

May I ask the Senator having the bill in charge how long he desires to continue in session?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That depends upon how long the Senator from Utah desires to speak.

Mr. KING. The Senator from Utah has not exhausted his subject.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is a very interesting speech, and we might go on for an hour longer. I will leave it to the Senator's convenience.

Mr. KING. I think some Senators have exhibited impatience at the speech, notably the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite the contrary. I have enjoyed it very much.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am sure everyone is enjoying the speech of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I am quite sure that most Senators would be glad to take a recess at this time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think the Senator had better go on and finish his speech. The Senate would be delighted to hear the Senator further.

Mr. KING. The distinguished Senator from Alabama is very considerate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us go on.

Mr. KING. Upon this item I shall conclude in 15 minutes in the morning.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Could not the Senator go on and conclude now?

Mr. KING. I can stop now if the Senator desires.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the Senator is through with his speech on this item I am willing to take a recess right now, but rather than that he should proceed to-morrow, I would prefer that he should conclude to-night.

Mr. KING. I would not want to promise that I shall say nothing on this item to-morrow. There may be some additional light that might be satisfactory to the Senator from Alabama, and I would be derelict in my duty if I did not bring it to his attention.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me suggest to the Senator from Alabama that if he gets the promise of the Senator from Utah that he will conclude in 15 minutes to-morrow morning, he will save time by taking a recess now.

Mr. KING. On this item I shall not take more than 15 minutes further.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a very great desire to oblige the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Utah, I am sure, is a little wearied from his effort.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; let us take a recess.

RECESS.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 1, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 31, 1919.

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

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

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, take us into Thine everlasting arms and hold us close to Thee, that we may feel the pulsations of Thy loving heart, be uplifted, strengthened, purified, ennobled; that in the onward march of time we may satisfy our better self, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.

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

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 15462) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and with the accompanying report (No. 1019) ordered to be printed.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois reserves all points of order on the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

H. R. 12001. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

BELIEF FROM INFORMAL CONTRACTS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question. Recently we had before the Committee on Mines and Mining a bill relating to the settlement of mining claims, growing out of the bill we passed, which I think became a law on October 5 last. I have not had time to examine the bill as passed by the Senate carefully, but I understand that there was added to the bill in the Senate an amendment known, perhaps, as the Henderson amendment, covering the very thing that is covered in a bill that has been considered somewhat by the Committee on Mines and Mining of this House, but upon which our committee has taken no action. I think this is a very important matter. It has never been considered by the House for a moment, and no conclusion has been reached by the Committee on Mines and Mining; but we did go into the matter far enough to discover that it involved the expenditure, perhaps, of millions of dollars. Will the gentleman agree that in case the Senate does not recede from that amendment the House shall have an opportunity to consider it and vote upon it before an agreement is reached?

Mr. DENT. I hope the gentleman will not ask me to make an absolute promise in regard to that. My attention has recently been called to that amendment known as section 7 of the bill. I will state to the gentleman that so far as I am personally concerned I am not inclined to have an extraneous proposition like that incorporated in this bill. It does not come under the jurisdiction of the War Department. It is entirely foreign to the original purpose of the bill; but I would not like to make a hard and fast promise on the subject.

Mr. HAMLIN. In all the time I have served here I have never made this request before, and I am not now saying that I would not favor some plan to adjust these so-called mining claims; but I have gone into the matter just far enough to convince me that it involves a great amount of money, and I am not at all certain that there is a great deal of merit in these claims. I feel that under these circumstances we ought not to send this bill to conference, with the possibility that it will come back in such form that we will have to vote up or vote down the whole conference report in order to obtain consideration of this particular amendment. I think the House ought to have some opportunity to consider it before there is a possibility of agreement upon it.

Mr. DENT. I agree with the gentleman's general statement, but I hope he will not ask me to make any absolute assurance as to what the conferees will or will not do. I have had a conference with the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War, Mr. Stettinius, who has been representing the War Department in France for some time, and I can state that the contractual situation that we have entered into in England and in France is getting to be quite embarrassing. Unless some legislation is passed on this subject, and passed quickly, this Government is going to suffer some embarrassment.

Mr. HAMLIN. I appreciate all of that, and so far as the part of the bill that the gentleman is specially interested in, the House did consider that. I raise no question at all about that, and I am more than willing to trust to the gentleman's judgment. But upon this matter, which is largely extraneous and I think hardly germane—

Mr. DENT. I do not think it is at all germane—

Mr. HAMLIN. I want the House to have a chance to consider it.

Mr. GARNER. This mining proposition is a very important matter. I do not see any reason why the gentleman can not tell the House that on a matter of this importance if the Sen-

ate is not willing to recede from that amendment he will bring it back to the House.

Mr. HAMLIN. That is what I ask.

Mr. GARNER. I do not like to encumber the gentleman, but this is a big proposition, and the Senate may say to the gentleman, "Very well, now, if you are not willing to take this amendment you can not have any bill"; and if they do that, I for one am willing that we shall not have any bill. I think the gentleman ought to come back to the House before agreeing to a legislative proposition.

Mr. MANN. Why may we not have a vote on this proposition this morning?

Mr. GARNER. I am perfectly willing, as far as that is concerned. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I do not believe in making these requests of the conferees except on matters of tremendous importance, but this is a matter of tremendous importance, and the pressure that will be brought to bear upon the gentleman and upon the other conferees, owing to the desire to get this contract law on the statute books quickly, will be very great, and I do not know how far he would be inclined to yield on that proposition.

Mr. MANN. Why not take the sentiment of the House this morning upon it?

Mr. HAMLIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the trouble about that is that the House has not the information that it ought to have about it this morning. If the House will bear with me a minute, recently the miners of the country—the fellows who are going to present these claims—had a convention at Washington and prepared a bill which was introduced by request by the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining in this House. Our committee had taken it up and had one preliminary meeting. I as a member of the committee was present, and we tried to get all the information we could. I confess that I am not prepared to vote on it this morning.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman may not be prepared to vote on the proposition that is before the committee, but he may be prepared to vote whether it should go in as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. HAMLIN. Oh, I would vote against it this morning; against its going into this bill in the light that I have.

Mr. MANN. Everybody knows that on new propositions there will not be given great consideration in the remaining days of this Congress, because time renders that impossible. We have to do things offhand more or less, and why not take the sentiment of the House this morning on this proposition, not merely on a formal rejection, but have the House vote on it.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am willing to have the House vote on it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, in order to facilitate the passage of the bill and get it to conference, I will promise the House that if the Senate does not recede on this proposition I will bring it back to the House for a vote.

Mr. MANN. I think it would be better to take the vote now.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think perhaps it is better this way, because the Senate may recede.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. KAHN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. SCHALL, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for one week on account of delivering an address at McKinley Memorial at Niles, Ohio.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15018, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

DIVISION OF PUBLICATIONS.

Salaries, Division of Publications: One chief of division, \$3,500; 1 chief editor, \$3,000; 1 assistant chief of division, \$2,500; 1 superintendent of distribution, \$2,500; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 assistant, \$2,000; 1 assistant, \$1,400; one assistant in charge of indexing, \$2,000; 1 indexer, \$1,400; 1 assistant in charge of illustrations, \$2,100; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,600 each; 2 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,500 each; 3 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,400 each; 1 draftsman or photographer, \$1,300; 10 draftsmen or photographers, at \$1,200 each; 1 lantern-slide colorist, \$840; 1 laboratory aid, \$720; 1 assistant in charge of document section, \$2,000; 1 assistant in document section, \$1,800; 1 assistant in document section, \$1,400; 1 foreman, miscellaneous distribution, \$1,500; 1 clerk, class 3; 2 clerks, class

2; 10 clerks, class 1; 16 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 40 clerks, at \$900 each; 21 clerks, at \$840 each; 5 machine operators, at \$1,200 each; 5 skilled laborers, at \$1,000 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 7 skilled laborers, at \$840 each; 4 skilled laborers, at \$780 each; 1 chief folder, \$1,200; 1 messenger or laborer, \$900; 13 messengers or laborers, at \$720 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$720; 1 folder, \$1,000; 2 folders, at \$900 each; 2 skilled laborers, at \$1,100 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$1,000; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 7 messenger boys, at \$720 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$600 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$420 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 1 laborer, \$840; 2 laborers, at \$600 each; 3 charwomen, at \$480 each; 3 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$195,620.

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

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio withhold his amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I rise to make an inquiry as to the two new positions provided for in this paragraph, one a "chief editor at \$3,000" and a "superintendent of distribution at \$2,500." The chief editor and the superintendent of distribution are new positions. Can the gentleman inform me whether they have heretofore been carried on a lump-sum roll?

Mr. LEVER. No; they are new places. The one for superintendent of distribution has been carried heretofore under another fund. The chief editor is a new place. The Assistant Secretary urged upon us the necessity for the chief editor. Heretofore the work of editing has been done by a committee sitting around the table. The Assistant Secretary says that the plan of editing the publications by a committee is not at all satisfactory; that there ought to be somebody who has the final word on the proposition. They will retain the committee, which will make its recommendations, and then the chief editor, who should be a practical newspaper man with agricultural training, shall have the final decision on any proposition before it goes into print.

Mr. STAFFORD. You pay him a pretty high salary for this work.

Mr. LEVER. It is a high salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. You give him a salary that for many years was paid to the chief of a division. Does this relieve the chief of the division of some work so that it makes his position a sinecure?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, no; the chief of the division is not an editor.

Mr. STAFFORD. Des he not pretend to exercise that function?

Mr. LEVER. No; not the functions of chief editor. Let me tell about the salary. The first recommendation by the department was for \$2,750. The Assistant Secretary came before the committee and said it was absolutely impossible to get the type of man desired for this work at that salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Assistant Secretary has not had a long connection with the Government, has he?

Mr. LEVER. About 12 months.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think he realizes the tenacity with which persons connected with the Federal service retain their hold, and the desire of persons outside to get into the service; otherwise I think he would have a different viewpoint as to whether \$2,750 would get a desirable man for this position. We are paying editors in other bureaus \$2,000.

Mr. LEVER. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not want to put my judgment up against others. I am informed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] that the chief of the bureau was only paid \$2,500 for a great number of years.

Mr. LEVER. That information is true. Mr. Hill was paid \$2,500 a year when the total appropriations for the Agricultural Department were only a few million dollars as against thirty millions now.

Mr. HAUGEN. He was an editor, and became recognized for his ability by the people in all sections of the world.

Mr. LEVER. He was a great man; no question about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri as to the necessity of the superintendent of distribution.

Mr. RUBEY. A year ago, when we passed the emergency appropriation act, or food-production act, they rearranged the work in this division and selected a man and gave him the title of superintendent of distribution. This man has held the position for 27 years; he entered the service in 1892 and had gone through every stage of promotion, and a year ago, when they wanted the best man they could find, they selected him and gave him the title of superintendent of distribution, at \$2,500.

Now, the department is asking—and in their estimates they say that this employee's salary is now paid from the emergency