the Government or any State has provided a home for the old soldier. What is a home? A place of confinement where there are regulations restricting and hedging the conduct of your life? Is that a home? Is a home a place far off from friends, among people you do not know? These men, if they are anything, are the Republic's noblemen, and are entitled to fair treatment by the Government we are so proud of. Give them enough that they may leave these institutions, however well kept they may be. They can be nothing more or less, and can not be more or less to a man removed from his youthful environments than something of a cross between an almshouse and a prison. Let the veteran have sufficient subsistence, let him go back to the woods and the fields, let him live and linger among his old friends at the corner store, let him go along the murmuring streams and hear the birds sing and live in the glory and splendor of the sunshine of his youthful associations. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have some time remaining—51 minutes, I think. Rather than consume that time myself, I shall yield it to others. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. THISTLEWOOD].

Mr. THISTLEWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I feel, in justice to myself and to the great State of Illinois and to her soldier citizens, that I ought to rise in my place and urge the pas-

sage of this legislation that we have been promising from year to year. I know we are told that the pension roll is already very long and the people of the country are taxed to pay these pensions. Suppose the roll now is very long, was there ever a country that possessed such an army of soldiers? Was there ever such a body of men gathered together, who marched under a flag, as were gathered together and who followed the flag that we followed? I think the body of men that came anywhere near being equal to that body of men were the men who followed the flag on the other side. I have no feeling now, nor did I ever have, against the men who contended on the other side. If I had possessed the feeling it long since would have been wiped out, because I look upon the veteran soldiers as among the most honorable men in this country. Are they the men you find in your penitentiaries? Are they the men you find blowing up bridges or packing dynamite through the streets? I think to-day they stand as an honor, each in his own section of the country, as an example for the younger generations to follow. I never meet a veteran who followed Pap Thomas on the battle field of Chickamauga and stood with him on Snodgrass Hill that I do not feel like taking off my hat to him, because they contended there from noon until dark and were relieved only by the darkness and their own sturdy soldier qualities. I feel the same way when I meet a veteran who followed Pickett in that magnificent charge at the Battle of Gettysburg. I think it stands almost without a parallel in the history of all the wars of all the nations of the world. [Applause.] So, I say, give us this pension legislation. You have been promising it to us long enough. Every national convention of the two great parties for years has said that we propose to give the soldier liberal pensions. Is the pension that is being received by the veteran of 70 years or more now a liberal one? Why, it will not pay his house rent. These things were promised.

The soldiers of the Civil War have not been pensioned in equal amount to the soldiers of the Mexican War. No soldier of this country of the Civil War received a land warrant for his services in that war. So I say we stand uncomplaining, but now demanding for those who need it, that you shall fulfill the full measure of your promise. Was there anything too good to promise when Lee was marching on Gettysburg, and when the very doors of Baltimore and Philadelphia were threatened? Was there anything too good to promise them? I think not. Was there anything too good to promise men who were wanted as recruits to come to the aid of Washington when Gen. Early was thundering at her gates? And I say now that we are demanding that the contract made with the people be fulfilled. I remember, and many of you remember, that in every gathering where soldiers were being recruited men stepped forward and said, "We will see that your widows are well cared for; we will see that your children do not suffer for food; we will take care of the families left behind." This was promised all over this country, and I say the time has come now when you ought to live up to your obligations. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if Illinois had done no more than give to the country and the world the great Lincoln, she would have been entitled to sit in the front rank in any gathering of soldiers in this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. THISTLEWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in addition to that we gave to the Union Army 250,000 men; we also sent that silent soldier from Galena, who, early in February, in 1862, at Fort Donelson, electrified the country by his laconic dispatch to Gen. Buckner, commander of the Confederate forces, saying "I demand your immediate and unconditional surrender," and whose name stands to-day among the great soldiers of the world. [Applause.] No greater magnanimity was ever exhibited by a soldier than was exhibited by him toward Lee and his army when they surrendered, and I feel that that, more than anything else, perhaps, has attracted the people of the whole country to the name of Ulysses S. Grant. Gentlemen, give us this pension legislation. I do not care whether you call it the Sulloway bill or the Sherwood bill or the Anderson bill, or what; but give us this pension legislation. I am not pleading for myself. I draw a pension, it is true; and I do not expect to swap that pension certificate for any pension that you can give me.

My pension says that it was granted because of wounds received on the field of battle. That is an honorable legacy I wish to leave to my family when I shall have passed away. [Applause.] So it makes no difference to me; I do not expect to ask one penny under this bill. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.] I ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that leave is granted. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I feel peculiarly honored in having the privilege of following the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the honorable and honored old soldier who has just taken his seat. [Applause.]

I come from a district presenting a disputed border of more than 200 miles, along the front of which was waged many heroic contests of the Civil War, and every mile of which was battle ground between the two great contending armies. There is scarcely a county in the second congressional district of West Virginia in which monuments are not erected to mark our battle fields and scarcely a lonely cemetery which does not contain the ashes of our sacred dead. There is not a highway crossing these 200 miles of firing line that has not been made historic by the daring charges and countercharges of Lee and Jackson and McClellan and Rosecrans.

We contributed generously and almost equally of our best blood and citizenship to both the Blue and the Gray, and we are proud of the records they have made, and you can not praise and glorify the courage and fortitude of one side without honoring the other; but to our young men and women all this is history; to the older generation, however, it is a sad but glorious memory. [Applause.] In West Virginia, I am glad to say, we no longer know either the North or the South, but are one people sufficiently proud and boastful of the fact that we are all true Americans. [Applause.]

From a constituency like this I am called upon to vote upon this pension bill, nor does this call come alone from the soldiers of the North [applause], but be it said to the credit and generosity of the no less brave boys that wore the gray. I have on my desk a number of letters from them urging me to support any pension bill that will bring additional comfort to the soldiers of the North in their declining years. Only on Saturday an old Confederate soldier, carrying by his side an empty sleeve, a silent but convincing evidence of his bravery on the field of battle, urged me to support this bill. Not only for these reasons, but because I believe it is right and just, I am here to support the best and most generous pension bill that can be secured at this time. Personally I would prefer the Sulloway bill, but will vote for the Sherwood bill because I believe it is the only one that can be passed and made a law at this session. [Applause.] It is but an act of justice to the old soldier already too long delayed.

The Sherwood bill has two classes of enemies upon this floor: Those who honestly oppose it; and those who speak in favor of it, yet are endeavoring to load it down with amendments, thereby secretly hoping to secure its defeat. Among this latter class are many on the other side of the aisle, who have been in power in all branches of this great Government for more than 40 out of the 50 years since the Civil War, and yet have failed to do their full duty by the old Union soldier. [Applause.] Their declarations upon the floor of this House favoring the Sherwood bill condemn them, and out of their own mouths are they convicted of guilty and unpardonable indifference and neglect of the old Union soldier, who has heretofore relied upon that party to do him justice.

It was for that grand old soldier and statesman, Gen. Sherwood, who fought as a private in the first land battle of the Civil War at Phillippi, W. Va., to lead the way and bring before this House a liberal and patriotic measure for the true relief of his comrades in arms.

Some express great surprise that the necessity for increased pension appropriations should now exist. Why not? Every year the old soldier becomes less able to earn a living at manual labor. The once strong arm is becoming weak and the martial feet unsteady. Every year his ability to earn is less and his needs are more. The pension rolls show that there are only about 450,000 survivors of this once magnificent army, and that they are dying at the rate of over 100 a day, and that owing to the advancing years the daily mortality is rapidly increasing and that 10 years more will see but few names of the old soldiers of the Civil War upon the pension roll. The pension roll is a roll of honor, and yet we are told by some that we can not pass the Sherwood bill because we must economize. To those who talk economy I would say let us economize in some other way. If I was compelled to choose between them I would rather build fewer battleships; cut down the standing Army; spend less for internal improvement; stop, if necessary, the building of the Isthmian Canal, than deprive the defenders of this Republic of their just demands. [Applause.]

The enemies of the Sherwood bill insist upon passing a widow's pension bill, and I say to them that I am for their bill, but I will not vote for it as an amendment to the Sherwood bill, for I believe it is offered for the purpose of defeating all

pension legislation at this time. The same is true of the amendment including the veterans of the Mexican War, also the veterans of the Spanish-American War. These may be just and right and should receive proper consideration at some other time. The Sherwood bill may not be the most generous bill, but let us not overload it at this time, for fear it will meet the fate of the Sullo way bill, which died in the Senate committee room. I am in favor of passing this Sherwood bill, and passing it now. [Applause.] The present system is too slow, for, in my short service on the floor of this House, I secured a pension for one old soldier who died in poverty and want before it reached him. Another was ordered before the examining board for an increase and died before it could be granted. If this great Nation ever intends to show its gratitude and appreciation of the Union soldier, we must do it now. Some tell us that the old soldier enlisted for bounty and money considerations. This is an insult both to the old soldiers of the North and the South, for the same blood flowed in their veins and the same patriotism and love of country inspired their hearts as led their children and their children's children to respond so promptly to their country's call in the Spanish-American War, and would inspire you and your children to rally around your country's flag in any hour of need. [Applause.]

Let us pass the Sherwood bill, and do it now, I intend to vote for it as it now stands, and vote against all amendments that may have for their purpose the defeat of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. DIXON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad of the privilege which this opportunity affords me of again casting a vote in favor of increasing the pensions of the soldiers of the Civil War. For six years I served as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of this House and was glad to be a member of the committee that reported the bill that increased the pensions of widows from \$8 a month to \$12 a month. I was glad of the privilege to vote for the McCumber bill, which increased the pension of a very large number of worthy soldiers of the Civil War, and at the last session of the Congress I rejoiced in the opportunity to join in the report of the committee and to cast my vote for the Sullo way bill [applause], and I am to-day, I repeat, glad of the opportunity to cast my vote for this meritorious measure. The war in which these men were engaged was not an ordinary contest; it has no parallel in history. Upon the Union side there were two and three-quarter million men engaged. The largest army in modern times was in the Franco-Prussian War, yet the Union soldiers in our Civil War exceeded the number of men of both armies by over 1,000,000 men.

The soldiers of the Union in the Civil War were three times as many as the total number of American troops in the Revolutionary War, Mexican War, the second war with England, and the War with Spain—the loss in killed and wounded many, many times as great.

We read of the famous charge of the Light Brigade as immortalized in poetry, yet there were more than a hundred regiments in the Civil War where the loss in killed and wounded exceeded that of this well-known charge. The fact is that the loss in killed and wounded in that great charge was but 36.7 per cent, while in the Civil War there were 72 Union and 53 Confederate regiments each of which lost in a single battle over 50 per cent of those engaged.

In that great contest many fell upon the field of battle; many dropped by the wayside worn and weary by the long and tedious marches; many suffered in the hospitals and camps; and thousands of men perished in prison martyrdom; and few, if any, returned from that four years of hardship and suffering to their homes unmarked in health and strength by that great conflict. And a great and generous Nation should come to the aid and comfort of these old men because they came to the Nation's rescue when the Nation's life was imperiled. [Applause.] Enlistment in that contest was not an ordinary occasion; it was a serious business, a trying ordeal. Opportunities had to be abandoned; men left their families and loved ones and offered themselves to their country to be uniformed for battle and robbed for death. No pen will ever place upon history's page the full measure of domestic tenderness of the volunteer Union soldier who, at the side of his pale-faced wife and pleading children, gave in solemn tones to the muster officer of the Government his name for the Army. [Applause.]

A generous Government should not allow any of the brave survivors of that great struggle to want for the comforts of life. This is but an act of justice, a recognition of gratitude. We can not delay the payment of this debt of gratitude, for the veterans are growing old, and their ranks are being rapidly diminished by death. Hardship borne and exposure suffered have hastened that event. Nearly 40,000 die each year, more

than a hundred a day, and it will be but a few more years when the history of their deeds will be but a sacred memory.

Let us act now and give them the comforts to which their age and services entitle them.

There were on the pension roll on June 30, 1911, of the survivors of the Civil War, 529,884; of this number 376,218 served longer than one year, and under this bill will receive \$30 per month. The remaining 153,666 will receive from \$15 to \$25 per month, depending on the length of their service. As the number of the survivors who served less than six months and more than three months is but 8 per cent of the total number of survivors on the pension roll, this bill will benefit 90 per cent of those now on the rolls and give them from \$20 to \$30. Personally, I would like to see them all receive the \$30 per month. I think they all deserve the same, and I have in each Congress introduced a bill to that effect.

I have so often here asked for liberal pensions, and have so repeatedly presented the claims of the soldiers, that I can add but little to what I have so often said before. I am glad to know that this measure is to be passed so soon in this session, and may early consideration be given to it at the other end of this Capitol. The soldiers are entitled to have this bill become a law. Their services made it possible for us to enjoy the blessings of this Government and the benefits we to-day receive. They settled by the sword what their forefathers were unable to settle by compromise—the question of human slavery and peaceful separation.

It was settled right, and all sections to-day, both North and South, East and West, ratify that solution. [Applause.] And the principles of Grant, when he accepted the sword of Lee, have spread all over this country, and the time of sectionalism has passed.

To-day we have the opportunity of giving to these old veterans who preserved the Union a few more dollars, not in payment of their services by mere money consideration. Money can not pay that. But it is done as a matter of gratitude and of right. This bill will benefit by its highest provision of \$30 a month practically 71 per cent of the soldiers now living, and while personally I would like to see that provision extended to all, if it can not at this time become a law, I will be glad to cast my vote for the bill as introduced by the distinguished soldier from Ohio, Mr. SHERWOOD. [Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BROWN], who spoke a few moments ago, I, too, come from a section of country which furnished a large number of men both to the Union and to the Confederate Army. In my congressional district lives the sixth man who scaled the heights of Lookout Mountain. In my congressional district there is a county which, although it furnished a great many men to the Confederate Army, furnished more men to the Union Army than there were legal voters in the county. I am proud to represent such a territory as that, and I am proud to say that, so far as I know, not a man of either party in that section of the country which I represent is opposed to the enactment either of this bill or some other measure which will be more liberal than the present law. [Applause.]

When this House the other day proceeded with such unanimity to the consideration of this pension bill, I felt that it was a splendid tribute to the patriotism of its membership, and I hoped it meant there would be no partisan debate of this really nonpartisan bill. I am sorry to say that there has been some politics dragged into the discussion. I think I can truthfully say that during my service of several years as a Member of this body I have never acted as an extreme partisan. I have voted for strictly party measures, of course, and shall continue to do so, but upon those measures not strictly party measures I have given them the best consideration I could, regardless of whether they originated from Republican or Democratic source.

My friend from West Virginia [Mr. BROWN] said that the Republican Party had not done its duty by the soldiers, and other similar statements have been made in this debate. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], and I believe the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], sought to leave the impression that the Republican Party was alone responsible for the failure of the Sullo way bill to be enacted into law.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman—
The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CONNELL). Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will change his reference to me, because I have not spoken on the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Perhaps it was another gentleman from Indiana who interrupted me with the question which I had in mind. I beg the gentleman's pardon if I am wrong. The purpose of the question which was asked me by some gentleman from Indiana was, as I understood it, to make it appear that this administration was really responsible for the defeat of that measure, and that the President of the United States had his personal representatives in the Senate prevent its passage by that body. I deny that that is true. It is true, just as it was true in this House, that some gentlemen—a few—on the Republican side did not think that the Sulloway bill ought to be enacted into law at that time. There were some Republicans in the Senate who opposed it, I admit, but I call the attention of the committee to the fact that on several occasions attempts were made, and always by Republicans, to bring that measure up in the Senate. On one occasion the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Scott, called it up and asked unanimous consent for its consideration, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] objected to it. I refer you to the page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I have before me now, where that occurred. It is on page 2883, containing the proceedings of February 18, 1911. Surely, no gentleman will contend that the Senator from North Carolina is the personal representative of the President.

Thereupon, the Senator from West Virginia moved to take up the bill, notwithstanding the objection, and an analysis of the roll call upon that motion will show that of the 49 votes cast for the motion, 46 were cast by Republican Senators, and of the 35 votes cast against it, all but 7 were cast by Democratic Senators.

I am calling attention to these facts because it has been alleged here, and it has been alleged and received with some credence in my district, too, that the political party to which I belong is solely responsible for the defeat of that measure in the Senate.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly, with pleasure.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. The gentleman from Kentucky does not take into account the number of absentees in the Senate. But I am not quarreling with the gentleman's attitude on that proposition. The gentleman has spoken of the statement that the President of the United States was opposed to this legislation, and it has been stated on this side that he gave strong intimation that he would veto the bill if passed. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact, in justice to the President of the United States, that at Los Angeles, in his trip through the West, he was brought to account by a post of the Loyal Legion and was asked the question whether or not he knew anything concerning the action contemplated, which did go through at the instance of Senator LODGE, and the President denied in toto that he knew of it. I want to say to the gentleman that I hope never to see the day when I shall not take the personal word of a President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I thank my friend for his timely and many statement.

On another occasion, on the 4th of March, the last day of the last Congress, the Senator in charge of the bill again called it up for consideration, and again an objection was made to it. And by whom was that objection made? I call attention again to the RECORD of the Senate proceedings, pages 4320 and 4321, where Senator GORE is recorded as having objected to the consideration of the measure and where on a motion to take it up, notwithstanding the objection, the political alignment on the roll call is shown to have been practically the same as it was on February 18.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. LANGLEY. My time is very limited, but I will nevertheless yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was just going to make a point of order, not because I have any objection to the proceedings in the Senate being discussed, but because the point has been made against our friends on our side when they have referred to proceedings in the Senate. Now, if we are not permitted to discuss that question, I do not think it ought to be done on that side of the House.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am referring to the RECORD of the proceedings of the Senate, not of the present Congress, but of the last Congress, and not on this bill, but on an entirely different bill, and I do not think the gentleman is correct in his statement as to the application of the rule.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, because it has been invoked against our side of the House, and I think the Chair has decided that we could not discuss the proceedings of the Senate. I think the objection was made by the minority leader in this House.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will state to the Chair that I have practically finished my reference to the Senate proceedings. But I desire to refer, before I complete my remarks, to the RECORD of previous Congresses, running back many years—that is, to mere matters of legislative history—but if I can not refer to the RECORDS of the last Congress, then—

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. My recollection is that there is nothing in the rule that will prevent a Member of the House or of the Senate from speaking of what passed in the other body in a former Congress. The rule, as I understand it, is that it is improper for either body to discuss the proceedings of the other body on matters then pending. I take it that the same rule would apply in this case, covering what took place in the last Congress, as would apply to what took place in the First Congress, for example. Without examining the authorities, I am clearly of the impression that there is nothing in the rules to prevent a reference to the action of the Senate in a former Congress.

Mr. LANGLEY. That was just what I was proceeding to say.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, since my denial of having said anything on this question, the further statement by the gentleman from Kentucky reminds me of what occurred and I want to recall the denial that I made, because it was I who undertook to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question as to whether or not the public news and the public records did not show that certain things occurred in another body. But before I finished my question the gentleman from Illinois rose, and I thought both the leader of the minority and the distinguished ex-Speaker were protesting that I had no right to make such a reference, and out of my very high regard for their good judgment and for the precedents of the House I went no further. But I want to let my interrogatory, or a piece of it, stand in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect of having participated in the colloquy to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BARNHART. My recollection is that the gentleman got on his feet, and his colleague from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objected and protested against my reference to what took place in the other body in a former Congress.

Mr. MANN. I did not object or protest.

Mr. BARNHART. I was afterwards informed by the leader on this side that the matter was not in order.

Mr. LANGLEY. I thought, Mr. Chairman, it was the handsome gentleman who has just taken his seat who interrupted me the other day; but when the gentleman denied it, of course I took his word for it. He evidently thought I was referring to a speech on the bill which I was alleging he had made, when in fact I was referring only to the question he asked me.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. I agree fully with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that under the rule it can not possibly apply to what has been done in a former session, whether it be upon this bill or the other bill. Time and again upon the floor of this House we get up and read what has taken place in the Senate, read the speeches that have been made, rulings that have been made, and so forth; but that is not the question.

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

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Do you think it ought to be ruled last week that we can not discuss it and then be ruled now that we can?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. No; but two wrongs do not make one right. Now, I want to say to the gentleman that if that is permitted the gentleman from Kentucky, in all fairness, inasmuch as he says he is about to leave the subject, ought to read the RECORD and show who it was that defeated the measure in the Senate—read what Senator PENROSE asked Senator LODGE, and read also what Senator Scott said in answer to Senator PENROSE when Senator PENROSE asked to take up another measure after he was through with his. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I will say to my friend from Colorado that I am not trying to suppress any facts at all. On the contrary, I am trying to bring them out, and I will if I am permitted to do so. I will state again that I admit that there were a few Republicans in the other body who were opposed to the Sulloway bill. The Record clearly shows that. But I insist again that this Record shows that nearly all of the Republicans were for the bill and that nearly all of the Democrats were against it, and that a clear majority of that body was in favor of the bill if, under the rules, it could have been put upon its final passage, and that nearly all of the votes that would have been cast for it were Republican votes. I will be glad to incorporate in my remarks that portion of the Record to which the gentleman refers, if the Chair rules that it is in order to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule under which the point of order is made is this:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there; because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independence, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

The point of order is sustained. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I understood that rule did not apply to proceedings in a previous Congress, but to the measure under consideration in the present Congress. However, if that is the ruling of the Chair, I shall abide by it and endeavor to proceed in accordance with the rule.

Before leaving the political phase of the subject, let me say to my friend from West Virginia [Mr. BROWN] and to other gentlemen on his side of the House who have sought to make it appear that the Republicans have been derelict in their duty to the soldiers, that I have had occasion to study pretty fully the legislative history of our pension system, especially while I was connected with the pension branch of the Government service, and that history utterly refutes the statements which have been made on that side of the House. It shows, furthermore, that practically every one of the many pension acts which go to make up our splendid code of pension laws was the product of Republican patriotism and Republican statesmanship. I have before me a compilation of the votes cast in both Houses of Congress on the 15 leading pension acts, commencing with the great fundamental act of July 14, 1862, and ending with the act of June 27, 1890, and it shows that 417 Democratic votes were cast for these bills and 648 Democratic votes were cast against them; and it also shows that 1,068 Republican votes were cast for them and not a single Republican vote against them.

Ah, gentlemen, the soldiers of the country know whether the Republican Party or the Democratic Party is their real friend. They have not forgotten the thousands of names that were dropped from the pension rolls and the thousands of pensions that were reduced under the first Democratic administration after the Civil War. It is true that most of you Democrats in the House voted for the Sulloway bill in the last Congress, and I give you due credit for that, even if your party in another body did vote almost in solid phalanx against it. And I am glad to see you support here to-day the Invalid Pension Committee in its efforts to get a more liberal pension law. I congratulate you latter-day saints of Democracy for the new-born zeal which you are displaying in behalf of the soldier. But to your party as an organization, let me suggest that it ought to go and make itself a new pension record before it seeks to enter the arena to contest for the championship as the special friend of the soldier. I call upon the old soldiers and their friends to examine and analyze the vote if there is a roll call upon the passage of this bill, and see to what party the bulk of the negative votes belong, and see also the sections and the environment from which the Republicans who vote against the bill come; they will both be significant, I think. And let me venture a prophecy, that after this bill passes the House, as it is certain to do, the Democratic press will teem with criticism of you Democratic Congressmen who are supporting this measure, and will cry out against it as a "raid upon the Treasury" and as an "unwarranted expenditure of public money." When these things are brought to the attention of the old soldiers, I have an abiding faith that at least many of them who temporarily have been misled by the argument that the great Republican Party has not done its duty by them will realize that it is and has always been their foremost champion and best friend.

Mr. Chairman, I know that what the soldiers and their friends want is action rather than words. I shall therefore occupy but little more of the time of the committee. As a partisan, I would have preferred to see this measure enacted into law by a Republican Congress. It would have been more

in keeping with the history of previous pension legislation. However, as a friend of the soldiers, I shall be glad to see it passed by any sort of a Congress, and that, too, regardless of the political party which may get the bulk of the credit for its enactment.

I hope that I am not seriously violating the rules of the House when I say that in the Committee on Invalid Pensions, of which I am a member, I favored a different measure than the one which has been reported; but I was so anxious to see a more liberal pension law passed that I resolved, if I could not get one just the way I wanted it, or just as liberal as I wanted it, I would give my support to the best that could be obtained. In the committee meeting I reserved the right to vote for certain amendments if they were offered, but in the end I intend to vote for the Sherwood bill, amended or unamended [applause], because I feel that justice to these old heroes has already been too long delayed, and I want to see them provided for as speedily as possible and before many more of them have passed away.

I concede that there is merit in the argument that men who rendered the longer period of service are entitled, in one sense, to a higher degree of consideration at the hands of their country than those who rendered a shorter period of service. That is true as a general proposition, but it would have appealed to me with greater force when these old soldiers were younger men. I feel, however, that they are now so far advanced in years and have such a short period of their lives remaining that it is too late for this Government to undertake to discriminate between the longer and the shorter periods of service; and that where it appears that a soldier served his country faithfully and has an honorable discharge he should be given now, in his old age, a rate of pension which will place him in comfortable circumstances for the remainder of his life and without inquiring as to the length of his service. By common consent a period of 90 days is fixed as the minimum of service entitling a soldier to a pension where disability of service origin is not established. I would like to see the period made shorter than that. I know of my own personal knowledge many old soldiers who did not serve that length of time, but who would have done so if they had had the opportunity, who gave all that they could to the service of the Union by risking their health and their lives in its defense; and while I say all honor to those men who spent many long months and years in the service, undergoing all sorts of privations and hardships, I can not believe that they would oppose the allowance of a pension also to those other soldiers who entered the conflict toward its close.

I can not help resenting some arguments that I have heard which, in a sense, reflect upon the short-term men. We should remember, gentlemen, the circumstances under which they enlisted. They took the step at a time when all the horrors of that terrible conflict were well known. They knew the story of the awful carnage of Bull Run, of Gettysburg, of Antietam, of Pittsburg Landing, of South Mountain, and of the many other bloody struggles of the earlier periods of the war. They knew what perhaps some of those who enlisted earlier did not know, that it was a bloody, relentless conflict to the bitter end. Some of them went to the front to fill the family's quota, depleted by the death of a father or a brother. All honor, I say, to the men who served long terms, but let us not disparage the courage, nor the patriotism, nor the valor, nor belittle the sacrifices made by the men who followed them to the front later in the war.

As I have already intimated, I expect to vote for certain amendments that I am assured are to be offered, and my associates on the committee so understand it. In the first place, I am opposed to that provision which would exclude from the soldiers' homes those soldiers who accept a certain rate of pension. Such a provision is, in my judgment, contrary to the purpose of Congress in providing for these homes. They were intended as houses of refuge for the old fellows, who could be better provided for there and whose lives could be made more congenial by the surroundings thus afforded them. No such provision has ever been put into our pension laws heretofore, and I am opposed to putting it in there now. A little money could be saved by such a provision, it is true, but the sum is paltry in comparison to the distress and unhappiness that it would bring upon the old men, who need the increased pension provided by this bill and yet who would have to make choice between it and the comforts of the soldiers' home.

I am also opposed to section 3 of this bill, which proposes to deny its benefits to all soldiers who have a net income of \$1,000 or more. The arguments against this section have already been quite fully presented in this debate. I am opposed to it because the effect of it would be to put our pension roll upon a pauper basis, which Congress and the country never intended and does not intend to do now. I am opposed to it because it would tend to take from our pension roll the status

which it now holds in the estimation of the country as a "roll of honor." True, we are appealing for more liberal pensions, because the great majority of the old soldiers need it; but at the same time we do not wish those who happen to have been fortunate or frugal enough to make themselves comfortable already to feel that they have thereby deprived themselves of the gratitude of the Nation. I am opposed to it for another reason, and that is that it would put into operation an inquisitorial process of adjudication of pension claims, which we have had too much of already, but which would far outstrip anything that has thus far been practiced by the Pension Bureau. Moreover, it would greatly delay the adjudication of claims, because the Pension Office would have to be satisfied beyond question that the soldier did not have such an income before he could receive the benefits of the act. This would not only require the soldier to furnish ex parte testimony on the point, but it would require the Pension Office to verify the testimony submitted in each case, and in many instances to withhold settlement of them until it would be too late for the soldier to get the benefit of the increase. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I undertake to say, from my own experience of a good many years in the pension work of the Government, that in order to properly execute this section it would cost double the amount of money that would be saved by excluding such cases from the benefits of the act.

There is another change that I would like to see made in existing law, and that is the repeal of the provision which denies a soldier's widow a pension if she married the soldier after June 27, 1890. The majority of my associates on the committee, however, thought that we ought not undertake to burden this bill, and possibly jeopardize its passage, by embodying that provision in it, and therefore I have reluctantly assented that it be brought up as a separate proposition.

I know of many cases in my own district where a loving and devoted wife, who married the soldier after the date named, lived with him until the end, and indeed devoted her life and all her energies to caring for him. It is a crying injustice to deny the widow a pension in such cases. I have introduced a bill in each Congress since I have been here proposing to repeal that law, and I am ready to work and vote for its repeal; and I hope, before the Sixty-second Congress ends, that this injustice will be eliminated from our pension law.

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

Mr. LANGLEY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will yield me a few minutes more time.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. LANGLEY. Some reference has been made in this debate to the proposition to pension members of State militia organizations who rendered faithful and efficient service in the suppression of the rebellion, cooperating with Federal troops and under the command of Federal officers, but who were never actually mustered into the service of the United States. Kentucky had many of these troops, some of whom are still living. Missouri had a number of them, and so did other States that I could name. Ever since I have been a Member of this House I have been contending that some legislation for the relief of these men ought to be enacted. I have introduced and urged the passage of a bill for this purpose in each Congress since I came here. Personally I was extremely desirous of seeing such a provision incorporated in this bill, but my associates on the committee and other Members of this House, who are equally as zealous as I am in support of a measure for the relief of these militiamen, insist that it is unwise and not for the best interests of the cause of the militiamen to undertake to engraft such a proposition on this bill, for the reason that if it should be added to the bill it might defeat the whole measure and that if it failed of passage it might injure rather than aid their cause.

I have discussed this question not only with members of the committee who are in sympathy with the militia measure, but with other gentlemen also in sympathy with it, and particularly with some of my friends from Missouri and Pennsylvania and West Virginia, who have constituents who rendered like service, and so far as I now recall every one of them expressed the opinion that we should unite our efforts toward bringing the proposition up as a separate measure to be considered by the proper committee and, if reported by the committee, by this House upon its own merits, and I have reluctantly, but I believe wisely, assented to that arrangement. It is, however, with the distinct understanding with the distinguished chairman of the committee and other members of it that at a very early date in this session the whole question is to be given a full and complete hearing, and is to stand or fall upon its merits. For that reason I have not offered the amendment, although I shall vote for such an amendment if it is offered,

because it is so just and so righteous that I could not do otherwise.

I want to say also that I am in favor of extending the provisions of this act to the Mexican War veterans, just as was done in the age law of February 6, 1907. Only a handful of those old heroes are still with us, and they ought by all means to be given the maximum pension provided by this bill. Indeed, it ought to have been given them long ago, and I am glad to note that there seems to be a general feeling in the House that such an amendment will be overwhelmingly adopted.

Before concluding I want to call attention also to the fact that there is another class of our soldiers who need more liberal consideration at the hands of Congress. I refer to the Spanish-American War veterans, who rendered such valiant service for our country in the War with Spain, and as a result of whose service we have taken a front rank among the nations of the world. The law ought to be amended so as to pension those men who are now disabled and who are unable to furnish proof of origin of their disabilities in the service, because they are so far removed from their former comrades in arms; and there are other amendments to the law affecting their status which I hope will receive the early consideration of the committee having jurisdiction of the subject.

There are still other inequalities in our pension system that I shall not stop to discuss now, but shall take occasion at a later date to go into.

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the outset, the district which I represent has a conspicuous place in the history of the Civil War, and particularly in the history of the war in the border States. It not only furnished many brave soldiers to both sides, but it has also furnished to the country a distinguished soldier poet, Col. John A. Joyce, who for more than a third of a century has wielded his pen in the cause of the veterans. Some one has called attention in this debate to the fact that the rate of mortality among the old soldiers is rapidly increasing; that during the past year nearly 50,000 of them crossed the dark river. Of course, as the infirmities of age increase the rate of mortality will rapidly increase also, so that in a very few years they will all have left us. Col. Joyce has put this pathetic thought into a beautiful poem, which I shall insert in the RECORD:

THE OLD SOLDIERS.

Our ranks are growing thinner every year,
And death is still a winner every year,
Yet we still must stick together
Like the toughest sort of leather
And in any kind of weather every year!

Our comrades have departed every year,
And leave us broken hearted every year,
But their spirits fondly greet us
And constantly entreat us
To come, that they may meet us every year!

Our steps are growing slower every year,
Pale death is still a mower every year,
Yet we faced him in the battle
Amid the musket's rattle,
Defying showers of metal every year!

We are growing old and lonely every year,
We have recollections only every year,
And we bled for this grand Nation
On many a field and station
And with any kind of ration every year!

Many people may forget us every year,
And our enemies may fret us every year,
But while onward we are drifting
Our souls with hopes are lifting
To heavenly scenes still shifting every year!

In the Maytime of the flowers every year
We shall live in golden hours every year,
And our deeds be sung in story
Down the ages growing hoary
With a blaze of living glory every year!

Let me again appeal to you, my fellow legislators, to join in expediting in every possible way this just and patriotic measure, so that its beneficence may be bestowed upon as many of the old fellows as possible before the end of life comes to them. I am proud of the privilege of speaking and voting for a more liberal pension measure. I shall always count it the highest honor that I was permitted to be a member of the committee that reported this bill and a Member of the House that passed it. [Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP].

Mr. SLEMP. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to represent on the floor of this House the only Confederate district that now sends a Republican to the Congress of the United States. It is a district, Mr. Chairman, from which there was no organized body of troops that served in support of the Union cause. Consequently there are a few, but not many, Union soldiers in my district, and their vote as compared with the total vote of

the district is insignificantly small. It is, therefore, from no motive of personal advantage that I shall record myself in favor of this bill. [Applause.] The associations of my life have been with those who sympathized with the Lost Cause. I was educated at an institution from which Stonewall Jackson entered the Confederacy, and my first college lessons were given in the section room where he conducted his classes as a professor before his sense of duty called him to take part in the great conflict between the States. My father served with his State as a Confederate colonel for four long years, and, like all true southerners, when the war was over he accepted the result with equanimity, laid down his arms, and thence afterwards became a loyal supporter of the Union. He served for two full terms in this House, and during that period he was an ardent supporter of pension legislation. Some of his closest friends in public life were those against whom he was engaged in armed conflict. It is a great pleasure to me by my vote to bear some testimony to his feeling and wishes on this subject.

There will be no bitterness on the part of the Confederate soldier on account of this legislation. Our only regret in the South is that our States have not so far recovered from the effects of the war that we can act as generously toward the Confederate soldier as the Nation can and does toward the Union soldier. I expect to vote for some amendments to the bill, but in the end I shall support it in its general features. My hope is that a generous Government, after the Union soldiers are fully provided for, as this bill will do, will consider pension legislation in favor of those who wore the gray and who, though defeated in conflict, yet served their State in the discharge of duty as they saw it and who to-day are loyal American citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] 20 minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, it is always an unspeakable pleasure to agree with my associates. It is also an irksome task to be compelled to disagree with them. I have listened to this debate, as I have listened to previous debates on this question, and have about made up my mind that if you will indulge me a personal reference I will give you an illustration that will somewhat enlighten you as to what prompts the objections to this pension legislation. Some years ago a very popular Methodist minister was returned to his pastorate in my home city for the seventh consecutive year and was given a great public reception. I was asked by the committee to speak on behalf of the citizen public. I accepted, was much impressed with the sacred surroundings in the pulpit that evening, and I made a somewhat sentimental talk. When I had finished, a good old Christian mother came rushing up to me and grasping my hand said to me, "God bless you, neighbor BARNHART, you would make a good preacher if you were a Christian, knew more of the Bible, and hadn't been a Democratic editor so long." [Laughter.] There were only these three things against my being an ideal man, in her estimation.

I have listened carefully to this debate, and find that the opponents to this bill have three objections to it. One is, they do not want to see it pass; the second, they do not want to see it pass; and the third, they do not want to see it pass. [Laughter.]

I said it would be an unpleasant duty to disagree with some of my colleagues on this bill, but the assaults on the bill are so unjust that it seems to me that somebody ought to "tell the truth and fear no man," and I am going to try to do it in a genteel but candid manner.

Where do the objections to increased pensions for deserving Union soldiers come from? We all know. First, they come from a section of the country which lost in the great struggle to preserve the Union, and any fair-minded man will concede that those from this section who do object have—or think they have—self-justification for doing so. Second, they come from politicians who think it profitable to play partisan politics with the old soldiers' cause. Third, they come from Representatives of millionaire constituents who fear that an increase of soldiers' pensions might necessitate income and inheritance tax laws; and fourth, they come from selfish friends of the soldiers' cause who are peevish because they have not had their way to secure personal glory. [Applause.]

For the Representative from the South, which thought it was right in the rebellion, who objects to commensurate pensions for the men who saved the Union I have no feeling of resentment or censure. He doubtless represents the sentiments of the people who have intrusted to him authority for legislative action. I believe he ought to favor the bill as a matter of acknowledgment that we are all proud that the Union of States was continued into the most powerful, influential, and happiness-giving in the world, but if he can not see it that way I

am fair enough to overlook what I consider his patriotic mistake.

But for those Members who object to the bill for so-called economy sake I have no compromise. Most of them come from the great cities where colossal wealth domineers and where it shirks every responsibility to popular government it possibly can. Somehow the capitalist has led himself to believe that equal taxation is not essential to exact justice to all men, and he opposes all legislation that might lead to a condition wherein wealth would have to bear its just share of public expenses. And these Representatives from the large cities who are fighting this bill of relief for needy old soldiers are clearly doing so on the cold-blooded proposition that they want to protect their rich constituents from an income and inheritance tax law prospects. They claim they are doing it in the name of economy, but economy which enables the rich men to live immune from just taxation and compels the old soldiers, who made their riches possible, to live in want and misery is treason to justice and malfeasance in patriotism. Why, if the tax-dodging rich could be made to pay their just share of Government taxes every soldier in the land could have a satisfactory pension, and every workingman could have his tariff and revenue taxes reduced so he could have a fair chance in the battle of life. [Applause.] Suppose larger pensions do increase public expenses. Where does the money paid for pensions go? Not for costly public structures; not for increasing salaries; not for exorbitant expenses for the Army and Navy; and not for pomp and parade of national vanity; but it goes into the hands of needy old veterans throughout the country, who at once put it into the marts of trade, and general prosperity and happiness are the gainers.

But the "big-business" representative says, "We can not afford it." Yet when I said to one of you New Yorkers that "you act and vote in favor of big appropriations here like you would be willing to vote public money to build a railroad to the moon, laid on solid silver ties, and tracked with solid gold rails," you replied, "Sure we would if it would make us a dollar." O money, what abuses and crimes are committed in thy name! And what a matchless exemplar of the sentiment of big-city greed was that Shakespeare character who said, "Put money in thy purse; put money in thy purse." [Applause.]

We appropriate millions and millions to build monuments to military officials who received profitable salaries and high honors for directing movements, but when we propose an act to reimburse the men who actually did the fighting, and did it for \$11 and \$13 per month and at dire exposure to permanent disability and death, you cry economy.

Another obstacle in the way of adequate pensions for old soldiers is politics—partisan politics. We work here day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year jockeying for political advantage, and needs of a righteous public service wait. Most of the debate on this bill has been made to attract favor with home people, rather than to change votes on this floor, and while we are doing it thousands of needy old soldiers, whose days are numbered and whose larders of necessities of life are depleted, are waiting and wondering why if we are going to act we do not do it before it is everlastingly too late for them.

And more than this, there are big men in the political game outside this Chamber who are scheming with pension plans to benefit this party or that. Look at the letter which Gen. SHERWOOD read from the National Tribune editor, who is fighting this bill and favoring another because it is a Republican measure. He poses as a great friend to the old soldier, but his letter of recent date, read on this floor, asked that he be given first honors in the Grand Army of the Republic, that he might help to close the schisms between the soldiers and the present Republican administration.

That kind of partisan politics is a disgrace to the Grand Army of the Republic organization, and it makes enemies for soldiers' interests and doubters in the righteousness of their cause.

And, then, there is the legislator who wants personal glory in pension legislation or he will complain and find fault with any bill that does not make him hero of the occasion. I, too, wish it might be possible that I could have the honor that my distinguished old friend, the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, will have of having this bill in his name. But that is not possible for me. I could not have the Sulloway bill in my name either, but I voted for it; and I shall vote for the Sherwood bill, too, for I plainly see that we can never agree on the specific details that we would have in a pension bill.

There are two or three features of this bill that I do not like. There were three or four in the Sulloway bill that I thought I might make better. But in the great diversity of opinion of 400 earnest and, in the main, conscientious men, we can not each

get in a bill what we would put there, had it been delegated to us to write it.

Personally I am opposed to the provision in the bill which bars veteran soldiers who have a net income of \$1,000 or more per annum from recognition under the proposed law. If this were a dependent bill that provision, and even a more exacting one, would be permissible. But it is not a dependent bill. It is a service pension bill, and every veteran, be he poor or rich, is entitled to the same badge of honor that a grateful people, through their Government, give to his comrades with similar service records. It is unfair for the Government to say to one soldier who has been industrious and frugal and laid up a competency for old age, "You can not share in the general gratitude we pay the saviors of the Union because you have been successful in life," and then say to those who have carelessly or through misfortune neglected opportunities to do well, "You shall have our special gratitude as soldiers."

Another objection is the provision concerning the benefits or limitation of benefits to veterans in soldiers' homes. Instead of the provision in this bill I would have it that those who live in soldiers' homes should have deducted from their pension allowance the actual cost of their keeping. This would be fair to the veteran who defrays his own living expenses outside the home and to the taxpayers who must furnish the money to defray pension and soldiers' home expenses. It may be right that a soldier living in a soldiers' home shall have his keeping at a cost of \$20 per month and the same pension allowance as veterans who pay their own living expenses; but it does not look fair and just to me.

I still believe that a bill like the one I had before the committee providing straight dollar-a-day pensions with limitation of unnecessary expenses and partiality of allowances would be more generally satisfactory to both soldier and taxpayer, but the members of the committee that carefully considered all the bills introduced decided otherwise, and so I concur in their judgment, because it is the only safe way to get any pension legislation through.

Let us put all whimsicalities, selfish motives, and dilatory tactics behind us and pass a liberal pension bill, as a great majority of us, regardless of politics, have at least implied that we will do. This bill may not be ideal. It may not be and, in fact, is not what many of us would like to see passed. But the Sulloway bill, which some claim to be better and for which I voted, was killed before it got a hearing in the Senate, and if this bill is more likely to become a law we ought to pass it. It does not afford dollar-a-day pensions for all, but it does give dollar-a-day pensions to nearly 400,000 of the 530,000 soldiers now on the pension rolls, and it gives \$25 per month to all the balance who served nine months and less than one year, \$20 per month to all who served six months and less than nine, and \$15 per month for all who served three months and less than six. It is a vast improvement over our present laws, and as such we ought to pass it just as other better-than-before pension laws have been passed.

Permit me to repeat with emphasis what I have said before. When our Nation has been in peril we have called for volunteers to shoulder arms and fight, and we have never called in vain. Men volunteered to risk their lives at any old wages the Government offered to pay, and they saved the country, to become one of the most delightful and wealthy beneath the sun. These men are now palsied by the touch of old age. Many of them are in want as the result of the sacrifices of time and health they gave for their country's cause. They were not paid reasonable compensation for their services. They offered themselves as sacrifices that we might enjoy the blessings of greatness and wealth which are so bounteously ours to-day. They will be with us but a few more years at most. Can we do too much to show them a Nation's appreciation of their help when we needed it? Not if we are grateful and solicitous for like services from our citizenship if a future emergency should arise whereby our Nation's fate might depend on the promptness, the bravery, and the patriotic enthusiasm of a volunteer soldiery. [Applause.]

READY REFERENCE DATA.

Total annual pensions now paid to veterans of Civil War—	\$111,736,728
(An average of \$192 per year, or \$16 per month.)	
Total Civil War veterans now on pension rolls—	529,884
Died last year—	35,242
Added to the rolls last year—	2,521
Average age of pensioned veterans—	70
Number of veterans on pension rolls who served—	
1 year or more—	376,218
9 months and less than a year—	60,564
6 months and less than 9—	47,002
3 months and less than 6—	44,510
Less than 3 months—	1,590

To the 376,218 who will receive \$30 per month under the Sherwood bill will be added the number of all who are disabled as result of injuries or diseases contracted in the service.

The Sherwood bill allows \$30 per month to all veteran soldiers of the Civil War who served 1 year or more; \$25 per month to all who served 9 months and less than 12; \$20 per month to all who served 6 months and less than 9; \$15 per month to all who served 3 months and less than 6.

The Sherwood service bill gives maximum total allowance now, which will grow less, while the Sulloway age bill would give minimum total allowance now, which would grow larger with age increases.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LANGLEY was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of liberal pension legislation and am in full accord with any legislation by this body which will provide a just and ample pension for our veteran soldiers. In taking this position I express my own desire and the sentiment of my district. I am also glad to note that this is free from being a partisan question, as it ought not to be involved in party politics, because men of all parties were prominent in arms in that great civil strife; and, again, if need be, we must look to the stalwart citizenship of our land, irrespective of party, to defend the Nation whenever the horizon is clouded by the horrors of war.

In granting liberal pensions we are but carrying out the pledges of both parties.

At the convention of the Republican Party held in 1908 it declared in its platform:

Another Republican policy which must be ever maintained is that of generous appreciation for those who have fought the country's battles and for the widows and orphans of those who have fallen. We commend the increase in the widows' pension made by the present Congress and declare for a liberal administration of all pension laws, to the end that the people's gratitude may grow deeper as the memories of the heroic sacrifices grow more sacred with the passing years.

The Democratic national convention of 1908 declared in its platform:

We favor generous pension policy, both as a matter of justice to the surviving veterans and their dependents and because it tends to relieve the country of the necessity of maintaining a large standing army.

So we find both parties committed to the policy of liberal pensions. Every Democratic Member and every Republican was elected on a platform declaring for liberal pensions for our veteran soldiers.

Since that time there have been several sessions of Congress without any liberal pension legislation being enacted. The necessity for such legislation was found in the expression of the people of this Republic, and both great parties incorporated it as one of the fundamental principles upon which they went before the people and conducted their campaigns. If there had been no necessity for such legislation, if there had been no demand for this particular enactment, it would not have been in the platforms of the respective parties, and it is due to our constituents, it is due to the people of this Republic, and to the soldiers themselves, that at this time this action shall be taken and our obligation to the war veterans liquidated.

The objection that it carries too large an appropriation is not tenable. Where in the history of any country is there an instance that after a successful war, without levying tribute, the men who bore arms melted away into the great citizenship of their nation, men contending on each side, the North and the South, shouldering the burdens and the expenses of that great war, going to their homes to make this the most magnificent country upon the face of the earth. And the soldiers pay their part of their own pensions, if you please. In my estimation this is not a charitable act; it is simply the payment of an obligation which we owe to these men who, in the days of their youth, by their valor, succeeded in giving to this country such profound service as was the admiration of the whole world. It will be but a short time that we will have the privilege of showing our gratitude to those men. They are dying at the rate of 40,000 a year, and the whole 500,000 of them will soon have passed away.

From the report of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I take the following:

The number of soldiers of the Civil War on the pension roll on the 1st of July, 1911, was 529,884. The aggregate amount of pension paid to Civil War soldiers during the year was \$101,425,534. The average rate for such pensioner was therefore \$191.41 under all the general and private pensions.

The number of deaths during the year ending July 1, 1911, was 35,243, or an average of almost 3,000 a month. The number of soldiers who will be available for pensions on the 1st day of January, 1912, is estimated to be about 509,000. Of this number over 63,000 are now drawing pensions of \$25 per month and \$30 per month and over. Hence in estimating the increased cost for pensions (should House bill 1 be enacted) we must deduct 63,000 from the entire number of pensioners, leaving the number of soldiers available for the increase on January 1, 1912, 446,000.

House bill 1 (the Sherwood bill) provides four classes—\$15 per month, \$20 per month, \$25 per month, and \$30 per month—rated on the length of service. The average rate is therefore \$22.50 per month, or \$270 per year. The average rate per man during the year ending

July 1, 1911, was (official) \$191.41. The increase under House bill 1 would therefore be \$78.59. Apply this increase to 446,000 soldiers and the amount is, in round numbers, a little over \$34,000,000.

According to the information furnished to the committee by the Commissioner of Pensions, the estimated cost of carrying out the provisions of the proposed Sulloway bill is as follows:

Age.	Increase per month.	Number.	Annual increase.	Amount.
62 years.....	\$12 to \$15	93,589	\$36.00	\$3,369,204.00
65 years.....	12 to 20	184,577	96.00	17,719,392.00
70 years.....	15 to 25	101,778	120.00	12,213,350.00
75 years.....	20 to 36	63,461	192.00	12,187,512.00
Total.....				45,489,468.00

This bill, if enacted into law, will grant to all persons who served 90 days or over in the Civil War, or 60 days or over in the Mexican War, and who have reached the age of 62 years, a pension of \$15 per month; this is \$3 per month more than is now allowed under the act of February 6, 1907; 65 years, \$20 per month. This is a new rating. Under the existing age act there is no rating between the ages of 62 and 70 years, and your committee thinks this is unjust to the soldier, and that in his declining years, with a majority of the veterans partially or wholly unfit to perform manual labor, there should be an increase allowed at the age of 65 years, hence the recommendation of a new rate of \$20 per month; 70 years, \$25 per month; this is an increase of \$10 per month over the existing rates; 75 years of age, \$36 per month; being an increase of \$16 per month over the amount now allowed under the maximum rate of the age act.

It occurs to me that with the assistance the soldiers are rendering, with the easy method of payment, where each man contributes through an indirect method in such a way that the amount is hardly appreciable, we should not hesitate to do this for these men. This great Government of ours does not maintain a standing army. Our young men are not compelled to do military duty as are those of foreign nations. We can well afford to be liberal in our pension laws. The amount is large because our Army was large; it required a great army in order to win that renowned victory which shed luster upon the soldiery of this great Republic. And in voting for this bill we are simply doing our duty. There is no occasion for drawing any fine line between the Sulloway bill and the Sherwood bill. Each has merits.

We boast of the greatness of our country—\$127,000,000,000 in wealth, so fabulous as to be beyond human conception, and expressed only by a row of figures. Eight billion dollars for our farm crop of a single year! We are so large that the area of Belgium, Holland, and Greece does not equal that of Michigan. The greatest engineering feat known to science, the Panama Canal, is apparently an easy task for American enterprise and American talent. Our vast area of fertile plains awaits but the magic touch of the husbandman to pour untold wealth into the lap of the Nation. We are rich in mineral and all natural resources, and now in the pride and strength of our national infancy let us do our duty by our veteran soldiers who did their share in building up our splendid citizenship, playing their part in the maintenance of this great Republic, and doing their part even now in paying the Nation's debt and obligation.

We are a Nation of nearly 100,000,000 people. We doubled our population in the short space of three decades. Soon we will be 200,000,000 people.

Let us be just to the heroes of the Civil War. They, in a short time, will pass away, but the memory of that terrible strife will be rehearsed and recounted by our children's children, to whom they bequeath so proud a heritage—a Republic where we must keep the fire of patriotism forever burning upon the altar of liberty and freedom.

[Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is only one feature of this bill to which I desire to address myself for a few minutes. I have always been in favor of pension legislation. [Applause.] I believe in the tribute just paid to the defenders of our country by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ANDERSON] who preceded me. I indorse every word of that sentiment. Believing as I do in the men who saved this Republic and gave us all we have to-day, since I have been in the American Congress I have never failed to vote for any measure and every measure that would give those defenders more money, those defenders who are in need at this time, gentlemen, and badly in need. We ought to do what we can to secure them all the comforts possible in their declining years. If I had my way, however, I should amend this bill materially. As it now provides it is my honest and candid judgment that tens and hundreds of thousands of dollars which should go to the old soldiers will go to clerks and to expenses of the Pension Department. I

can not reconcile myself to section 3 of this bill. For instance, take an old soldier who served one year. We will say he has an income of \$950 net. I do not know that I understand just what the word "net" means in this case, but, I take it, over and above the running expenses of his business. He will draw under this bill \$30 a month. I take another old soldier who was side by side with him in that service, who shared with him the hardships of the service, and he has an income of \$1,000 a year. As provided by this bill, he is precluded from drawing one dollar pension. I can not reconcile myself to that sort of a provision. I want to say to you, gentlemen, it may take more money to eliminate this section, it may require greater expenditure upon the part of the Government of the United States to eliminate this section, but in justice to the defenders of the country it ought to be eliminated by this House. This is only a part of a comparison that might be made. Take, for instance, two men who served four years and underwent the hardships incident to the life that they endured. One of them has an income, we will say, of \$900 to \$950 a year. The man who fought by his side has an income of \$1,000. Under the provision of section 3 of this bill one draws a pension of \$30 a month and the other is precluded from any pension whatever.

Can you reconcile yourselves, gentlemen, to that sort of a provision in this bill? It undoubtedly ought to be eliminated. But let us go a little further with that comparison. Take the man who served one year, and he has a net income, we will say, of \$900 a year. Another man has served four years, and he has a net income of \$100 more per annum, or \$1,000 a year. The soldier who served one year is entitled to \$30 a month under this bill and the soldier who served four years of the best days of his life is precluded from the possibility of a pension under this provision. It seems to me that some one was ill advised when that section was placed in the bill. You can not pass that and do the square thing for the fellows who saved this Republic and gave us all that we have to-day.

I would go a little further. If necessary, I would cut out a few battleships, much as I believe in a strong navy. I would go a little further, and if necessary I would reduce the rivers and harbors appropriation bill in order that these men who followed that flag to victory and gave us the greatest country that God's sun ever shone upon could have what they ought to have in the last days of their lives. I would eliminate appropriations in other departments of the Government, and I would eliminate section 3 of this bill and give them that which every man in this House feels from the bottom of his heart they justly deserve. [Applause.]

Another thought. At what is it to be decided whether the applicant is entitled to a pension? That is, we will suppose he has an income of a thousand dollars a year now and an income of less than a thousand dollars within a short time, or, on the other hand, suppose his income now is less than a thousand dollars and within a short time after he draws his pension, by reason of some good fortune, he draws an income greater than a thousand dollars a year. Is it proposed under the provisions of this act to deprive him of his pension under such circumstances? The gentleman who proposed this section of the bill must have been deluded into believing that the country was in grave danger of being inflicted with another Democratic administration, and naturally and properly concluded that under such circumstances every Civil War veteran would draw a pension under these provisions. For whoever heard of anybody having an income of more than a thousand dollars a year under a Democratic administration? There are other features of the bill to which I can not reconcile myself.

Section 2 provides that any person who served in the Civil War, received an honorable discharge, was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor, whether his present unfitness is due to the gunshot wound or some entirely different cause, shall receive \$30 per month, the maximum under this bill, regardless of his length of service. That is a just provision, and I am in favor of it.

But the same section provides that one who served during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was discharged because of disease or other disabilities, other than gunshot wounds, shall receive \$30 per month only in case the disabilities received in the service now totally unfit them for the performance of manual labor. This provision is pure buncombe. Under the general law that has been in operation for years if the soldier has a disability incurred in service that unfits him for manual labor he receives \$30 per month, and this bill grants him no relief whatever. If he has a disability that nearly unfits—one that he incurred in service—that caused his discharge from the service in less than 90 days—one from which he has suffered through all the years since the close of the war—he does not, under this bill, receive a cent of pension. On the other hand, if he served but 60 days—and during that time re-

ceived a flesh wound from which he suffered but a few days—the bill gives him \$30 per month.

I will read section 2. Note the discrimination against those who incurred disease or other disabilities while serving their country:

SEC. 2. That any person who served in the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor, through causes not due to his own vicious habits, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty resulting in his disability now to perform manual labor, shall be paid the maximum pension under this act, to wit, \$30 per month, without regard to length of service.

The part of the section relative to diseases and similar disabilities is valueless, for it does not enlarge the benefits of the present general law. I have a letter from A. M. Current, an old soldier at Guthrie, Okla., received to-day, in which he says:

I think you ought to oppose the Sherwood bill and work for the Sulloway bill. There are soldiers who served a few months and were discharged for disability incurred in the service and were never able to get back in the service, who were just as patriotic and suffered just as much for their country as the soldier who served more than a year. For they did all their health, impaired in the service, would permit.

His objection is good and the bill should be remedied in this respect. Let me make a comparison. One man served 60 days and during that time received a flesh wound from which he suffered only a few days. In recent years he became rheumatic and can not now perform manual labor. He gets \$30 under this bill. Another man enlisted for three years, but in 80 days was discharged because he had contracted in the service stomach trouble of so severe a nature as to render him unfit for service. He continued to suffer from this disability for years after his discharge, but is now cured or relieved of this disability. Even though he should now be blind, deaf, consumptive, and paralyzed, and be entirely without means of support, under this bill he would receive nothing, for his present disabilities were not the ones incurred in line of duty. He was just as patriotic, suffered just as much, and is as needy as hundreds of other soldiers, but gets nothing. Is not this discrimination unjust?

Why not give the man now disabled, who was honorably discharged after a short service because of disease contracted in the service, the highest pension under this act, as you do the soldier who received a gunshot wound?

The bill in its general provisions is too extravagant. It means too many clerks, too many investigations, and too many complications. A general pension act should provide safeguards against fraud, but this is not a general pension act. It specifies and includes only those who served the Government of the United States during the Civil War, and every man who comes within the range of the provisions of this bill is to-day a man of advanced years, and the cases of attempted fraud would be the rare exception and not the rule.

This bill should be written in the plainest English and in the simplest form with the view of reducing the number of clerks in the Department of Pensions, and of eliminating examining physicians, and of reducing the number of field inspectors to a minimum. I would take the money given under the provisions of this bill to unlimited numbers of these clerks, physicians, and field inspectors and pay it direct to the old soldiers.

Another feature of pension legislation has been overlooked by the gentleman in charge of this measure. There is not one word about the widows of the soldiers of the Civil War. Under the present law widows can draw but \$12 a month. As a general rule, they are less able to earn a sum sufficient to maintain them than the soldiers themselves. They have been just as patriotic, just as devoted to their country, and in tens of thousands of cases the hardships experienced by them far exceeded those of their husbands. And I regard it as absolutely inexcusable that they have not been better provided for. And it is a matter of profound regret to me that this bill does not contain a provision increasing their pensions.

I also call your attention to a provision of the present law. The widow of a veteran of the Civil War is precluded from drawing a pension if she married the soldier subsequent to 1890. For 20 years and more she has been his faithful wife, she has helped him to rear a family, has devoted her life to him and nursed him in his declining years, is left at his death with a dependent family, and there is no provision for her pension. This bill should remedy that unfortunate condition, but it does not.

I have in mind a number of cases where veterans of the Civil War served slightly less than 90 days. By their very act of enlistment they demonstrated their patriotism. In hundreds of cases their service, though short, was of immeasurable value to their country. They should not be omitted from the provisions of this bill, and in every case where the State Militia was used by the Government for a period of 60 days or more they should have a pensionable status.

I should prefer to see this bill amended so as to reach all cases which I have enumerated, and I expect at the proper time

to offer or vote for amendments which will cover these cases, which, I regret to say, have been omitted in this bill.

We should not stand upon the question of expense, and no Member of this House should permit his apprehension of a Treasury deficit to influence his vote. This bill, when amended as it should be, should receive the sanction of every patriotic American citizen. It matters little to me who gets the credit. We owe a debt to the defenders of this Nation, not so much for their service as for their patriotism, and the time is now come when we should do our full duty. I have no fear but that the American people will stand by the Congress and the President when we shall have liberally rewarded these great American patriots.

No soldier of the Civil War has ever thrown a bomb or made an incendiary speech. His energies have for more than 50 years been directed to the building of a Republic rather than to the destroying of one. He is seldom guilty of an infraction of the law, but always sustains it. He has never assailed the Constitution or the Republic, but has given his best days and his best blood in support of them. He gave heroic service to his country and a lasting example of patriotism to the world. He made the Declaration of Independence mean what it says—that all men are created equal before the law. He dispelled the lowering cloud of slavery which had so long threatened this country with destruction. He lifted our standard of civilization and perpetuated this Republic.

I do not know how others view his services, but as for myself I prefer to minimize the expenditures in every department of the Government in order to express my appreciation by a liberal pension for every man who took part in that great conflict, and to leave it to an unprejudiced constituency as to whether I have done my full duty.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cox of Ohio). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have no prepared or set speech, and I shall therefore ask your kind indulgence to permit me to express to you whatever thoughts the inspiration of the moment may give me for utterance and in whatever language, good or bad, that may come to my lips for expression.

I have the honor to represent a district which has within its confines 310,000 population. Possibly no Member on the floor of this House represents more of the veterans of the Civil War than I do. I feel I would be derelict in my duty to them and those interested in their welfare if I did not offer a few observations on the provisions of this bill, which reads as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War.

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the late Civil War, and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, shall, upon making proof of such facts according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed on the pension roll and be entitled to receive a pension as follows:

For a service of 90 days or more and less than 6 months, \$15 per month; for a service of 6 months or more and less than 9 months, \$20 per month; for a service of 9 months or more and less than 1 year, \$25 per month; for a service of 1 year or more, \$30 per month; *Provided*, That no one who shall be in receipt of a pension of \$25 or more per month under this act shall be entitled to admission or residence in the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; and no State or Territorial home for disabled soldiers and sailors shall receive any aid from the General Government on account of any person who shall be in receipt of a pension of \$25 per month or more under this act.

SEC. 2. That any person who served in the Civil War and received an honorable discharge and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor, through causes not due to his own vicious habits, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty resulting in his disability now to perform manual labor, shall be paid the maximum pension under this act, to wit, \$30 per month, without regard to his length of service.

SEC. 3. That no one shall be entitled to pension under this act who is in receipt of an annual net income of \$1,000 or more, exclusive of any pension he may receive.

SEC. 4. That no person shall receive a pension under any other law at the same time or for the same period he is receiving a pension under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. That rank in the service shall not be considered in applications filed hereunder.

SEC. 6. That pensions under this act shall commence from the date of filing the application in the Bureau of Pensions after the approval of this act.

In the outset, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I expect to give this bill my hearty support. It is true that it does not contain all the provisions that I would like to see incorporated into it. I would like to see the widows of the veterans of the late war cared for by a provision in this bill. I would like to see the Mexican War veterans, the Spanish War soldiers, the home guard, the State militia, the telegraphers, the teamsters, and, in fact, everyone who contributed their share toward the preservation of this great Union, in days of its peril, included in this bill and amply cared for by its provisions. But we have assurances from the committee having charge of this bill that

if it is loaded down with these amendments it can not pass the Senate, and therefore can not become a law. So far as I am individually concerned, then, I am opposed to the incorporation into this bill of any amendment which, in my judgment, will defeat its final passage.

The distinguished gentleman from the State of Illinois, the leader of the minority, in his speech on Saturday afternoon made a plausible and, in my judgment, a dangerous argument. He said that it was the duty of this House to put into this bill all the relief which all are entitled to who helped save this Union, and if the Senate failed to pass it, let it assume the responsibility therefor. If a bill with all these amendments could pass the Senate, I would say well and good, and it would receive my warm and hearty support. [Applause.]

But if a physician is called to see a patient, what would you think of his skill, if he should devote his time to inquiring into whether the man had his leg broken in falling from the roof of a house or falling on a sidewalk, thereby trying to place the responsibility on some one, or somewhere, instead of devoting his energies in relieving the suffering of the injured patient? The thing the patient needs is results and relief; and the thing this House wants is to get results in legislation, and relief for the old soldier, and not merely to place the responsibility upon the shoulders of anybody for the lack of legislation or the lack of relief.

If this bill, or something similar to it, is not passed within a short time, there is no need to pass any additional legislation in behalf of the veterans of the late war. They are now treading on the icy brinks of death, and will soon be beyond the power of the country they saved to either serve or help. Favorable action ought to be taken on this bill here, and at once. If the widows' bill is a meritorious measure, and, in my judgment, it is, in all probability it is the part of wisdom to incorporate it into another measure, introduce it in this body, pass it, and send it to the Senate for its consideration. Do the same thing for the Mexican War veterans, the Spanish-American War soldiers, the Home Guard, the State Militia, the telegraphers, the teamsters, and others. Put each class in a separate bill. Pass them through this House and let each of them, in the United States Senate, stand or fall on its merits there. In my judgment, this House believes that many of these bills ought to be enacted into law. The Senate, however, may feel differently about it. The House may feel differently on some of these measures. This House might not pass this bill, now before us for consideration and known as the Sherwood bill, if all these measures of which I have spoken were incorporated into it and made one bill.

Why, then, risk the chance and opportunity of defeating this measure by loading it down with a raft of amendments. Is it a safe policy to carry all the eggs in one basket? Might we not lose for the old soldier what we are able to get for him by striving after the impossible? Besides, if these other measures can pass the House and Senate in one measure they can pass them in separate bills.

From what I have seen here for the last few days I believe that a majority of this House thinks that the old soldier ought to have additional relief—and I believe that a majority of the Senate will take the same view—but I fear that a majority of this House does not believe that all the other classes I have mentioned should be cared for through pension legislation. It seems, therefore, that the wise thing for the friends of pension legislation to do is to present separate measures here for all those who, in our judgment, ought to be pensioned, and pass as many of them as we can; and by so doing we will not defeat those measures which can pass, if left to stand or fall on their own merits.

Taking that view of it, I introduced at the special session of Congress separate bills looking to the relief of the widows of the Civil War veterans, the Mexican War veterans, the State Militia, and others, and those bills are now in the hands of the Invalid Pensions Committee for consideration. And we have had promises and assurances from members of that committee here on the floor of this House within the last few days that separate bills on a number of these classes of cases shall be forthcoming, and shall pass the House. This is glad news, and I hope nothing will interfere with those plans and purposes. I gather it, too, that it is the purpose of the Invalid Pensions Committee to pass this bill for the benefit of the old soldiers, and not to pass any special acts for their benefit, believing that enough has been done for the old soldiers when this bill has been passed. This may work a hardship in some cases, but I am ready to concede that you have already done much to bless and benefit the old soldier when you pass this bill.

I offered the following bill at the special session of Congress: Granting pensions to all enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico.

Be it enacted, etc. That any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late Civil War, or 60 days in the War with Mexico, and who has been honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now or may hereafter be placed upon the pension rolls of the United States at a less rate than \$1 per day, shall, after the passage of this act, be placed on the pension roll at the rate of \$1 per day: *Provided, however,* That any person now drawing a pension of more than \$1 per day shall not be affected by this act.

I would like to see it pass. In many respects it is a better bill than the Sherwood bill. I would like to see it pass, but I am ready to concede that the Sherwood bill is a pretty fair measure, except in two particulars.

There are two provisions in it, and I speak as a friend and not as a foe to this measure, which, in my judgment, ought by all means to be taken out of it. Then, and not till then, will it be a good measure. I hope that the committee having it in charge will eliminate section 3. I believe I will take the time to read that provision again, although I am sure it is familiar to everyone here. It is as follows:

Sec. 3. No one shall be entitled to a pension under this act who is in receipt of an annual net income of \$1,000 or more, exclusive of any pension he may receive.

So far as my own district is concerned, this provision will not affect the pension drawn by a single soldier within its confines. I want to state it as my deliberate judgment that there is not a soldier in my district who has a net income of \$1,000 a year, exclusive of whatever pension money he may be drawing. From that viewpoint, then, it will not affect the soldiers in the district I have the honor to represent; but from another standpoint it will affect them very materially.

What does this provision mean? It means delay. It means expense, if left in the bill. It means endless trouble in readjusting the pension legislation of this country. According to the report of this committee, there are now about half a million soldiers who are on the pension roll. About 63,000 of these now draw a pension above the amount specified here in section 3, and therefore will not be affected by it. But there are 446,000 soldiers in our country that will be affected by this provision. In other words, before any of these 446,000 soldiers now on the pension roll can get relief under section 3 and other provisions in this bill, proof will have to be made to the Interior Department, governed by whatever rules and regulations it may see fit to prescribe, showing, first, that these people get a net income of less than \$1,000 a year. Every one of these 446,000 soldiers will have to make proof of that proposition. And what is a net income? That question will come up for consideration. It will involve the necessity of looking into the private affairs and the private business of every old soldier in the land. And, besides, this is a pension bill based upon service; and if it is a pension bill based on service, let us not put into it a provision which contradicts its name and contradicts its alleged purpose. [Applause.]

This provision of the bill is an insult to every prosperous and well-to-do soldier in the land and advertises to the world the unfortunate condition of every other one. It punishes thrift and enterprise and rewards profligacy and shiftlessness. After each war it says to every young man who has served his country: "Sit down. Take life easy. If you will do that and have no means of support Uncle Sam will pension you. But if you are industrious, hard-working, and a successful man, the Government will not recognize you."

Gentlemen, this policy will not do. And besides that, don't you know it is going to cost this Government more to administer this provision of the bill and adjust the pension claims under it than it will to leave it out and pension the few old soldiers who have a net income of \$1,000 per year, exclusive of any pension they may receive? It will take an army of pension clerks, inspectors, and other Government employees to readjust the 446,000 pension claims now on the pension rolls. Better pay this money to the old soldiers. Not over 2 per cent of them would be financially affected by this provision of the bill. Delay and hardships are inevitable under this provision of the bill as it now stands.

The Secretary of the Interior, in whose department all these matters will be adjusted, has this to say of it:

"The provision relative to incomes would necessarily require evidence in each claim as to the income of the applicant. This would, no doubt, lead to a large amount of correspondence and consequent delay in the adjustment of the claims filed. The claims filed the first year and not adjudicated until the second and third years after the passage of such a bill would carry arrears from the date of filing," etc. It is admitted here by the man best able to judge, that these claims can not be adjudicated for years. While the process is going on the old

soldier is dying—dying at the rate of 36,000 a year—3,000 a month. One hundred less of them see the light of day every time the sun comes up in the morning. Why promise the old battle-scarred veteran something in a pension bill, and then place something in the way of his getting it? This provision of the bill must be eliminated.

And there is a part of another provision, which ought to go. That part of section 2 which says:

That no one who shall be in receipt of a pension of \$25 or more per month, under this act, shall be entitled to admission or residence in the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

There are 10 National soldiers' homes and 30 State soldiers' homes in this country. There are 25,000 soldiers in the National homes and 20,000 in the State homes. These homes are already built at State and Government expense. Whether this provision becomes a law or not, those homes will still have to be maintained at State and Government expense. All the old soldiers will certainly not leave the homes. All of them can not leave the homes. Many of them can not dress themselves or feed themselves. The average age of the soldiers now living is between 70 and 71 years. They will not be with us long. You know it and they know it. Let us neither banish them from the homes nor punish them if they can not go.

With this provision of this measure, and the \$1,000 a year income provision taken from it, it will then receive my hearty support. I can not believe that either provision will be permitted to pass this House. [The House later rejected both of these provisions.] It is true that this Government pays out in pensions each year \$160,000,000; and that this bill (with the two provisions to which I most seriously object taken out of it) will cost this Government \$45,000,000 more each year. Those opposing the bill strongly urge that this Government is already paying out too much money in pensions and that this bill righteously deserves overwhelming defeat.

It is also said that the old soldier has been petted and spoiled; that it has come to the point where he believes that his Congressman has got nothing to do except answer his letters, look after his pension claim, and chase around to the departments in his interest, and to the neglect of the business of all the other people in the district and country. It is said that he is insistent and persistent in his demands; that he never stops writing to his Congressman; that he is never satisfied with what he has got and is always wanting more; that greed and graft have driven from the altars of his heart the fires of patriotism; that he now wants his Congressman to help him loot the Treasury of the country he fought to save; and that he is satisfied with his services as a Congressman if he does and dissatisfied with them if he does not.

It is said, too, that the Confederate soldiers after the war expected nothing from the Government, went home and went to work, and that the average Confederate soldier is now better off than the average Union soldier; that the Union soldier has become idle and shiftless and worthless and depends upon the Government to give him enough money in the way of pensions to keep him up.

These are serious charges, and I hope that no old soldier in my district, or elsewhere, ever has been or ever will be guilty of them. I hope that those who feel that way on this subject will not forget the fact that the old soldier did help to save this Union. That much can neither be doubted nor denied. That much, at least, of his life and motives are secure from truthful attack. That he displayed valor and patriotism, fortitude and courage no honest man conversant with the facts will ever dispute.

As a result of his privations and hardships, lofty patriotism and Spartan-like valor, we have one flag and one country, which is a marvel to all the world in its wonderful achievements and an inspiration to all mankind in its love of liberty, lofty ideals, and high resolves.

The war is over. Its passions and its bitterness should be buried with its dead.

Possibly not all the right was on the one side nor all the wrong on the other. Each side believed in the justice of its cause and fought courageously to maintain it. No stain was left on American manhood by reason of that sanguinary struggle; no blot upon the valor of American arms. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time of the House long in a discussion of this bill, but I feel that I would be derelict in my duty to my constituents if I did not raise my voice in its behalf. I am one of those who can recollect nothing of the Civil War. I was born several months after Fort Sumter was fired upon, and those stirring times which are mentioned with so much eloquence by the survivors of the exciting and thrilling days of 1861-1865 are not even a memory to me.

My understanding of the agreement made by the authorities of our country in the day when they needed brave men to defend and protect the Union is that it was a matter of patriotism, not of purely financial consideration. When men were urged to enlist they were told that they would be taken care of if alive, or their survivors and dependents would be in case they never returned alive.

I believe a good deal in common honesty myself. I care little what creed a man may believe or whether he affiliates with any denominational church. If he is an honest man and does what he contracts to do in a willing manner, he can generally be found among good and desirable citizens. I want this Government to live up to what I have always been told was their agreement with the men who braved the shot and shell and saved the Union from disruption.

I have the honor to represent a district which has the reputation of having contributed as many soldiers to the Civil War in proportion to its population at that time as any in the Union. At the beginning of the war my native county was one of the strong Democratic counties of the Empire State, but that did not interfere with Steuben County sending many a soldier to the front to defend our country's flag. The politics of the district have been so one-sided since that I am the first Member of the Democratic Party to be sent to the National House of Representatives since the tidal Democratic year of 1882. I was not chosen by voters of my own party alone. I had the support of many in the opposite political ranks, and I attribute my election, in part at least, to the issuance of a personal platform, on which I ran, and in which I agreed to represent the thirty-third district of the State of New York according to the principles therein laid down, and also to endeavor in other matters to represent the honest views of the people of the district. The subject of pensions was not dwelt upon in that platform, but I am so sure that the Sherwood bill meets with the approval of my constituents that I am going to support it.

I am not in favor of section 3. I am in favor of eliminating that from the bill for the reason that I do not think that thrift should be punished by discrimination, and further, I believe that it would cost more to inquire into the financial standing of every applicant than it would cost to pay the additional pensions to veterans who are fortunate enough to enjoy an income of \$1,000 or more.

I sent a copy of this bill to every Grand Army post in my district, 22 in number. They were read in the post meetings, and in nearly every case I received an official communication from the proper officer stating that it was a satisfactory measure, and that the post wished to see it become a law.

I am aware that the survivors of the Civil War are a small proportion of our present population, but I have found few men who did not believe in liberal treatment to the old veteran and in smoothing his declining years, which at the best are comparatively few.

I am glad to see that this great question is not being discussed from a sectional or party viewpoint, but is being considered on this floor in a broad and patriotic manner. This is not a question of charity. It is a question of justice. In the town where I reside there is a home for soldiers and sailors, erected by the efforts of the Grand Army of the State of New York. It was built originally by subscriptions, and a goodly part of the first \$100,000 was contributions of the people of the churches of the State of New York, regardless of creed, and the gifts of the citizens of Bath. The home was later turned over to the State of New York as the best method to secure the benefits intended. I can remember as a young man when the home first opened. If my recollection serves me right, it was about Christmas Day, and the first veterans to be sheltered within this home were unfortunate invalids and cripples who were that day removed from the county almshouse. To-day there are from 2,000 to 2,200 veterans within the protecting walls of this noble institution.

I favor this bill and believe it will pass. If it were done by a unanimous vote it would show the deep and lasting gratitude of a thankful people.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ANDERSON] asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill

(H. R. 1) granting a service pension to certain defined veterans of the Civil War and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOLIDAY ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up a privileged resolution. I move the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves the adoption of the resolution which he sends to the Clerk's desk. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 21.

Resolved, That when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 21, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock m. on Wednesday, January 3, 1912.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that when the House meets to-morrow and goes into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Sherwood bill, general debate be limited to 1 hour and 40 minutes; 30 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], 40 minutes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], who is opposed to the bill, and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Indiana, Judge CULLOP.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] asks unanimous consent that when the House resolves into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to-morrow for the consideration of House bill No. 1, general debate be limited to 1 hour and 40 minutes; 30 minutes of it to be occupied by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], 40 minutes by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], and 30 minutes by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 12, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

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

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Jupiter Inlet, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 257); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Winthrop Beach, Boston Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 258); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Thames River, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Ridley River, Pa. (H. Doc. No. 259); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Escambia and Conecuh Rivers, Fla. and Ala. (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Delaware River at Bordentown, N. J. (H. Doc. No. 262); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Yalobusha River, Miss. (H. Doc. No. 263); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Sakonnet Harbor, R. I. (H. Doc. No. 264); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and

survey of Hoquiam River, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 268); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Chandlers River, Me. (H. Doc. No. 265); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Darby River, Pa. (H. Doc. No. 266); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with letter of the Chief of Engineers, report of a preliminary examination of Los Angeles (San Pedro) Outer Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 267); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Broad Creek, Md., a waterway connecting Pocomoke Sound and Little Annesmessex River, with plan and estimate of cost of improvement (H. Doc. No. 269); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Pamlico and Tar Rivers, with a view to obtaining greater depth and width as far up as Tarboro, N. C. (H. Doc. No. 270); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Manatee River, Fla., with a view to securing a depth of 13 feet from the mouth to Palmetto and Bradentown, and thence such depth to Ellenton and Rye as commerce may demand (H. Doc. No. 271); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination of South Channel of Mystic River and South Bay, with a view to securing increased depth, and examination and survey of Chelsea Creek between the Meridian Street Bridge and the Old East Boston Bridge, Boston Harbor, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 272); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting twenty-first report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortification for fiscal year ended June 30, 1911 (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriations for contingencies of the Army for fiscal year ended June 30, 1911 (H. Doc. No. 273); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

19. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of expenditures on account of appropriations for contingent expenses of the War Department for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1911 (H. Doc. No. 274); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

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

A bill (H. R. 6246) granting a pension to John H. Caldwell; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10731) granting a pension to Guilbert Allen (now Peace); Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 14877) granting an increase of pension to William Tucker; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 15351) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Hillsboro, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15352) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Wilmington, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15353) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Lebanon, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 15354) providing for the construction of a steam fog signal at the entrance to Cutler

Harbor, Washington County, Me.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 15355) to amend section 429 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to publications admitted to the second class of mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 15356) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Modesto, State of California; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 15357) to regulate radio-communication; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia): A bill (H. R. 15358) to transfer jurisdiction of the Washington Aqueduct, the filtration plant, and appurtenances to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 15359) extending the time for certain homesteaders to establish residence upon their lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEVY: A bill (H. R. 15360) to regulate the rank of certain officers in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANDLER: A bill (H. R. 15361) to correct an error in the record of the supplemental treaty of September 28, 1830, made with the Choctaw Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 15362) to provide for a site and public building at Arcadia, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15363) to provide for a site and public building at Lakeland, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 15364) to create an Indian code commission, codify the law relating to Indians taxed and not taxed, and to define more exactly the privileges and disabilities of the several classes of Indians in the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15365) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make changes in coal leases in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DODDS: A bill (H. R. 15449) for the construction of a gymnasium and manual-training building combined, with equipment, for the Mount Pleasant Indian School, at Mount Pleasant, Mich.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 177) authorizing the Director of the Census to publish statistics of the domestic and foreign consumption of cotton, the surplus held by cotton manufacturers of the United States, and the number of bales exported; to the Committee on the Census.

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. 15366) granting an increase of pension to David A. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 15367) granting a pension to Catharine Klinglesmith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15368) granting a pension to Josephine Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATES: A bill (H. R. 15369) granting an increase of pension to Amelia W. Brooks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 15370) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Bohannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15371) granting an increase of pension to Cineas Ryman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 15372) granting a pension to Walter Thomas; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 15373) for the relief of the legal representatives of Julia R. Speaks, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15374) for the relief of the legal representative of Elizabeth Youmans, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 15375) granting an increase of pension to Libbie B. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 15376) for the relief of William Mickler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15377) for the relief of Mary Jones Smith, daughter of Jonathan L. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 15378) granting a pension to Pereuta J. Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15379) granting an increase of pension to Jacob M. Neely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15380) for the relief of the county court of Marion County, W. Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15381) for the relief of Alfred McMasters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15382) for the relief of Anthony C. Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15383) for the relief of Sanford Wood; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENVER: A bill (H. R. 15384) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 15385) for the relief of Dewitt C. Blanchard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: A bill (H. R. 15386) granting a pension to Patrick J. Hanrahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 15387) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Bonnet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 15388) granting a pension to William Mendenhall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 15389) granting an increase of pension to Albert Spicer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 15390) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin White; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 15391) granting an increase of pension to Isaac W. Sanborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15392) granting an increase of pension to Ira Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 15393) granting an increase of pension to Buel Wolcott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15394) granting an increase of pension to Daniel D. Krebs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15395) granting a pension to Margaret E. Carrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARTMAN: A bill (H. R. 15396) granting a pension to Stacey Hoon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15397) granting an increase of pension to Lydia A. Benton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15398) granting an increase of pension to Hayes Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15399) granting an increase of pension to James Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15400) granting an increase of pension to George Nell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15401) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15402) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 15403) for the relief of the heirs of George Winfrey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15404) for the relief of the heirs of Noah Fugate, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15405) for the relief of the estate of John McCullough, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15406) for the relief of the estate of Ira W. McCutchen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15407) for the relief of the estate of Howell Tatum, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15408) for the relief of David E. Tatum; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15409) for the relief of Wellborn Echols; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15410) for the relief of the estate of John Tittle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15411) for the relief of the heirs of John W. Gilliam; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15412) granting an increase of pension to William Galligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15413) granting an increase of pension to Charles Oswald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: A bill (H. R. 15414) for the relief of Joseph Welch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON: A bill (H. R. 15415) granting an increase of pension to Robert Chandler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 15416) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Robertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15417) granting an increase of pension to John C. Rote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15418) granting an increase of pension to James Starn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15419) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McKelvey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15420) granting an increase of pension to Milton S. Lawhead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: A bill (H. R. 15421) granting a pension to F. Byron Ridgely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15422) granting a pension to George W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15423) granting a pension to Annie E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15424) granting an increase of pension to Anthony M. Carson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15425) granting a pension to Harry M. Haaga; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 15426) granting a pension to Julia E. Baldwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 15427) granting a pension to Elizabeth Adams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15428) granting a pension to Delia M. Yocum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15429) granting a pension to Emma B. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15430) granting a pension to Jefferson Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15431) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Coy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15432) granting an increase of pension to John Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15433) granting an increase of pension to James R. Power; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 15434) for the relief of W. P. Doran; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 15435) granting an increase of pension to William N. Berkley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 15436) to correct the military record of Erastus Coyle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 15437) granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15438) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lyons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15439) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Knepley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 15440) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Enderlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 15441) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15442) granting an increase of pension to Milo Paden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15443) granting an increase of pension to John C. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15444) granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 15445) for the relief of Bayard T. Garrabrant; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIS: A bill (H. R. 15446) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 15447) for the relief of the estate of James A. Robinson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. AMES: A bill (H. R. 15448) granting an increase of pension to Richard Monahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petitions of Samuel A. Almes, of Apollo, Pa., and Henry Rauch, of Minneapolis, Minn., in favor of reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to David A. Davidson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AMES: Papers to accompany bill for an increase of pension to Richard Monahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Leffler Bros., of Leipsic, Ohio, favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions adopted by the Seventh-day Adventist Church of New Philadelphia, Ohio, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 237; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. J. Portz and 30 prominent farmers of Newcomerstown, Ohio, favoring the immediate enactment of the Sulzer parcels-post bill (H. R. 14); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of Axtell J. Byles, of Titusville, Pa., favoring Lincoln memorial road; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Memorial of Black Hills Hebrew congregation, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging abrogation of Russian treaty of 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Memorial of congregation of Beth Israel, of Milwaukee, Wis., urging the termination of the American-Russian treaty of 1832; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Milwaukee Branch, Lake Seamen's Union, in favor of House bill 11372; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 15292; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: Papers to accompany House bill 14756; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of Milwaukee (Wis.) Feeders, Helpers, and Job Pressmen's Union, No. 27, indorsing House bill 11372; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of McKeesport, Pa., in favor of reduction of duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE FOREST: Petitions of the Stables Co. and L. W. Killen, of Schenectady, N. Y., favoring a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Memorial of Rockville (Mo.) Seventh-day Adventist Church, against the passage of House bill 9433; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: Papers in support of House bill 14532; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of the Keystone Manufacturing Co., of Buffalo, N. Y.; of Sibley, Lindsay & Curr Co. and Defender Photo Supply Co., of Rochester, N. Y.; and of New York Leather Belting Co., of New York City, in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of William A. Pinn, of New York City, protesting against H. R. 11023; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: Memorial of B'nai Jacob Lodge, No. 130, Grand Lodge of the Independent Western Star Order, of Belaire, Ohio, in regard to abolition of Russian passports unless dignity of United States is maintained; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Protective Tariff League, concerning the revision of the tariff, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Hod Carriers and Building Laborers' Union, Local No. 134, of Ottawa, Ill., in favor of the Boober bill (H. R. 5601); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Manufacturing Chemists' Association of the United States, in favor of the maintenance of the Tariff Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Avery Co., of Peoria, Ill., in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Albert Spicer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Memorial of Lodge No. 13, Independent Western Star Order, urging abrogation of Russian treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Memorials of William Schreiber Lodge, No. 628, Independent Order B'rith Abraham; of First Botoschan American Sick Benefit Association; and of Isaac Elchonon Independent Benefit Lodge, all of New York City, favoring the abrogation of the Russian treaty of 1832 and requesting Congress to adopt the Harrison-Goldfogle-Sulzer resolutions (H. J. Res. 5 and 40); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: Memorial of Nathan Marcus Lodge, No. 72, Independent Order Free Sons of Judah, urging the abrogation of the Russian treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of Acheduth Club, of Hartford, Conn., urging abrogation of treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Memorial of Silk City Lodge, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of Paterson, N. J., urging abrogation of treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Memorial of Ferndale (Wash.) Seventh-day Adventist Church, against the passage of House bill 9433; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. W. Swanson and 16 other prominent business men of Ferndale, Wash., protesting against the enactment by Congress of any legislation for the extension of the parcels-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KINDRED: Memorial of Lodge No. 38, Independent Order Ahawas Israel, urging abrogation of treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Congressional Committee of Equal Rights Association of Kentucky, relative to proposed amendment to Federal Constitution; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, memorial of Supreme Council, United Commercial Travelers Association, relative to efficiency of Life-Saving Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOPP: Petition of citizens of Grant County, Wis., relative to Russian passports; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: Memorial of Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Disciple, and Congregational churches, of Champaign, Ill., favoring ratification of the arbitration treaties with England and France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of National League for Medical Freedom, urging that medical practice in Panama Canal Zone be not limited to any one school of medicine; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of Lodge No. 580, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, urging abrogation of the treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Memorial of California State Federation of Labor, urging that a battleship be constructed at the Mare Island Navy Yard, during the Panama Exposition; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, memorial of Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, urging appointment of John K. Bulger as supervising inspector, first district, Steamboat-Inspection Service of the United States; also the appointment of Joseph P. Dolan to position of local inspector at San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of California State Federation of Labor, urging extension and enlargement of the Chinese-exclusion act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Presbytery of Los Angeles, Synod of California, relative to use of the Bible in the public schools of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the Providence Board of Trade, urging necessity of suitable landing place and properly lighted harbor at Point Judith, R. I.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of some citizens of Rhode Island, to have duty on raw and refined sugars reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PARRAN: Papers to accompany House bill 14426, granting an increase of pension to Alfred K. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: Memorials of Congregation Ados Israel, of Hartford, Conn.; of Ararat Lodge, No. 13, Independent Order of B'nai B'rith; and of the Acheduth Club, favoring the abrogation of the Russian treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Sarah Rogers Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, in favor of Federal children's bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Resolutions of the Trans-Mississippi Congress, against the proposed establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Cook County Lodge, No. 266, Order B'rith Abraham, urging termination of treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of 275 medical men, urging passage of House bill 30, for the reestablishment of the canteen in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of First Baptist Church of Riverside, Cal., in favor of arbitration treaties with Great Britain and France; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Louisville Commercial Club and the Manufacturers' Association of Racine, Wis., urging expenditure of first \$500,000 as authorized by House bill 3088, Sixty-first Congress, at City of Mexico, Rio de Janeiro, and Tokyo; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorials of Socialer Turn Verein, consisting of 360 members, urging investigation of the administration of the immigration office at Ellis Island; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TILSON: Memorial of Lodge No. 479, Order B'rith Abraham, urging abrogation of treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITACRE: Petition of New Berlin Literary Club, of New Berlin, Ohio, for repeal of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 31, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters, in favor of House bill 5601; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of L. M. Barth Co.; Local Union No. 42, National Brotherhood of Operative Potters; and Watchcase Engravers' International Association of America, urging repeal of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorials urging abrogation of treaty with Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Arthur G. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petitions of C. W. Deeds, of Rawson, Ohio; Dr. B. F. Kearney, of Delaware, Ohio; and A. H. Henkle, of West Liberty, Ohio, asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 15250, granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 12, 1911.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

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

Mary A. Curran, executrix of the estate of John J. Curran, deceased, late claimant in his own right and as sole heir of Murty Curran, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 146);

W. J. Goodwin v. United States (S. Doc. No. 147); and

Ada E. Much, widow of George W. Much, deceased; William W. Nalley; James M. O'Neill; Henry S. Walker, administrator of Adam L. Rose, deceased; and Joseph Thompson v. United States (S. Doc. No. 145).

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8619. An act to amend "An act to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1906; and

H. R. 13041. An act to provide for the support and maintenance of bastards in the District of Columbia.