

UTAH.

L. P. Nelson to be postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Utah, in place of Thomas Brady. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1915.

Henry W. Wadley to be postmaster at Pleasant Grove, Utah, in place of Luella E. Thorne. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

VERMONT.

David P. MacKenzie to be postmaster at Island Pond, Vt., in place of John S. Sweeney. Incumbent's commission expires January 26, 1915.

VIRGINIA.

William H. Maffett to be postmaster at Vienna, Va., in place of Edmond L. S. Bouton, removed.

John L. Pulley to be postmaster at Ivor, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

T. W. Richardson to be postmaster at Bedford (late Bedford City), Va., in place of William H. Mosby, deceased; change name of office.

WASHINGTON.

Stonewall J. Craig to be postmaster at Clarkston, Wash., in place of S. D. Steininger. Incumbent's commission expires February 1, 1915.

George T. Heslin to be postmaster at Newport, Wash., in place of Carl M. Johanson. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

Calvin W. Stewart to be postmaster at Tacoma, Wash., in place of F. L. Stocking. Incumbent's commission expires February 23, 1915.

WISCONSIN.

Thomas N. Curran to be postmaster at Campbellsport, Wis., in place of Platt Durand. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Henry B. Kaempfer to be postmaster at West Bend, Wis., in place of William Hausmann. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1915.

John J. Kaiser to be postmaster at Stratford, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1915.

John A. Kuypers to be postmaster at De Pere, Wis., in place of Paul L. Halline. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1915.

Charles J. Janisch to be postmaster at Waterloo, Wis., in place of Alexander Archie. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1915.

George H. Herzog to be postmaster at Racine, Wis., in place of James A. Pritchard. Incumbent's commission expired January 11, 1915.

WEST VIRGINIA.

A. L. Hatfield to be postmaster at Matewan, W. Va. Office became presidential July 1, 1914.

James A. Pyles to be postmaster at New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of R. T. Richardson. Incumbent's commission expires March 3, 1915.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 18 (legislative day of January 15), 1915.

POSTMASTERS.

FLORIDA.

R. E. L. McFarlin, Quincy.

ILLINOIS.

George R. Tilton, Danville.

MICHIGAN.

William H. S. Wood, Howell.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry C. Deible, Reynoldsville.

John E. Guthrie, Summerville.

TENNESSEE.

Felix P. McGinness, Carthage.

E. F. Wilson, Tullahoma.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 18, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

God bless us all, for we all need Thy blessing and Thy help. We are weak; Thou art almighty. We know only a little; Thou knowest all things. We are a mixture of good and evil; Thou are infinitely pure and holy. Impart unto us wisdom, strength, purity, that we may reach the highest results in our calling, satisfy the best that is in us, and accomplish Thy commands; in the spirit of Him who taught us Thy will and left us an example worthy of all emulation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 16, 1915, was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CANTOR, for one week, on account of the death of his son.

To Mr. GARRETT of Texas, for three days, on account of illness in his family.

GOVERNMENT AID TO HOME OWNERS.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of Government aid to home owners, both farm and city.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of aid to home owners. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a communication received from the Boston Chamber of Commerce; also some suggestions in regard to the upbuilding of the American merchant marine and an article written by myself published in the New York World on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing certain resolutions passed by the Boston Chamber of Commerce and also an article which he himself wrote, published in the New York World, on the subject of improving the American merchant marine. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PLAZA AWARDS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago unanimous consent was given that Senate joint resolution 129, relative to the Plaza Commission, be stricken from the calendar and that the resolution lie upon the table. I find it still upon the Union Calendar, and I repeat the request.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the resolution will be stricken from the calendar.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I also ask unanimous consent that House joint resolution 308, relating to the same subject, be stricken from the calendar and that the resolution lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that House joint resolution 308 be stricken from the calendar, and that it lie on the table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing resolutions adopted by Branch No. 520 of the Polish National Alliance, of Toledo, Ohio, on the Smith-Burnett immigration bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing resolutions on the Burnett immigration bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

OLD POST OFFICE, JERSEY CITY, N. J.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9584) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the present old post office and the site thereof in the city of Jersey City, N. J.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the completion of the new Federal building at Jersey City, N. J., and its occupancy by the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell the present old post office and site thereof in said city, after proper advertisement, at public or private sale, on such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, strike out, after the word "discretion," the following words: "sell the present old post office and site thereof in said city, after proper advertisement, at public or private sale, on such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "offer at public sale, after proper advertisement, the present old post office and site in said city, and sell the same to the highest and best bidder."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when this bill was up before, I think, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL] was going to get a statement from the Treasury Department of the value of this site and propose an amendment fixing an upset price.

Mr. HAMILL. I have such a letter, Mr. Speaker, and in the opinion of the Treasury Department this property should be sold at not less than \$25,000. I have drawn an amendment to that effect.

Mr. MANN. Did the gentleman get an estimate of the value from the official taxing or assessing board?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What do they say the value is?

Mr. HAMILL. The actual valuation of the land, as made by the tax assessors of Jersey City, is \$21,700.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman proposes to offer an amendment fixing the upset price at \$25,000?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the basis of the appraisement in Jersey City as to its valuation?

Mr. HAMILL. The full value.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HAMILL. I ask unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word, and is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a speech delivered on December 30, 1914, by a Member of this House, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. GEORGE J. KINDEL, and circulated separately, in which he says:

What if we had a captain of industry like Mr. Ford, of automobile fame; Mr. Wanamaker, of department-store fame; Mr. Woolworth, of the tallest-building fame, at the head of our Postal System. With a man of their caliber as our Postmaster, how long would political hacks such as our Third Assistant Postmaster continue feeding at the public crib?

What valuable service has he rendered to entitle him to a perpetual meal ticket at the hands of our Government?

Mr. Speaker, that comment is as foolish as it is unjust. The Third Assistant Postmaster General of the United States is the Hon. Alexander Monroe Dockery, of Missouri. I notice in this speech, on the front page, something that I never saw on a speech before in my life:

I will mail to commercial or economic bodies, at 75 cents per hundred, or single copies at 1-cent postage stamp.

Now, I assume that if people are required to pay for copies of this speech it will not have a very large circulation, even though the fool killer is considerably behind with his work. But I want to invite the attention of the House, especially the Members who do not know the Third Assistant Postmaster General personally, to the fact that he served for 8 consecutive terms—16 years—as a Member of this House. During that service he was a towering figure on the floor of the House of Representatives. He served on the great Committee on Appropriations of this House. His distinguished services are still evident in all the executive departments of the Government.

Among his other legislative activities he was the author of the celebrated Dockery Act, which for the first time put the accounting system of the Federal Government on a business basis. The Dockery Act gave the Treasury Department the power to outline a uniform system of accounting for the various bureaus of the departments of the Government. Under that act the disbursements in the Treasury Department have been

reduced lower and lower each year in proportion to the amount of money disbursed and the amount of business handled by that great department. The departments are still operating under the Dockery Act, which has saved thousands of dollars of the peoples' money.

Gov. Dockery retired from service in this House when he was elected by the people of Missouri as the governor of that great State in 1900. He served four years as governor. If he had not retired from representing his district to become governor, he would still be a commanding figure on the floor of this House, for he was greatly beloved by the people of his district and greatly revered and beloved by the people of Missouri.

To talk of a meal ticket in connection with the public services of a man like Mr. Dockery is absurd. His public services were at the call of the people of his district and of his State. When his term as governor expired he was out of public life for eight years, his private interests being ample to engage his attention.

He has never asked, and under no other circumstances than a request from the Democratic administration would he accept public service. He has accepted it to my personal knowledge at a personal loss to himself. The idea of a meal ticket has never entered into Mr. Dockery's service to the United States, and does not to-day. The present Postmaster General, who was a Member of this House at the time Mr. Dockery was a leader of the Democratic Party on this floor, invited him into the official family with the full knowledge that Mr. Dockery was one of the principal supporters of the Speaker of this House for the Presidency of the United States.

I know nothing of the dispute between Gov. Dockery and the gentleman from Colorado, except that I understand that Gov. Dockery is seeking to compel the gentleman from Colorado to pay the Government about \$4,000 postage for alleged abuse of the franking privilege. Gov. Dockery, having been a Member of this House, knows the just rights of a Member in the use of the franking privilege. I am satisfied he would not call the gentleman from Colorado to account unless he had grounds to do so. As an honest and vigilant public servant he will not submit to an abuse of the franking privilege at the expense of the Public Treasury. Those of us who desire to see the franking privilege protected from abuse are inclined to support Gov. Dockery's action.

Mr. Dockery's services added luster to the Democratic side of this House; has added luster to the Democratic Party in the State of Missouri, and to-day adds luster to the Democratic administration in Washington; he is a man who never shirked a duty or betrayed a friend. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He needs no defense at my hands on the floor of this House, but I desired to take this opportunity to call these facts to the attention of the Members of this body. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KINDEL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. KINDEL. To move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri made that motion.

Mr. KINDEL. Then I rise, Mr. Speaker, to oppose the amendment. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Gov. Dockery has such a champion as we have just discovered in the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. What I meant to convey was that we put men in office who are positively not qualified for the position in which they are placed. Mr. Dockery himself told me that he did not know anything about the rates that were operating in the parcel post. He could not, to save his life, reconcile the present graduated rates on parcel post, and neither can the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] or anybody else. I contend that any man that will take a position that he does not know anything about is getting a meal ticket and not earning the money which he receives.

Mr. DECKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINDEL. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. DECKER. Does the parcel-post business come under Gov. Dockery's department?

Mr. KINDEL. Yes.

Mr. DECKER. In what way?

Mr. KINDEL. In the management of the receipts and the rules of the Post Office. Can the gentleman himself reconcile these rates?

Mr. DECKER. I am not talking about the rates. I want the gentleman to explain to the House in what way Mr. Dockery has the management of parcel post.

Mr. KINDEL. He is one of the heads of the department.

Mr. DECKER. Does it come under his department?

Mr. KINDEL. He told me I must pay \$4,000 for putting a rubber stamp on some things I put out.

Mr. DECKER. Does it come under Mr. Dockery's department?

Mr. KINDEL. I told the gentleman in a general way that he is one of the heads of the department.

Mr. DECKER. Does the gentleman mean to give the impression that Mr. Dockery is not acquainted with the work and details of his department?

Mr. KINDEL. I emphatically say that he can not reconcile the parcel post's graduated rates upon which they work, and I will leave that challenge open to you or any other man.

Mr. DECKER. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. KINDEL. There is no use in asking any more questions, and I decline to yield any further. I have nothing against Mr. Dockery nor anybody else connected with the Post Office Department. I came here elected a Democrat, to help the country and to help the party, but I found it was utterly useless to get in on the transportation rates, although when I came here I had been studying and giving large attention to those matters for the past 25 years. In everything I have said there is no malice intended toward anybody. All I want to do is to improve the service, if it can be done. I have not made a speech on the floor at any time that I did not inject rates and rules on transportation into it. Mr. Dockery wanted to humiliate and ridicule me by presenting me with a bill for \$4,000, because I had put a rubber stamp on a speech announcing the very fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] has just said concerning the fool killer, and I repeat that speeches do cost money and that I am out of pocket, and if anybody wants more than one copy they must send a 1-cent stamp for each one. I think it would be money well invested and time well spent to study and digest my speech, and if you find anything for criticism in it, I am open to conviction. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The question is on the committee amendment.

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

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 4, insert "Provided, however, That said property shall not be sold for less than the sum of \$25,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that that amendment is perfectly satisfactory to the committee.

The amendment of Mr. HAMILL was agreed to.

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

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

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LOUIS RIVER.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17762) to amend an act approved February 20, 1908, entitled "An act to authorize the Interstate Transfer Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT]. Has the War Department or the engineers of the War Department reported on this bill as yet?

Mr. LENROOT. Not any further than the gentleman is already aware of.

Mr. MILLER. Then they have sent in no formal report upon the bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Not that I know of.

Mr. MILLER. Does not the gentleman think that it is advisable that the consideration of this bill be postponed until such report is received?

Mr. LENROOT. No; but I shall not object if the gentleman makes that request.

Mr. MILLER. Under the circumstances, I think I shall have to ask the gentleman to request that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill which has been reported and the next bill on the calendar, H. R. 15727, be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that this bill and the next one on the calendar be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. I understand there is some controversy in respect to the matter that ought to be first settled.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the condition as to the other bill which he mentions, the one

that follows this on the calendar, is not at all the same as the bill that is now before us, because the Board of Engineers has reported upon that.

Mr. MANN. I thought the gentlemen had agreed upon that. Then I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the bill just reported be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois whether this bill under the circumstances would retain its place upon the calendar or would it go to the bottom of the calendar?

Mr. MANN. I think it ought to retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the gentleman think, because so many of these bills are passed over without prejudice, that they ought to go to the bottom of the calendar?

Mr. MANN. Of course when Members first began to ask unanimous consent to pass the bills over without prejudice, when the Unanimous Consent Calendar first went into effect, I objected; but in the course of time various good reasons were given for passing a particular bill, and that has been the custom from then on.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it prevents a lot of Members from having an opportunity to have their bills considered.

Mr. MANN. I do not care about the matter particularly. If the gentleman desires to object to this, I shall not quarrel with him, but then I shall object to passing any bills over without prejudice, under any circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not mean the first time.

Mr. MANN. If we are going to have that rule, we ought to treat everyone alike. I do not believe in making any distinction in respect to bills as between one Member and another. If the gentleman thinks the bill ought not to be passed over without prejudice, I certainly shall not quarrel with him, if he objects, but I shall object to passing any other bills.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall not object to passing any of them over without prejudice, but I submit that if we do it two or three times on the same bill—

Mr. MANN. Unless there is reason for it, it ought not to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this bill likely to be disposed of on the next unanimous-consent day?

Mr. MANN. I do not know. I understand that they are waiting for a report from the War Department, and it ought to be in.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall not object at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there has been an understanding that this bill and the next bill on the calendar shall be considered as companion bills, and in view of my understanding that the gentleman from Minnesota would object if this bill were presented now, I ask unanimous consent to modify the request of the gentleman from Illinois by including the following bill, and that both bills be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection particularly, because the gentleman from Wisconsin is, of course, ready to make the same objection to the next bill that I have made respecting this, but I do not think it fair to state that the two bills are companion bills.

Mr. LENROOT. I said it is the understanding that they shall be treated together.

Mr. MILLER. I do not quite agree with that. That has been the understanding in times past; but I wish the gentleman to know that if there is any doubt in his mind, regardless of whether the House sees fit to pass the bill or not, I am under the highest obligation and shall be insistent on every effort to consider the other bill. If the department is not able to report upon the gentleman's bill, I can see no reason why the House should not take action upon the bill that has been reported upon.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota, that there was an understanding when these bills were recalled from the Senate that they should be considered together when considered at all.

Mr. MILLER. I had no such understanding with the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman representing the committee which has on this calendar so many bills, not knowing exactly what hands I may fall into and not desiring to make any enemies, as the candidate for membership in the church said when he was asked to renounce the devil and all his works, I will say nothing about the proposition of my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] as to passing bills to the heel of the calendar;

but I will say, as to this pending bill, there has been some conflict over the two bills—this and the next one—as between the two localities represented, respectively, by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], but I think the crux of the difficulty is aimed at in this bill. Our committee recommended and Congress many years ago consented for a bridge. Our committee is now inclined to the opinion that the conditions of the consent of Congress have not been complied with by the company constructing the bridge.

The committee, after elaborate hearings, reported the bill introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], to amend the original act. The War Department, however, had not up to that time concurred with the view of the committee; but I am informed that the War Department is undergoing a change of heart on the subject and that there is likely to come in a report favorable to the bill, and for that reason I think it wise that the matter stand in status quo for the present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to passing this bill and the next one without prejudice? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

FALSE ADVERTISING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to pass without prejudice the bill H. R. 4931, a bill to prevent false advertising in the District of Columbia. I ask it at this time, Mr. Speaker, because when that bill was introduced the District attorney or the prosecuting attorney of the District of Columbia at the time thought it was necessary. The present District attorney doubts whether it is necessary or not, but his attention has only recently been called to the bill, and he would like to have further time to investigate it.

The SPEAKER. What is the calendar number of the bill?

Mr. DENT. It is H. R. 4931, Calendar No. 370.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to pass Unanimous Consent Calendar No. 370 without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

COMMISSION TO SURVEY CRATER BATTLE FIELD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13923) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to designate, define, and survey the battle field of the Crater at Petersburg, Va., and to collect certain data concerning the same and make report thereon.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is ordered stricken from the calendar.

CERTAIN CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST THE STATE OF TENNESSEE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was S. J. Res. 65, to amend S. J. Res. 34, approved May 12, 1893, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims against the United States."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a request for unanimous consent that consideration of this resolution be passed without prejudice—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to pass this resolution without prejudice.

Mr. HULL. For the reason that the Department of Justice has been working on information sought by the gentleman from Illinois and others and has not been able to complete this work, but we are hopeful the desired information may be brought in a little later on.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman, when the information is obtained, have it printed either in the RECORD or in some other form, so that it will be available for Members of the House?

Mr. HULL. I will be very glad to take that up with the gentlemen on the other side.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING, GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4012) to increase the limit of cost of the United States public building at Grand Junction, Colo.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limit of cost of the United States public building at Grand Junction, Colo., be, and the same hereby is, increased from the sum of \$100,000 to the sum of \$200,000, said increase being necessary in order to complete the building according to the present plans and specifications.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$175,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been up, and up, and the House has had some discussions on it once or twice before. The city of Grand Junction is the largest city in the western part of the State. I secured an appropriation some four and a half years ago for \$100,000 to provide a public building there. The Supervising Architect has advertised three different times, and has never been able to get a bid that could be accepted. They can not build any kind of a suitable building for the present appropriation. The matter is at a standstill. It seems that it will be exceptionally expensive to get a suitable foundation. They report that it will cost some \$30,000 to build a proper foundation.

Mr. FINLEY. Right there, let me ask the gentleman, is that the case in every part of the city of Grand Junction, that you have such trouble to get a proper foundation? Why not move the location?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; the whole city is underlaid with some alkali—it would do no good to change the site—they have to make an extensive construction there they claim to stand the weight of this kind of a public building. Furthermore, since the original appropriation was made the Government has established or extended the Reclamation Service there, and has increased the Weather Bureau and other Government functions there. The Treasury Department wants to provide for all of them at the same time, and this authorization only provides for a very plain brick building, while that city, I think, is entitled to a stone or marble building.

Mr. FINLEY. Well, what are the dimensions of the building upon which the plans and specifications have been made?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Eight thousand square feet of floor space, I believe. The report and its hearings give all the details very fully. This matter has been gone into exhaustively by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Supervising Architect and the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, and the Treasury very earnestly recommended and tried to get \$100,000 additional, whereas I am only asking for \$75,000 in this bill.

Mr. FINLEY. I will say this to the gentleman, that this looks too much like a new proposition. It is 75 per cent a new proposition.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is not a new proposition. The original one has been pending and held off for nearly 10 years since we got the site, and nearly 5 years since I got this appropriation. That city is certainly entitled to a public building, and they never can get one until Congress appropriates enough for them to build a building large enough to hold the Government business there.

Mr. FINLEY. It has gone out all over this country that we are to have no public buildings bill this year.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman that if there are to be none of these bills passed this session I do not ask to have this one passed; I do not want any advantage over other equally meritorious bills, not at all. I will say now to the other Members of the House, if that is the program I will subscribe to it instantly. But we have, during the past six months, passed one or two bills of this kind, and there are several more of them on the calendar, and if we are going to pass others I do not want the House to make fish of one and fowl of another. I fully realize that we are all trying to economize in every way, and no one wants to make any appropriation that is not absolutely necessary as an emergency measure. We just passed one small bill somewhat similar to this.

Mr. FINLEY. I was not here when that bill passed; I was at my committee room.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say for the information of the gentleman from South Carolina that it is not the purpose of the committee to report any omnibus public buildings bill.

But we distinctly stated some time ago, and the committee came to that conclusion after hearings and after conferring with the Treasury officials and other officers of the Government,

and even the President himself, that we would only report out such bills as appeared to be emergencies and of urgent necessity.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, just there, will the gentleman give me the urgent necessity in this instance?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let me finish that statement. We particularly described as one of the emergencies which the committee thought ought to be taken care of, cases where authorizations had heretofore been made and where the department had attempted by advertisement to secure contracts for the erection of a building and found, after such effort, that the authorization was inadequate and that the building could not be constructed within the limits of the authorization; and that we would then consider propositions to increase the authorization. That is one of the cases. And for three times, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has stated, advertisements were made and efforts to make contracts were made, and it was found utterly impossible to construct an adequate building for the purposes of Grand Junction within the limits of the authorization.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, just there. I ask the gentleman what facilities are afforded at Grand Junction at this time for the accommodation of the public business?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand that they are extremely meager, though my friend from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] can answer the question.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will answer that. They have the post office in a rented building and without sufficient space. They have the Reclamation Service in another rented building in another part of the city and without sufficient space. They have the Forest Service in another place, and other Federal offices scattered around over the city.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman tell me what rentals are paid?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The report here of the Treasury Department shows that they pay \$1,000 a year rent for the post office; they pay \$750 a year for the Reclamation Service; they pay \$300 a year for the Forest Service; and they pay \$480 a year for the Weather Bureau, and besides that they have the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Justice in separate buildings, and they are establishing a drainage department of the Government that will require considerable room. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the post-office receipts of that city are \$35,000 a year.

Mr. FINLEY. About how much population has Grand Junction?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There are 15,000 served at this office.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If my friend will permit me, I want to say this much further. He ought to recollect that the site for this building was procured some seven or eight years ago. The building was provided for in the public building bill of June 25, 1910, four and a half years ago. Now, the gentleman in his district, presumably, and I in mine and other gentlemen in theirs, had items carried in that bill. The buildings have been constructed. This is not a new proposition, but one which has been pending for all these years. It was carried originally in the bill of 1910, and on account of the fact of this foundation being so peculiar, as has been described, it has been utterly impossible to construct the building within the limits of the authorization. I hope my friend will not object.

Mr. FINLEY. I want to say to the gentleman this, that these are war times. The condition of the Treasury is not such as to warrant any expenditure that is not absolutely necessary, and I am not here contending for anything for any other State or any other district in the Union. But any proposition that looks to an isolated instance, where it is substantially a public building proposition as big as this, it strikes me it can wait until next winter.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman, and I am violating no confidence, I think, when I say that I had a talk with the President on the subject of this character of legislation recently, and I think the gentleman will agree with him that we ought not to stop all matters of public improvement; that where it is necessary for work to be done or where it results in a substantial saving to the Government and can not be done hereafter so well and so economically as it can be done now, it is our duty to do it now.

Mr. FINLEY. I do not understand how there could be so much of error in what would necessarily be the cost and the estimates upon which this proposition was first based.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the Government functions have very greatly increased in that city since this building was originally proposed. The Reclamation Service has a large force there now. Grand Junction is the metropolis of western Colorado and the center of a large part of the Government functions in that part of our

State, and these matters have been developing very much in recent years.

Mr. FINLEY. The figures which you have read amount to about \$2,000 a year in rent.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. More than that. They amount to nearly \$3,000 a year in rent.

Mr. FINLEY. And then the necessary cost of upkeep of a public building would be vastly more. Now, I ask the gentleman how much harm and injury would be done to the public service by letting this matter go over until next winter?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina that this building has gone over now for 8 or 10 years, and it has been 4½ years since I got the original appropriation. If Congress is not going to pass any bills of this kind increasing any existing appropriations at all at this session, then I will acquiesce. However, I will say that there is no case more meritorious or urgent than this one, and if any bills of this kind are to be considered I certainly want to have this bill passed if possible.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will my friend permit one more question? He can realize—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hope the gentleman will withhold that request for a moment. I just wanted to ask one question of my friend, if the gentleman will not insist on it now.

Mr. MANN. I withhold the request for the regular order for a minute.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman this, that here is a case where \$100,000 has already been authorized. It is found that the building can not be constructed for that money. Is it not good business judgment to authorize \$75,000 more now, when the gentleman knows that not a dollar of the \$75,000 will possibly be reached for three years?

Mr. FINLEY. Has the site been obtained?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; seven or eight years ago. The Government owns the site now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18783) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla. The bill was read, with a committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] a question in regard to that.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the right to object as well.

The SPEAKER. Very well.

Mr. MANN. If this increase is granted, will this be the last one that will be asked for?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will say in reply to the gentleman that there is one other bill, which has passed the Senate—

Mr. MANN. I mean the last increase for this building?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MANN. We made two increases before, did we not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but I will say to the gentleman that this is one of the most marvelously growing places in America. There is no question about it.

Mr. MANN. We commenced by making an authorization of \$55,000 in 1908, after we purchased a site for \$7,500 in 1907. Would it not be wise, if this place is growing so rapidly, not to hurry the building, because everything we have done heretofore has fallen short?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; it would be wise to get this additional land as quickly as possible. That is the proposition here.

Mr. MANN. We provided \$55,000 for a building in 1910, and increased it \$25,000 in 1913. It is proposed now, in the early days of 1915, to make another increase. I do not say it is improper, but I just wondered if we could ever tie it up.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think so. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this request does not come from my colleague [Mr. SPARKMAN], who represents St. Petersburg, but it comes from the Treasury Department.

Mr. MANN. I have never found him short in attending to his duties.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. He has not made the request. It comes absolutely from the department itself, and it was on their own initiative that the bill was introduced. Now I yield to my colleague [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I only want to say that when the first authorization of this building was made I called the attention of the Treasury Department, possibly not that of the House, to the fact that the amount authorized was not sufficient for an adequate building there. That was in 1910. This they realized later. In the next act, in the bill of 1913, they provide for an increase of \$25,000, which it contains. Again I warned that increase was not enough, and that they would yet need a further increase.

Last summer, when they were believed to begin work on the building, they found that the amount as increased would not suffice, and of their own initiative they sent an agent down there to look into the matter, who, after a thorough investigation, reported that they would need at least the amount which they ask for here, and which this bill carries.

Now as to the urgency of the matter, I doubt if there is one more so. Why, at this very time, and for several months past, the post-office authorities have been utilizing the municipal building—the city hall—of St. Petersburg as a post office, because they can not find any other suitable place for that purpose that is more available. Among other difficulties, the rents are higher there than the Post Office Department is willing to pay. Of course, no one will rent to the Government when he can get more from other parties, and but for the fact that the city itself lets them use a part of its own building, they would have no place there in that beautiful, progressive town in which to carry on the post-office business.

This bill, as has been stated by my colleague [Mr. CLARK], is very meritorious. There is certainly none on the entire calendar more so. The city is growing as rapidly as any other in Florida, and that means in the country. Its post-office receipts have grown from \$13,661 in 1908 to \$44,913 in 1914. Its normal population is now about 10,000, with a winter population of perhaps 25,000; and I would suggest that we had better provide for the building now and get it started, otherwise we may be soon called upon for a further increase.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, we have here, as has been stated, an appropriation for a building in the State of Florida. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Florida that, in view of the large amount of money that is collected from the different States by direct tax, Florida has already had its share.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As to that I want to say that Florida, up to this time, has not gotten anything. She has not asked for anything.

Mr. DONOVAN. Then I object. If the gentleman does not know what is going on down there and makes that statement, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] objects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

REGULATION OF TRAFFIC DURING PARADES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2415) relating to the exclusion of traffic from the streets and avenues of the District of Columbia during parades.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that the House committee seems to have taken something for granted because this bill was prepared by the corporation counsel and because it already had been passed by the Senate. But I find on the first page, toward the end of line 7 and throughout line 8, when taken in connec-

tion with what follows, that the bill either gives concurrent jurisdiction to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and to the police court or it gives conflicting jurisdiction; I can not certainly tell which. Besides that, the bill nowhere creates the offense of misdemeanor or felony or any other specific offense. I therefore object to its present consideration, and further ask that the bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects, and asks that the bill be laid on the table. Is there objection to his request?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should have the bill laid on the table without its being considered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call the attention of the gentleman to the title of this bill "relating to the exclusion of traffic from the streets and avenues of the District of Columbia during parades." It would seem to pertain to vehicular traffic and not to the granting of permits to parade. But the bill itself apparently empowers the commissioners to grant permits to parade, and then it imposes a fine of \$40 for the violation of such regulation as they may provide. It is not clear to me, as I read the bill in connection with the title, whether the imposition of this penalty, which seems to be delegated to the commissioners, is to be against street car companies or vehicles that may interrupt a parade, or against those who parade without a permit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I wish to say to the gentleman that in construing a statute the court will not take the title into consideration in connection with the bill; and if he will look at the end of line 7 and all of line 8, taken in connection with what follows, I apprehend that it may confer judicial power upon the commissioners to convict and impose fines.

Mr. MOORE. It reads that way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I do not think the commissioners ought to have judicial powers.

Mr. MOORE. I am not going to object to the motion to refer the bill back to the committee, but I think—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the entire calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to recommit the bill to the Committee on the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

PETER LASSEN NATIONAL PARK, CAL.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 52) to establish the Peter Lassen National Park in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington objects. The bill will be stricken from the calendar.

ALCATRAZ ISLAND.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9017) transferring the control and jurisdiction of Alcatraz Island, and its buildings thereon from the Department of War to the Department of Labor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Alcatraz Island and all its buildings thereon, now under the control and jurisdiction of the Department of War, and now used as and known, designated as and called the United States military prison on Alcatraz Island, Cal., be, and the same hereby is, transferred to the Department of Labor to be used by the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, the said Alcatraz Island and all its buildings thereon to be hereafter under the exclusive control and jurisdiction of the Department of Labor.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That Alcatraz Island and all buildings, machinery, and improvements thereon, now under the control and jurisdiction of the Department of War, and used for and known as the Pacific branch, United States military prison, on Alcatraz Island, Cal., be, and the same hereby is, except as herein otherwise provided, transferred to the Department of Labor to be used by the Bureau of Immigration as an immigration station or for such other uses as may be provided for by law. The said Alcatraz Island, together with all buildings, machinery, and improvements thereon, shall be hereafter under the exclusive control and jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, subject to the provisions of the

act of Congress approved September 28, 1850, providing for a lighthouse at Alcatraz Island."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to say that there does not appear to be any compensation to the War Department for the transfer of a very valuable piece of property.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, there is no compensation provided in this bill. After all, it would be simply a matter of bookkeeping—transferring in the Treasury Department from one page of the ledger to another page of the ledger the cost of the buildings.

This transfer is really needed at the present time. Alcatraz Island, in the bay of San Francisco, is about 2 miles from the mainland, and has on it a comparatively new building, completed probably three or four years ago for a military prison.

The War Department has recently inaugurated a new policy with reference to military prisoners. As I understand it, the new regulation went into effect on or about September 30 last. Many of the prisoners confined in this military prison are deserters. They are serving time for desertion, ranging from one year to two or three years. Some of them, too, are serving time for felonies that were committed by them while they were in the Army. The War Department feels that when a soldier has deserted and is willing to serve out his time and get an honorable discharge, it should be the policy of the department to give that man a chance to redeem himself. I understand that the Navy Department has carried out such a policy for some years quite successfully. The War Department has now taken it up.

The purpose of the War Department is to rehabilitate an old fortification built in 1861, located at the northern extremity of the peninsula of San Francisco, known as Fort Point. This fort is a very substantial building. At a comparatively small cost of money it has been renovated and made habitable for disciplinary companies of soldiers who deserted and who are trying to redeem themselves. The War Department feels that these soldiers can be used to some advantage if they are placed in these disciplinary barracks at Fort Point; that their labor can be utilized in the construction of roads and walks, and the care of the grounds in the military posts in and about the bay of San Francisco.

The present immigration station is located on Angel Island, between 4 and 5 miles from San Francisco and approximately 3 miles north of Alcatraz Island. That station was completed about 10 years ago. With the exception of the building which contains the dynamos and boilers, as I now recall, the buildings are of wood construction. At the present time the sole occupants are orientals, Chinese and Japanese and Hindu immigrants who come from oriental countries to San Francisco.

There is no doubt that with the opening of the Panama Canal additional immigration buildings will have to be constructed. There are no accommodations, or there would be no accommodations at present, for white immigrants coming to San Francisco if they should come in any considerable numbers, and it is believed that they will come in considerable numbers as soon as the canal is formally opened for the traffic of the world. In view of that fact, the Secretary of Labor, negotiating with the War Department, and the War Department, feeling that a considerable saving could be made to the Government by transferring those buildings to the Department of Labor, has asked for this legislation.

Mr. MOORE. Has the Department of Labor indicated that it wants it?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. In the report of the Committee on Military Affairs on this bill the gentleman will find the statement that the Commissioner of Immigration and the Secretary of Labor both want the transfer.

Mr. MOORE. It would not want the buildings for prison purposes?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, no. At a very small expense they could be converted into very desirable quarters for immigrants.

Mr. MOORE. Hospital purposes?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, there is a splendid hospital there. The buildings are of modern reinforced-concrete construction, only completed three or four years ago.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Would there not be another advantage that the gentleman overlooked in having this transfer, that instead of these disciplinary companies being located some 5 miles away, and being transferred back and forth every day at a loss of three or four hours' time, they might be conveniently employed if they were located at Fort Point?

Mr. KAHN. That is very true. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

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

Mr. KAHN. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Is it not rather a reflection on the War Department that they should construct these modern buildings, almost finishing them now, and then immediately find out that they are not proper for the service for which they were constructed or that the place is not a proper one?

Mr. KAHN. The buildings themselves were constructed by prison labor, so that the actual cost of construction was not very great. But, as I stated at the very outset, the War Department has recently—in fact, within the last year—inaugurated an entirely new policy so far as the treatment of military prisoners is concerned. At the time the buildings were commenced no such policy was in contemplation. The fact that they have changed the former policy makes it advisable to transfer these buildings to another branch of the Government service that certainly will require buildings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MOORE. Are these buildings known as prison buildings?

Mr. KAHN. They are known as the United States Military Prison, Branch of the Pacific.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman knows that it would be very unhappy to call buildings "prison buildings" that were to be devoted to immigration purposes.

Mr. KAHN. If they are turned over to the Department of Labor, they will be known as the United States Immigration Station. The very fact that these buildings occupy a very conspicuous location in the bay of San Francisco and are designated as a United States military prison, in my judgment, is exceedingly detrimental to the War Department.

Mr. NORTON. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that one of the principal reasons for desiring this change is the sentimental one that the citizens of San Francisco are opposed to having this prison located in the harbor on this island?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is entirely mistaken; the sentimental reason probably occurred to me rather than to anybody else. As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I do not think it a good thing to have such a conspicuous building as that pointed out as a military prison; but there is not a citizen of San Francisco who has expressed any opinion on the subject as far as I know. They are willing to have it there no matter what it is called, but the Immigration Service requires additional buildings and will have to have them, and in the interest of economy it is desirable to make this transfer.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the report shows that within the past two years \$250,000 has been expended in the construction of a new prison building on this island. It occurs to me that there is no immediate need for a change of the control of this building from the War Department to the Immigration Department, except that it be for the satisfaction of some citizens in San Francisco to improve the harbor and have these buildings designated as an immigration station rather than as a prison. Further than that, it means that a large appropriation will soon be asked for in the improving of the harbor and for the construction of other prison buildings on the mainland. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have referred back to the Committee on Naval Affairs the naval appropriation bill (H. R. 20975) in order to correct one paragraph that does not accurately express the action of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER. The unanimous action of the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. By inadvertence, the language does not accurately express the action of the committee.

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

Mr. MANN. I did not hear the request.

Mr. PADGETT. I am asking to have the naval appropriation bill, which is on the calendar, referred back to the Committee on Naval Affairs in order to correct some inaccurate language.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

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

MALAMBO FIRE CLAIMANTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 4254, an act to enable the Secretary of War to pay the amount awarded to the Malambo fire claimants by the joint commission under article 6 of the treaty of November 18, 1903, between the United States and Panama.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill S. 5614, for the improvement of the foreign service, which provides for the reorganization of the Consular Service and the secretaries in the Diplomatic Service.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all appointments of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and of consuls general and consuls shall be by commission to the offices of secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, or consul, and not by commission to any particular post, and that such officers shall be assigned to posts and transferred from one post to another by order of the President as the interests of the service may require: *Provided*, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years, unless the public interest demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year, and no longer: *Provided further*, That no secretary, consul general, or consul shall be promoted to a higher class except upon the nomination of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 2. That secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and consuls general and consuls shall hereafter be graded and classified as follows, with the salaries of each class herein affixed thereto:

SECRETARIES.

Secretary of class 1, \$3,000.
Secretary of class 2, \$2,625.
Secretary of class 3, \$2,000.
Secretary of class 4, \$1,500.
Secretary of class 5, \$1,200.

CONSULS GENERAL.

Consul general of class 1, \$12,000.
Consul general of class 2, \$8,000.
Consul general of class 3, \$6,000.
Consul general of class 4, \$5,500.
Consul general of class 5, \$4,500.

CONSULS.

Consul of class 1, \$8,000.
Consul of class 2, \$6,000.
Consul of class 3, \$5,000.
Consul of class 4, \$4,500.
Consul of class 5, \$4,000.
Consul of class 6, \$3,500.
Consul of class 7, \$3,000.
Consul of class 8, \$2,500.
Consul of class 9, \$2,000.

SEC. 3. That section 1685 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1685. That for such time as any secretary of embassy or legation shall be lawfully authorized to act as chargé d'affaires ad interim at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his salary as secretary of embassy or legation, compensation equal to the difference between such salary and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the ambassador or minister at such post; and for such time as any vice consul shall be lawfully authorized to assume charge of a consulate general or consulate during the absence of the principal officer at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his regular salary or compensation as a subordinate consular officer or employee, compensation equal to the difference between such salary or compensation and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the principal consular officer at such post."

SEC. 4. That a secretary, consul general, or consul of whatever class detailed for special duty outside of the city of Washington shall be paid his actual and necessary expenses for subsistence during such special detail: *Provided*, That such special duty shall not continue for more than 60 days unless in the case of international gatherings, congresses, or conferences, when such subsistence expenses shall run only during the life of the international gathering, congress, or conference, as the case may be.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of State is directed to report from time to time to the President, along with his recommendations for promotion or for transfer between the department and the foreign service, the names of those secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and the names of those consular officers or departmental officers or employees who by reason of efficient service, an accurate record of which shall be kept in the Department of State, have demonstrated special efficiency, and also the names of persons found upon examination to have fitness for appointment to the lower grades of the service.

SEC. 6. That section 1674 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1674. That the official designations employed throughout this title shall be deemed to have the following meanings, respectively:

"First. 'Consul general' and 'consul' shall be deemed to denote full, principal, and permanent consular officers as distinguished from subordinates and substitutes.

"Second. 'Consular agent' shall be deemed to denote consular officers subordinate to such principals exercising the powers vested in them and performing the duties prescribed for them by regulation of the President at posts or places different from those at which such principals are located, respectively.

"Third. 'Vice consuls' shall be deemed to denote consular officers subordinate to such principals exercising and performing the duties within the limits of their consulates at the same or at different points and places from those at which the principals are located, except that when vice consuls take charge of consulates general or consulates when the principal officers shall be temporarily absent or relieved from duty they shall be deemed to denote consular officers who shall be substituted, temporarily, to fill the places of said consuls general or consuls.

"Fourth. 'Consular officer' shall be deemed to include consuls general, consuls, vice consuls, interpreters in consular offices, student interpreters, and consular agents, and none others.

"Fifth. 'Diplomatic officer' shall be deemed to include ambassadors, envoys extraordinary, ministers plenipotentiary, ministers resident, commissioners, chargés d'affaires, agents, secretaries of embassy and legation, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, and none others."

The offices of vice consul general, deputy consul general, and deputy consul are abolished.

SEC. 7. That no ambassador, minister, minister resident, diplomatic agent, or secretary in the Diplomatic Service of any grade or class shall, while he holds his office, be interested in or transact any business as a merchant, factor, broker, or other trader, or as an agent for any such person to, from, or within the country or countries to which he or the chief of his mission, as the case may be, is accredited, either in his own name or in the name or through the agency of any other person, nor shall he, in such country or countries, practice as a lawyer for compensation or be interested in the fees or compensation of any lawyer so practicing.

SEC. 8. That this act shall take effect on the 30th day of September, 1914, when all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are repealed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that if this bill is to be passed at this session it should be passed now, in order that it may be provided for in the appropriation bill. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman from Virginia state what the difference is between the Senate bill and the bill as reported from his committee. I notice that the Senate bill is quite different from the House bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The differences are slight.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Is the gentleman's request for consideration, or is it a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. His request is to take from the Speaker's table this bill and consider it.

Mr. MOORE. Does that admit of an opportunity for debate as under suspension of the rules? Under the suspension of the rules there would be 20 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The suspension of the rules has nothing to do with it. The Chair put it ahead because if the bill is to be passed at all it should be passed now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman postpone the consideration of this bill until later in the afternoon, when we may have an opportunity to examine it? We have not been able to obtain the print that has been read by the Clerk.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say to the gentleman that 10 minutes have elapsed since I sent for my copy, and I have just been able to obtain it.

Mr. STAFFORD. And we are not certain of the copy we have received. The bill that I have in my hand does not show that it is the bill that passed the Senate.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If I could be recognized a little later, I would be perfectly willing to postpone the consideration of the matter now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know about that. He can not tell what the state of the business will be in two or three hours. The Chair will promise to recognize the gentleman, however, as soon as we get through with the next two of these bills. Will that be satisfactory to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know how much time that will take, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is simply asking if the gentleman would like to have that much time.

Mr. STAFFORD. That certainly will be better than taking it up for consideration now.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Chair to make that the next three bills.

The SPEAKER. Very well; make it the next three.

MAJORS IN ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17765) to regulate the details of majors in the Ordnance Department.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That majors may be detailed in the Ordnance Department, under section 26 of the act approved February 2, 1901, and acts amendatory thereof, without a compulsory period of service out of that department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HONOLULU, HAWAII.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 5295) to amend existing legislation providing for the acquisition of a site and the construction of a building thereon for the accommodation of the post office, United States courts, customhouse, and other governmental offices at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the acts of June 30, 1906 (34 Stats., p. 782), June 30, 1906 (34 Stats., p. 794), May 30, 1908 (35 Stats., p. 490), May 30, 1908 (35 Stats., p. 541), March 4, 1909 (35 Stats., p. 951), June 25, 1910 (36 Stats., p. 696), March 4, 1911 (36 Stats., p. 1373),

March 4, 1913 (37 Stats., p. 866), and October 22, 1913, providing for the acquisition of a site, the enlargement thereof, and the construction of a building thereon for the accommodation of the post office, United States courts, customhouse, and other governmental offices at Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, be, and the same are hereby, amended so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, in lieu of enlarging the site heretofore acquired for said building, to reconvey said site by the usual quitclaim deed to the person or persons from whom the United States acquired title, or to their successors in interest, upon the payment to the United States of the price the Government paid for said property, and conditioned upon the payment being first made by said previous owners, or by their successors in interest, of the sum of \$35,000 to the person or persons who contributed said sum for the opening and dedication of Bishop Street, adjoining said site, or to their successors in interest; and the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a new and conveniently located site of ample area for said authorized building, and to enter into contract, within the limit of cost hereinafter fixed, for the acquisition of such new site, or such enlargement of the present site, and for the erection and completion of the building heretofore authorized: *Provided*, That the cost of the present site, including the enlargement thereof, or of such new site, and of said building shall not exceed the total of the limits of cost heretofore fixed, to wit, \$1,325,000: *Provided further*, That all appropriations heretofore made toward the acquisition of the present site and the enlargement thereof and the construction of said building, together with the proceeds of such sale of the present site, are hereby made available toward the acquisition of such new site, or the enlargement of said present site, and the construction of said building upon either the new or the present site.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 16, strike out the words "in his discretion."

Page 2, lines 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and line 1, on page 3, strike out the following: "Reconvey said site by the usual quitclaim deed to the person or persons from whom the United States acquired title, or to their successors in interest, upon the payment to the United States of the price the Government paid for said property, and conditioned upon the payment being first made by said previous owners, or by their successors in interest, of the sum of \$35,000 to the person or persons who contributed said sum for the opening and dedication of Bishop Street, adjoining said site, or to their successors in interest," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Sell said site to the highest bidder, at public or private sale, after giving notice by advertisement for 30 days in some newspaper published in said city of Honolulu, at a minimum price of not less than \$150,000, the proceeds of said sale to be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Page 3, lines 6 and 7, strike out the words "in his discretion."

Page 3, lines 11 and 12, after the word "site," strike out the comma and the words "or such enlargement of the present site."

Page 3, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "the present site, including the enlargement thereof, or of."

Page 3, lines 19 and 20, strike out, after the word "building," the comma and the words "together with the proceeds of such sale of the present site."

Page 3, lines 21 and 22, after the word "site," strike out the comma and the words "or the enlargement of said present site."

Page 3, line 23, strike out the word "either" and the words "or the present."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that there is no limitation in the bill as to the cost of the new site. We make available all of the moneys that have heretofore been appropriated for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Honolulu, without any limitation whatsoever on the cost of the new site. I propound this question to the gentleman who has charge of the bill—whether he does not think there should be some restriction placed in this bill on the exercise of discretion on the part of the Government officials in islands so far removed as Hawaii?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not propose to take a cent out of the Treasury. The gentleman is aware of that, of course. In 1906 there was authorization for the construction of a customhouse, courthouse, post office, and various other public buildings in Hawaii, in Honolulu. A site was purchased for \$104,000. It was ascertained that that was inadequate in size, and an appropriation or authorization was made for the purpose of enlarging it. It was found that was going to cost so much, and there were so many intricacies in regard to the matter, that it was determined they could not do that and still construct the building within the authorization. Therefore this bill is for the purpose of selling the old site at \$150,000, turning that money into the Treasury, and then buying a new site and to construct the building out of the authorization; so it really is a net profit of \$150,000 to the Public Treasury.

In regard to the suggestion of the gentleman, this is under the suggestion of the Treasury Department. It was first in the discretion as to enlargement of the old site, but all of that is stricken out, and that has been done with the concurrence of the Treasury Department. They say there are several sites in view. They believe they can buy a site and keep within the cost of \$200,000 or \$225,000. However, the entire site is to be purchased and the building constructed within the authorization, and hence we discussed with them the very question that the gentleman has asked, and they said for that reason they did not see any necessity and hoped there would not be any limit as to the cost of the site, because the building and the site can not exceed the amount of the authorization.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman has had wide enough experience on the Committee on Public Buildings to know that if

you are going to grant to these officials out there unlimited discretion as to the purchase of a site within the combined cost of the site and the public building, when the site has once been purchased, then they can come back and say that the site cost so much that they are not able to construct the building within the amount authorized.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes, that is true; that is often done.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing in the report to show what the estimated cost of the new building will be.

Mr. BURNETT. I see the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KALANIANA'OLE] here, who is perhaps more familiar with that proposition than I am, and I would not object to a reasonable limitation on the cost of the site. I believe it unnecessary, however, because this thing has been going on so long that they are very anxious to get on with the construction of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman will not contradict himself. In one breath he says he agrees with what I say might arise and the next breath he says he thinks it is unnecessary to do this.

Mr. BURNETT. I think so because of the facts. I think they will proceed to purchase the site and construct the building.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not furnish the committee with any estimate as to the cost of the building?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Delegate here from Hawaii can give the gentleman more accurate information than I am able to give.

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE. Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Department has not given any estimate of the cost of these sites. There are two sites now being considered by the Treasury Department, one in the city proper and another about a quarter of a mile out of the city, both of which I believe can be purchased for about \$200,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Which one does the gentleman refer to when he says the price is \$200,000?

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE. Both the so-called Spreckels site and the Irwin site, I think, can be purchased for that amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Both have an estimated value of \$200,000?

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE. It may be a little more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman have any objection, in line 10, page 3, to inserting, after the word "cost," "\$200,000," so as to read "within the limit of cost of \$200,000," so that these officials in purchasing a new site will leave sufficient money for the erection of this public building?

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE. I do not think it would be well to limit the cost of the site to \$200,000, as one can not say with any degree of certainty that that amount would be sufficient to purchase either of the sites under consideration.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is acquainted with the practice in these public-building proposition of limiting the appropriation for the site and then the amount of appropriation for the public building. I have no objection whatsoever to the erection of this public building, but I can see that if a public building is to be erected there should be some limitation on the cost of the site.

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE. In this case I do not think it would be well to limit the cost of the site, inasmuch as the cost of the building and site must come within the authorization.

Mr. STAFFORD. I realize it is a proper legislative function to place a limitation as to the amount that can be paid for site purposes.

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman knows that very frequently when there is no limitation on the cost of the site that they purchase a very large site at a very large price, and that then there is not enough money left to construct the building according to the original plans, and they come here for a supplemental appropriation. I would not have any objection, Mr. Speaker, even to raising the amount and allowing \$50,000 more, so as not to restrict them too closely and enable them to obtain a proper site, but without such a limitation I will feel constrained to object. I hope that meets with the approval of the Delegate from Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman objecting or objecting conditionally?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am objecting conditionally, and I find my suggestion has the full approval, I may say, of the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Do I understand the Delegate accepts the raise?

Mr. STAFFORD. The Delegate always accepts everything that is right and proper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama what is the total authorization for site and building?

Mr. BURNETT. One million three hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. That has heretofore been made, but not in this bill.

Mr. GOULDEN. That excludes the sale or the proceeds of the sale of the present site?

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, yes; that goes back into the Treasury. Now, as far as the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin goes, I think it would be a very wise provision to put a limitation that the cost shall not exceed \$250,000, and, like the Delegate, I do not believe it will cost that. I do not believe it will exceed \$200,000, but out of abundant caution, in order that they may have ample funds, we have no objection.

Mr. MANN. You are selling the present site for \$150,000.

Mr. BURNETT. And that goes into the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. That is not large enough, and what is the use of wasting time in passing a bill to buy a new site for \$150,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The Delegate himself thinks it can be bought for \$200,000, and so we give him plenty of leeway by adding \$50,000. We put that limitation on the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Does that include the new proposition?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment. In line 10, page 3, after the word "cost," strike out the words "hereinafter fixed" and insert in lieu thereof "of \$250,000."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the word "cost," strike out the words "hereinafter fixed" and insert the word and figures "of \$250,000."

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

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

PRESIDIO AND FORT MASON (CAL.) LANDS.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was H. J. Res. 246, ceding to the State of California temporary jurisdiction over certain lands in the Presidio of San Francisco and Fort Mason (Cal.) Military Reservation.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has already become a law, a Senate bill of similar import having already been passed. I therefore move that it be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is the point at which I understood I was to be recognized.

Mr. MANN. That bill went off the calendar. That does not count.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and consider at the present time the bill S. 5614, for the improvement of the foreign service. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the chairman of the committee should explain this bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin asked the difference between this bill and the bill as reported from the House committee. The gentleman, I suppose, has in his hand a print of the bill S. 5416?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. Since the colloquy I went out and obtained an engrossed copy of the Senate bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Now, the gentleman will observe at the end of line 14 of this bill as it passed the Senate—

Mr. MOORE. Line 14 on which page?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Page 1, section 1, as follows:

Provided further, That no secretary, consul general, or consul shall be promoted to a higher class except upon the nomination of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. MANN. Of course, that absolutely destroyed the purpose of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; that was the purpose of the bill as recommended by the House committee. They did not use that language. The intention of this, I will say to the gentle-

man from Illinois, is that the President may appoint to a class, and that being confirmed by the Senate he could transfer the secretary or the consul from any post in that class to any other post in the same class; but if the President wishes to promote or demote a consul or secretary it has to be sent to the Senate for confirmation. The House bill did not use that language but made a similar provision in different language.

Mr. MANN. The House bill was directly the contrary.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No.

Mr. MANN. The House bill provided consuls should be appointed as consuls and should be sent to posts in the discretion of the President.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, no; it did not. Only to posts in the same class.

Mr. MANN. That is what it reads.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The House bill provided that consuls should be appointed to classes, and that confirmation had to be had by the Senate, and then if the President should desire he could transfer a consul from any post in that class to any other post in the same class, but he could not promote or demote the consul without the advice and consent of the Senate; and the provision applies to secretaries.

Mr. MANN. The House bill says:

That hereafter all appointments of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and of consuls general and consuls shall be by commission to the offices of secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, or consul, and not by commission to any particular post, and that such officers shall be assigned to posts and transferred from one post to another by order of the President as the interests of the service may require.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Such officers shall be assigned to a post and transferred from one post to another.

Mr. MANN. Yes; they are to be appointed simply as consuls. It is true section 2 of the bill says the grade shall be classified as follows, but they are not appointed to a class. Under section 1 they are appointed as consuls. There is not any question about what the bill says. I supposed the very purpose of this bill was to give the President or the Secretary of State acting with him power to change consuls and let a man enter the service in a lower grade without being held up by Senators all the time on the question of patronage.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; the gentleman is mistaken as to the purpose of the bill, and the same question arose in the Senate that the gentleman is making now, that the bill was not clear on that point, and the amendment I have just called attention to was put in on the floor of the Senate to make that clear.

Mr. MANN. I may be mistaken as to the purpose of the bill, although I have examined this bill for several Congresses.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That was not the purpose. And the Senate took the position that the gentleman from Illinois takes, that the wording of the bill was not plain, and did not carry out the meaning of the bill, and therefore added that amendment.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman has introduced two bills on this same subject in the House, has he not?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. And when he refers to the House bill, to which one does he refer?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I refer to H. R. 18654.

Mr. MAPES. In H. R. 18654, sections 5, 6, and 7 of H. R. 16680 were omitted, were they not?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. And that strikes out the section providing for the efficiency reports and the competitive examination feature, does it not?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Now, in the Senate bill as it passed the Senate, section 5 was kept in?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The bill passed the Senate with that section in?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Does the gentleman propose, if unanimous consent is given to consider this bill this afternoon, to offer an amendment striking out section 5 as reported by the House committee, or to leave it in as it passed the Senate?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. In deference to the gentleman, I did not propose to offer an amendment to the Senate bill. I do not care about section 5, but I do not propose to offer any amendment to strike it out.

Mr. STAFFORD. To which section 5 does the gentleman refer?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Section 5 in the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. The engrossed copy? What objection could there be to that? It reads as follows:

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of State is directed to report from time to time to the President, along with his recommendations for promotion or for transfer between the department and the foreign service, the names of those secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and the names of those consular officers or departmental officers or employees who by reason of efficient service, an accurate record of which shall be kept in the Department of State, have demonstrated special efficiency, and also the names of persons found upon examination to have fitness for appointment to the lower grades of the service.

Is that the section that the gentleman objects to?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not object to it. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] wants it.

Mr. MAPES. I object to its being taken out.

Mr. STAFFORD. What objection could be lodged against it?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. My only objection to that is that it was a part of the system of civil service that was originally incorporated in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. I have in my hand a copy of Senate bill 5614, which was reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Senate. I attempted to get from the House and Senate document rooms the text of that bill as it passed the Senate, but they tell me it has not been printed. I presume the copy that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] has in his hand is the only copy in this room.

Mr. MANN. No. I will loan the gentleman my copy if he desires it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That was the only change made. The bill passed the Senate exactly as reported by the committee, with the exception that I have indicated.

Mr. MOORE. Has section 5 of the bill S. 5614 been stricken out by the Senate?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] asked me if I would move to strike it out if unanimous consent were given to the consideration of the bill. I said I would not.

Mr. MOORE. Section 5 of the Senate bill will be considered when the time comes for consideration?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I wish to inquire if sections 6 and 7, both pertaining to examinations and promotions, were in the bill as originally presented to the House by the gentleman from Virginia himself.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. As originally introduced. I subsequently changed it and introduced another bill.

Mr. MOORE. And they were stricken out by the Senate, and they contain certain civil-service features?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They not only were stricken out by the Senate, but the House committee did not report them.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman say why they were stricken out by the House and by the Senate?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They were stricken out by the House committee because that committee was anxious for the early enactment of this legislation, and we thought the bill would stand a better chance to get through if we did not inject the civil-service feature into the bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield a moment? I want to read what Mr. Carr said with respect to the civil-service feature.

Mr. MAPES. Just one moment. Was the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate in favor of the two sections?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. There were several gentlemen who were in favor of them. I am not, and I do not know how many gentlemen there are on the House committee who are not in favor of them.

Mr. MAPES. They were in the bill as originally introduced?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; they were in the bill as originally introduced; and I then introduced another bill leaving them out and leaving out section 5 of the Senate bill. But I will say to the gentleman that, so far as the civil-service law is concerned, there is an Executive order in the State Department that puts consuls and secretaries to embassies and legations under as strict civil-service regulation as any law we could pass, and it is being rigidly enforced at the present time.

Mr. MAPES. The Executive order could be changed at any time?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Could I make a suggestion to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, the gentleman from Virginia expected to suspend the rules and have this bill considered to-day, which would require a two-thirds vote?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now the gentleman is asking unanimous consent. If consent is given now there will be an opportunity, I

take it, for amendment and debate? The gentleman would not expect to move the previous question at once?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is perfectly willing to allow a reasonable allotment of debate and amendment under the five-minute rule?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me we would make progress if we were to determine now whether or not we were going to consider it where we would have a chance to amend it, over what we would make if we considered it only under suspension of the rules.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to introduce an amendment to reincorporate into the bill sections 6 and 7, I shall have no objection. I understand that I will have that right.

Mr. MOORE. I want a little time, but I do not want to interfere with the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] intends to object conditionally?

Mr. MAPES. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a Union Calendar bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. With the understanding that there will be reasonable latitude for debate and amendment?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all appointments of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and of consuls general and consuls shall be by commission to the offices of secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, or consul, and not by commission to any particular post, and that such officers shall be assigned to posts and transferred from one post to another by order of the President as the interests of the service may require: *Provided*, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years, unless the public interest demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year, and no longer: *Provided further*, That no secretary, consul general, or consul shall be promoted to a higher class except upon the nomination of the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, this bill purports to be for "the improvement of the foreign service." I am certainly in favor of the improvement of the foreign service so far as it pertains to the efficiency of the personnel, and I join very heartily in the recommendation of the Secretary of State that there shall be some improvement in the salaries paid to many of our hard-working and efficient representatives on the other side of the water. Too much can not be said about the work they are doing, and too much can not be said about the advisability of encouraging these men to give even better service. Many of them receive a stipend that is niggardly in the extreme; consuls, vice consuls, and others of the minor representatives in the foreign service. It is regrettable that some of our American representatives in foreign countries must live and maintain families on salaries ranging from \$1,500 and less up. I would like to see all that corrected in some systematic way, but I would not like to see taken away from the men who are faithful and who work at such small compensations the right of promotion and the hope and expectation of being advanced in consequence of faithful service performed. If the bill did not leave a loophole in this respect, admitting of the possible overthrow of an efficient service by omitting the right of examination and promotion upon records made, I would cheerfully support it.

The Secretary of State, in his report recommending the passage of the bill, argues for "a higher efficiency" to the Government and "greater service to the business interests" than are obtainable at present. The Secretary of State makes this specific statement in his report to the United States Senator who happened to have charge of the bill in the other Chamber.

The Secretary of State, however, in his official letter suggests the advisability of introducing "elasticity into the service." First he wants "a higher efficiency," then he wants the privilege to "introduce elasticity into the service."

Now, if it were simply a matter of meeting a war condition, if it meant only that in an emergency he should have the right to transfer these consular officers, without sending their names to the Senate for confirmation, very well. That kind of "elasticity" might be all right. This House might very readily approve of it. But the Secretary has laid himself open to a double meaning upon this question of "elasticity" and of efficiency in the service.

At a recent court proceeding in New York City we were given a side light upon the kind of "elasticity" that might be generally applied to secure the kind of "efficiency" most desired by the Secretary of State.

Addressing the Hon. W. Walter Vick about consular matters in Santo Domingo the Secretary said:

MY DEAR MR. VICK: Now that you have arrived—

Mr. Vick, you will remember, was appointed to a position approaching that of diplomacy for this particular island.

MY DEAR MR. VICK: Now that you have arrived and are acquainting yourself with the situation, can you let me know what positions you have at your disposal with which to reward deserving Democrats? Whenever you desire a suggestion from me in regard to a man for any place there, call on me.

Are we to understand by this that the Secretary is standing in this particular for "higher efficiency" or for an "elasticity" of the service that will give him the privilege of sending those friends of his whom he regards as deserving Democrats to fill positions in the service?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). The gentleman has spoken five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I ask unanimous consent to continue the reading of this letter until it is finished.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. The Secretary, in his letter to Mr. Vick, continues:

You have had enough experience in politics to know how valuable workers are when a campaign is on and how difficult it is to find suitable rewards for all the deserving. I do not know to what extent a knowledge of Spanish is necessary for employees. Let me know what is required, together with the salary, and when appointments are likely to be made.

Sullivan will be down before long, and you and he together ought to be able to bring about such reforms as may be necessary there. You will find Sullivan a strong, courageous, reliable fellow. The more I have seen of him the better satisfied I am that he will fit into the place there and do what is necessary to be done.

W. J. BRYAN.

I have no further comment to make, Mr. Speaker, except to say that the Secretary of State who wrote this letter to Mr. Vick seeking places for "deserving Democrats" in the Consular Service is the same Secretary who, in his report to the Senator who had this bill passed in the Senate, said:

In the present emergency—

That is, the emergency for the passage of this bill giving the Secretary an "elasticity" in the service—

the President desires me to inform you that he earnestly hopes that the bill S. 5614, which you were good enough to introduce in the House on May 19 last, will become a law at the earliest possible moment.

And in this connection I would add that the President, whose wish was voiced by the Secretary of State in his letter to the Senator, is the same President who only recently, in a speech at Indianapolis, indicated that he stood for a particular political party, and that he desired to see the interests of that particular party advanced.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this may be a good bill in that it provides higher salaries for some of our deserving consular employees. It may be a good bill in that it may encourage "higher efficiency" without examinations; but if it is such a bill as will grant to the Secretary of State that "elasticity" which he seems to desire in his letter to Mr. Vick, then it is a bad bill, and ought not to pass.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following amendment:

Strike out the proviso in section 1, which reads as follows:

"Provided, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years, unless the public interests demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year, and no longer."

And insert in place thereof the following:

"Provided, That any such officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State without loss of grade, class, or salary, such assignment to be for a period of not more than three years, unless the public interests demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year, and no longer."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. I have not reduced the amendment to writing. I think when I explain the amendment—

Mr. MANN. I know; but the gentleman can not offer his amendment in this way. We have a right to know what the

amendment is. The gentleman has plenty of opportunity to prepare his amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the proviso in section 1, which reads as follows:

"Provided, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years, unless the public interests demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year, and no longer."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That any such officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State without loss of grade, class, or salary, such assignment to be for a period of not more than three years, unless the public interest demands further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year, and no longer."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, this measure was originally introduced in the House by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] on May 19, 1914, and into the Senate by Senator Stone on May 20. It was, I think, identical as originally introduced in the two branches. It was taken up and hearings were had upon it in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the House committee it was suggested that there was weakness in the proviso to section 1 as originally drawn, for this reason: It has been the habit of the Department of State to withdraw secretaries of embassies or legations from their service in foreign posts and place them temporarily as clerks in the Department of State. As there has hitherto been no appropriation under which the department was enabled to pay to such secretaries their previous salaries, they were allowed only the compensation ordinarily paid the regular clerks in the personnel of the department. Therefore these men, not because they were inefficient, not because they were being punished, but simply because there was no appropriation that could care for them, were, when thus taken back into the Department of State, often to do the most responsible service, obliged to serve at perhaps two-thirds or one-half of their regular pay.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs in considering this measure felt that this result was improper and unjust, and drafted an amendment to care for it, and in reporting the bill to the House that amendment was embodied. It reads as follows:

That any such officer may be assigned for duty to the Department of State without loss of grade, class, or salary—

And so forth.

That was clearly to cover this very point. It was suggested by some officials of the department that possibly the measure as originally drawn cared for the difficulty, but it was the opinion of the committee that it did not and that it was safer to have such a provision. Therefore, as it is not included in the Senate bill now before us, I am suggesting it in the form of an amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the idea contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and yet I hope it will not be adopted at this time, because I believe that any amendment to this bill now may mean its defeat.

The gentleman has the same desire that the department has and that the members of the Senate committee have. Everybody who has investigated the matter realizes that to bring a secretary from an embassy paying \$3,000 a year to Washington to do work for the Department of State at a salary of \$1,000 or \$1,200 or \$1,500 is unjust and unfair, and in drawing this bill, which is a State Department bill, it was drawn to obviate that injustice. In the opinion of the officials of the State Department it does obviate that injustice, and I think there can be no doubt about it, though the language of the gentleman from Massachusetts is clearer.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that where a man is appointed to the Consular Service and his salary is fixed by law, and the same act provides that he may be assigned to the State Department temporarily, that he will receive the salary fixed by law when he is so assigned unless it is expressly set forth in the law to the contrary?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Not under the present law.

Mr. McKENZIE. I mean under this bill.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; under this bill he will, because after this act has been approved it provides for more secretaries in certain classes than there are posts for those secretaries to fill. There will be one additional secretary in the \$3,000 class, and that secretary will be assigned to duty here in Washington, and he will get the \$3,000 when he is appointed a secretary in that class, whether he is secretary at London or Paris or here in Washington. He will be appointed secretary in class 1, and will be confirmed as a secretary in class 1, and when he is brought to Washington he will still be a secretary in class 1,

and although performing duties in the department at Washington he will draw the salary of a secretary in class 1.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman recognizes that the present system is unjust and indefensible?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ROGERS. I assume that the present law would continue in operation in this city unless it was changed by the new law. Can the gentleman point to anything in the new law that changes it?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes; all secretaries are appointed to classes, and the salaries for those classes are fixed in the bill, and when they are assigned to London or Paris they will be assigned to class 1 and get \$3,000. If assigned to the Department of State in Washington, they will still get the \$3,000.

Mr. ROGERS. The only language of the bill is this language:

Provided, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years unless the public interests demand further service.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. They will assign him from one of these classes—either 1, 2, 3, or 4—to duty in the department at Washington. A man so assigned will stay three years, except for special reasons for extending it, and then he gets a salary not as clerk but as secretary in his class, assigned for duty in the Department of State at Washington. That is the construction put upon it by the State Department and also by the Senate. While it is not as clear as the language in the gentleman's amendment, it seems to me that it is clear enough. I will say that if the gentleman wants to improve the service, if he wants this bill to pass, his amendment ought not to be agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. I have no desire to imperil the bill, because I thoroughly believe in it. But this bill will go to conference, and it seems to me there will be ample time to consider it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. It might be very difficult to get it up in the Senate again.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Is it not true that if it comes back from conference and goes to the committee it loses its privilege?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes. I will say to the gentleman that the Secretary of State is in favor of this bill not only because it increases the salary for a few secretaries, but because it makes the service more elastic, and that elasticity is not in the way of enabling the Secretary of State to provide positions for Democrats over Republicans, but it is to transfer secretaries from one post in some class to another. As to the letter which was read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] that the Secretary of State wrote to Mr. Vick it meets my hearty approval, and I believe it meets the approval of red-blooded party men in this country, Democrats or Republicans. It was simply a statement that in his opinion there were Democrats as able to fill positions as Republicans, and so far as he was concerned he favored a Democrat of capacity and character over a Republican, and I believe his wisdom and patriotism in that matter is approved by the country. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised to hear the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] or anyone else openly defend the unfortunate letter of Secretary Bryan to Mr. Vick. That was not a case of getting Democrats jobs as against Republicans. It was a case of trying to exploit the people of another country in order to furnish ward workers for the Democratic Party in this country. It was a case of trying to make the poor people of Santo Domingo pay the expenses—I will not say of the Democratic Party, but of the political heelers of the Secretary of State.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to reorganize to a large extent the Consular Service of our Government, as well as other portions of the Diplomatic Service. Personally I am in favor of the bill. I hope that we may accomplish by legislation some kind of an organization that in some way, unknown to us, will perhaps put a little lime or other element of strength into the backbone of the State Department. I received yesterday by wireless the following telegram from one of the newspaper correspondents who has been in Washington for some time, now, I believe, on his way to Berlin to act as a newspaper correspondent there. It may be assumed that he is pro-German. I suspect that to be the case. He says:

S. S. "NEW AMSTERDAM," January 16.

Representative MANN,
Washington, D. C.:

New Amsterdam held up by British cruiser *Caronia* in sight of New York. American citizens, including correspondent of Washington Herald, forced to show passports to British officer. See Fish-Berthemy letter.

SCHUETTE.

I remember the letter which Secretary Fish wrote during the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. At that time French war

vessels hovered around the city of New York and the entrance to Norfolk Harbor prepared to seize German vessels that might come out; and as there was some backbone and nerve in the office of the State Department at that time, Secretary Hamilton Fish wrote a letter which, I think, was addressed to Elihu B. Washburne, the American minister to France. It was to our diplomatic representatives in France at that time. The letter is as follows:

SECRETARY OF STATE HAMILTON FISH TO E. B. WASHBURN, AMERICAN MINISTER TO FRANCE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, October 4, 1870.

This Government desires and intends to maintain a perfect and strict neutrality between the two powers now unfortunately engaged in war. It desires also to extend to both the manifestation of its friendly feeling in every possible way and will allow to the vessels of war of each power equally the hospitality of its ports and harbors for all proper and friendly purposes.

But this hospitality is liable to abuse, and circumstances have arisen to give rise in the minds of some persons to the apprehension that attempts at such abuse have taken place.

I am not in possession of facts to justify me in saying that such has been the case, but I have deemed myself justified in calling the attention of M. Berthemy, the French representative at this Capital, to the current rumors, sustained, as they are, by the presence of a number of French vessels upon the coast of the United States. These vessels have appeared at or near the entrance of the harbor of New York, off Sandy Hook; at the entrance of the Long Island Sound; at or near the entrance of the Chesapeake Bay. One or more is represented to have been anchored not far from Sandy Hook (the main entrance to New York Harbor), and there is a difference of statement as to the precise distance at which she lay from the shore, some claiming that she was within a marine league. But of this there is no positive evidence. She has entered the port of New York—as claimed by some—for the purpose of watching a German steamer about to sail thence. Three of them have put into the harbor of New London (which looks out upon Long Island Sound, the eastern entrance to the New York Harbor) avowedly for some small repairs; one recently asked permission, which was granted, to make some repairs at the Norfolk Navy Yard, near the entrance of Chesapeake Bay.

All this may be consistent with an intention of perfect observance of the neutral character of our waters and jurisdiction and with an entire absence of undertaking any hostile movement against the vessels of North Germany from those waters or that jurisdiction.

A large trade has been carried on from the ports of the United States approached by the waters in which these vessels have thus appeared by vessels belonging to North Germany.

The appearance of French vessels in these immediate neighborhoods in such numbers and force does not fail to excite the alarm of these vessels and must have the effect to a greater or less degree to diminish that trade.

The United States are not prepared at present to say that any actual violation of international law has been committed or that the hospitality of these waters has been positively abused. But the hovering of the vessels of war of a belligerent on the coasts near the entrance of the principal ports of a friendly power does interfere with the trade of the friendly power.

The interruption of the regular communication with you, by reason of the investment of Paris, has led me to represent to M. Berthemy our views on this subject and to say that, although the vessels of either belligerent may not actually shelter within the jurisdiction of the United States and proceed thence against the vessels of its enemy, this Government would regard as an unfriendly act the hovering of such vessels upon the coast of the United States, near to its shores, in the neighborhood of its ports, and in the track of the ordinary commerce of these ports with intent to intercept the vessels of trade of its enemy.

I have requested M. Berthemy to make known these views to the French Government and to express the confident hope of the President that there may be no cause of complaint on the part of this Government by reason of any such hovering by the vessels of the French Government.

You will be pleased to take an early opportunity to present the same view to the minister for foreign affairs, which you may do by reading to him this dispatch.

HAMILTON FISH.

Mr. Berthemy at that time was the French representative at this Capital. How refreshing it is to go back to the old days of Ulysses S. Grant and Hamilton Fish and learn that we had the nerve to tell the French to keep their war vessels away from the entrance to our harbors with intent to annoy the commerce of this country, and they kept them away. [Applause.] And if we would say so now, Great Britain would keep hers away. We are a neutral power; but we have some rights, and we ought to insist upon our rights being respected. [Applause.]

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the American people agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann] in his statement that there is no backbone in the administration of the present State Department. I believe that the American people applaud and approve the actions and policies of the present Secretary of State, as well as the whole administration. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] just read a letter into the RECORD and criticized the Secretary of State for writing to Mr. Vick about getting places for certain Democrats. The gentlemen on that side of the aisle forget that when the Democrats came into control of the Sixty-second Congress, and when the Republicans in Washington and away from Washington saw the handwriting upon the wall, the Republican administration under Mr. Taft and the State Department, presided over by Secretary Knox, recommended to the Foreign

Affairs Committee of this House that we enact into law the placing of the Consular Service under the civil service. This was not done until they saw that the Democrats would sweep the country in 1912. We did not take their suggestions, because we knew and they knew they had placed Republicans in all of the places in this service and had covered them in by an Executive order, and we knew they wanted them fixed so that they could be retained. The administration has not removed them. They have kept them. The administration has placed efficiency above partisanship. I do not know that I can agree absolutely with that policy. I believe that good and efficient Democrats could have been found to take and fill many of these places. This bill is based on efficiency and economy. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] says that he is going to introduce some amendments to put these places under the civil service. If he will read section 5 he will see that these places are to be filled on merit.

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

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. I understand the gentleman's contention to be that the President has authority under the orders heretofore issued by President Roosevelt and President Taft to conduct something of the same kind of an examination as is provided in the amendment which I propose to introduce.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and there is an Executive order now in force.

Mr. MAPES. That can be set aside by the stroke of the pen of the President.

Mr. HARRISON. It can; and I want to say that the representative of the State Department, Mr. Carr, came before the committee and said that this was what they desired to have done.

Mr. MAPES. May I ask the gentleman a further question? Is the gentleman in favor of carrying out in good faith those orders of the former Presidents?

Mr. HARRISON. I am in favor of appointing efficient men to this service, and I hope and believe that they can find Democrats to fill these places who are efficient. I believe, like the Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, that Democrats are just as good as Republicans, and I do not believe there is a Republican on that side of the aisle who has any respect for his party and any feelings for the men who make up the rank and file of the party who is not in favor when they get into power of putting good Republicans in control if they can get them. I think possibly you could find a few if you should get a comb and scrape the whole country and—

Mr. MAPES. I am afraid the gentleman is not answering my question.

Mr. HARRISON. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. MAPES. Is the gentleman in favor of carrying out in good faith those orders of the former Presidents?

Mr. HARRISON. If it were left to me, I would abolish the Executive order with respect to this business altogether and put in good Democrats throughout the country who are reliable and worthy and efficient.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Then the gentleman's objection to the amendment I propose to introduce is based upon the fact that he is not in sympathy with those orders and therefore not willing to have them enacted into law?

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the gentleman that Mr. Carr, representing the department, came before us, and Mr. LINTHICUM, a member of the committee, asked him this question:

Mr. LINTHICUM. And the civil service of this bill you recommend striking out?

Mr. CARR. We recommend leaving that just where it stands at present under existing Executive orders.

And another reason why I am opposed to the amendment would be that it might be impossible, if you tack on amendments to this bill, to get it enacted into law at this session of Congress. The Senate would not probably recede from their former action and concur in them, and it might be the means of defeating this most desirable legislation.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. This bill was started six months ago with those sections all in it?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. At that time it would have been just as easy to report it out of the committee and pass it with those provisions in as without them?

Mr. HARRISON. It was not reported out of the House committee with those provisions in it. A majority of the committee were opposed to incorporating them in the bill.

Mr. MAPES. It was before the committee with those provisions in.

Mr. HARRISON. It was; and they were stricken out on the recommendation of the State Department. I think probably the State Department thought it might endanger the passage of the bill. Mr. Speaker, one word in conclusion, and that is that I hope that no amendment will be tacked on this bill, so that the bill can be speedily passed and become a law. It is very important that that should be done.

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Carr, director of consuls, indorses this bill and recommends its passage?

Mr. HARRISON. Oh, undoubtedly he favors it and recommends its passage as well as the State Department recommends it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That section 1685 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1685. That for such time as any secretary of embassy or legation shall be lawfully authorized to act as chargé d'affaires ad interim at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned, he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his salary as secretary of embassy or legation, compensation equal to the difference between such salary and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the ambassador or minister at such post; and for such time as any vice consul shall be lawfully authorized to assume charge of a consulate general or consulate during the absence of the principal officer at the post to which he shall have been appointed or assigned he shall be entitled to receive, in addition to his regular salary or compensation as a subordinate consular officer or employee, compensation equal to the difference between such salary or compensation and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the principal consular officer at such post."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to inquire of the chairman whether this increase of salary to the acting secretaries and consuls and vice consuls is to be paid, whether there is a vacancy or not, or whether it is to be paid in every instance—

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What section?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am referring to the provision in section 3—that any secretary of embassy or legation or vice consul who fills the post during the absence of his principal shall receive, in addition to his regular salary, compensation equal to the difference between such salary and 50 per cent of the salary provided by law for the principal at such post.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. What is the question?

Mr. STAFFORD. Whether he is to be paid only in the case the salary of the principal is not being drawn, or whether he is to be paid under all conditions, whether the principal is absent from his post and drawing the salary or not?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No; he is only paid where the principal is absent and not drawing his salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. The section does not place any such limitation upon it.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is a rule in the State Department. If the principal gets leave of absence, he does not draw the salary; and, as a matter of fact, this provision saves the Government money.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no question as to the saving of money to the Government, if the principal is not to receive the salary while absent from his post.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is the fact.

Mr. MANN. That is the case now.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is nothing in this section—that may be a regulation, but it is not provided in the section.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. That is the construction that has been put upon the law from time immemorial.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the other practice could pertain under the wording of this amendment.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. But it does not in practice.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not the intent?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No, indeed.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That a secretary, consul general, or consul of whatever class detailed for special duty outside of the city of Washington shall be paid his actual and necessary expenses for subsistence during such special detail: *Provided*, That such special duty shall not continue for more than 60 days unless in the case of international gatherings, congresses, or conferences, when such subsistence expenses shall run only during the life of the international gathering, congress, or conference, as the case may be.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend section 4 by inserting just before the proviso—I do not have the page and

line—after the word "detail," the following: "Not exceeding \$4 per day."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 1, after the word "detail," insert the words "not exceeding \$4 per day," so that the line will read "expenses for subsistence during such special detail not exceeding \$4 per day."

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. I will yield.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks that the sum stated in his amendment, \$4 per day, is ample to cover the expenses for subsistence in other countries? I believe from what knowledge I may have of the matter that there are certain capitals in Europe where the expense for subsistence would be considerably greater than \$4 per day.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt there are many places where it could be greater than \$4 per day. We passed a law here in the last session, I believe it was, limiting the amount that could be paid for subsistence here to \$4 or \$5 a day—

Mr. STAFFORD. Five dollars.

Mr. MANN. To anybody, a Cabinet officer or anybody else. I do not pretend to be fixed about the amount. Maybe it ought to be \$5 a day, although it occurred to me that \$4 was all right. This is simply where a man is detailed to some place else, and we still pay him his salary. This pays him his subsistence. Now, it became a habit under the law authorizing these payments generally to pay the judges of the court of the United States \$10 a day. That is what they get. They put in a bill for \$10 a day whenever they are holding court in places away from where they live. I do not think we ought to extend that abuse to anybody else.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. If the gentleman will yield, it seems to me if the State Department orders some of these subordinate officials of the Government in the Diplomatic Service to leave their posts and go to other cities on special duty and be put to the additional expense of providing for their subsistence, that they might find themselves put to very great inconvenience and hardship if limited to the sum named by the gentleman from Illinois, namely, \$4 a day. It seems to me it should be much larger in Europe and other countries than in the United States.

Mr. MANN. The expense of living in Europe is not as large as living in the United States, and it should be remembered that these people are drawing their salaries, anyhow. If they want to live high, I have no objection.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. This is not intended to cover a detail in Europe. It is only intended to cover a detail in this country, and I think the gentleman from Illinois is correct about it. There ought to be a limitation, and still I believe it will imperil the passage of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it will not.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. If the gentleman will make it \$5 a day instead of \$4, it would be more satisfactory.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to say \$5 a day.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Make it \$5 a day.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make the amount not exceeding \$5 per day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois modifies his amendment by making it to read not to exceed \$5 a day.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes it not exceeding \$5 a day in this country?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason we should pay more than we do for subsistence to other men in the service? It means if this amendment is adopted they will likely get \$5 a day instead of \$4.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. These men are in the Consular Service or are secretaries of embassies and legations, who are brought here and sent about the country to confer with commercial boards and to give them information about matters in foreign countries.

Mr. MANN. This provides for actual expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, they have actual expenses besides this \$4 a day?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. No. That is not the intention of the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Their actual expenses for subsistence will not exceed so much.

Mr. FOSTER. Actual expenses for subsistence; but that does not include the railroad fare.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; that has nothing to do with railroad fare. They get paid that, and properly.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I was getting at. This gives them \$5 a day besides their traveling expenses?

Mr. MANN. It does if they spend it.

Mr. FOSTER. I judge they would usually spend that amount.

Mr. MANN. Ordinarily they would in Chicago, New York, or Washington, undoubtedly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of State is directed to report from time to time to the President, along with his recommendations for promotion or for transfer between the department and the foreign service, the names of those secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and the names of those consular officers or departmental officers or employees who by reason of efficient service, an accurate record of which shall be kept in the Department of State, have demonstrated special efficiency, and also the names of persons found upon examination to have fitness for appointment to the lower grades of the service.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment. I have not the engrossed copy of the bill, and it may be that the amendment comes after a different line than the one I have marked.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4 of the engrossed copy, after line 17, insert the following as a new section:

"SEC. 6. That the board of examiners for the Diplomatic Service shall be composed of an Assistant Secretary of State, the chief examiner of the Civil Service Commission or such other officer as that commission shall designate, a law officer of the Department of State, and one other officer to be designated by the Secretary of State. The board of examiners for the Consular Service shall be composed of an Assistant Secretary of State, the Director of the Consular Service, a law officer of the Department of State, the Chief of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce, and the chief examiner of the Civil Service Commission or such other officer as that commission shall designate.

"SEC. 7. That the scope and method of the examinations shall be determined by the board of examiners, but the examinations shall include business experience and ability; the resources and commerce of the United States, with special reference to the development of export trade; international, commercial, and maritime law; American history, government, and institutions; and one language other than English. These examinations shall be held at least once annually, and shall be conducted with strict impartiality and without regard to the political or other affiliations of any candidate; and upon their conclusion the board of examiners shall certify in writing to the Secretary of State the names of those persons whom they have found to be, in their judgment, thoroughly well qualified for the Diplomatic or Consular Services, and the results of the examinations shall be made public.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I reserve it now. The amendment provides for a board of examiners and a complete civil-service system in the Consular and Diplomatic Service. This is a bill to appoint consuls and secretaries to classes. The amendment is a civil-service law incorporated into this bill and is not germane to anything that is in the bill. I think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MANN. Why, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the appointment of consular officers. It provides for dividing them into grades, and it provides for their salary. Now, if we provide for the appointment, we can lead up to the appointment. Personally I do not have any doubt that the amendment is germane, but as laid before the House I can not vote for it, because I do not want to destroy the bill. I would rather have a half loaf than no loaf.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] desire to be heard?

Mr. MAPES. I do not care to discuss the point of order. It seems to me that my amendment is clearly germane.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman where he got this printed matter?

Mr. MAPES. It is sections 6 and 7 of the bill as first introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood].

Mr. MANN. It is the same bill.

Mr. MAPES. It is from the same bill with these sections taken out.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The committee did not think it was germane to the main object of the bill and cut those provisions out.

Mr. MANN. The committee of the Senate did not want to take away their power, I suppose.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The committee of the House eliminated it.

Mr. MANN. It was eliminated in the Senate. The House did not act upon it until they found they could not put it through the Senate.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. The House committee reported this bill with these provisions out of it before the Senate passed the bill that has been considered here to-day.

Mr. MANN. That is all true; but the gentleman found he could not pass it through the Senate with these amendments in it. Let us be on the square about these things. That is true of a previous Congress and true of this Congress.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I did not and do not think we could pass it through this House with this amendment in it.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether you could or not. We were not relinquishing any power by the amendment; we were asking the other body to do it, and we were perfectly certain they were not going to do it.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this amendment at the request of the National Civil Service Reform League. The amendment is taken verbatim from sections 6 and 7 of a bill introduced in May, 1914, by the chairman of the committee that reported this bill. On May 19, 1914, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] introduced a bill along the line of the Senate bill which we are now considering, with these two paragraphs in it. Subsequently he introduced another bill with those two sections and section 5 of the Senate bill, which he had in his first bill, eliminated. This last bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. The bill as originally introduced in the Senate by Senator STONE also contained sections 6 and 7, the section which I propose to reinstate by my amendment as well as section 5.

The National Civil Service Reform League approved and recommended the bill as originally introduced by the gentleman from Virginia. With these sections taken out, however, they say that the point of the bill is destroyed, and that they do not support it.

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

Mr. MAPES. Certainly.

Mr. ROGERS. Does not the gentleman think that it stands about like this: That this bill as originally introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] contained two good provisions, each independent, each desirable, standing on its own legs, and that as the result of that amendment one of the good things has been taken out, but that a good one remains behind?

Mr. MAPES. In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] I will say that the Senate bill does contain one section recommended by the Civil Service Reform League, but which the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House eliminated, providing for efficiency reports and promotions from the efficiency list. It is a good feature, which was not in the bill as reported from the House committee. I intended to introduce the three sections if the House bill had been taken up, but we are considering the Senate bill, which has left the efficiency section in, and the chairman of the committee assured us that he would not attempt to have it stricken out.

In further answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I would like to read just one paragraph from a letter which I have from the National Civil Service Reform League, which says that—

In the opinion of the league, however, the bill (H. R. 18654) is largely devoid of its usefulness without these sections. * * *

The main purpose of the original bill was to enact into statute the provisions of the Executive orders providing for examination for admission to the Consular and Diplomatic Services promulgated by President Roosevelt on June 27, 1906, and President Taft on November 26, 1909, the first order relating mainly to the Consular Service and the second order extending the same system to the Diplomatic Service.

Those who have been interested in the Consular Service, business men and others, have been endeavoring for a number of years to improve this service. Now, we propose to take away all the examination features of the Diplomatic Service except as they are promulgated by Executive order.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman is not that the case now?

Mr. MAPES. That is the case now.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Does not the gentleman think that in the past eight years the Consular Service of this country has greatly improved?

Mr. MAPES. I think it has, and we might have—perhaps not under this administration—but we might have an Executive order that would take these men from under these examinations, the same as we had an Executive order under this administration taking out of the civil service the fourth-class postmasters which were put under the civil service by President Taft. I have not heard any objection, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment which I have proposed, putting back into the bill the two

sections which have been taken out. The only opposition to the amendment that I have heard is based upon the assumption that it might jeopardize or prejudice the passage of the bill in another body. If it is a good thing, let us incorporate it in this bill.

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

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating a letter from the National Civil Service Reform League.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the document named. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the letter referred to:

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE REFORM LEAGUE,
New York, September 15, 1914.

HON. CARL E. MAPES,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAPES: Inasmuch as it is understood that a special rule is likely to be passed at any time bringing up for immediate consideration Mr. FLOOD's bill (H. R. 18654) providing for the appointment of secretaries in the Diplomatic Service and appointments in the Consular Service, I venture to call your attention to certain facts with respect to the bill. On May 19 Mr. FLOOD introduced a bill (H. R. 16680) making the same provisions as the bill mentioned above, with three additional sections, two providing that candidates for entrance to the Diplomatic and Consular Service shall be subjected to a qualifying examination, the other providing that efficiency records of employees in the Diplomatic and Consular Service shall be submitted to the President in order that promotions may be based upon an accurate record. The National Civil Service Reform League was glad to register its hearty approval of the bill in that form, and it did so in letters to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

In the opinion of the league, however, the bill H. R. 18654 is largely devoid of its usefulness without these sections. Without insuring some system of examination for appointees in the foreign service, no matter how adequate the salary schedule and the method of designating incumbent's terms, there can be no guaranty that appointments will not be made for political considerations. The examinations provided for in the original bill are noncompetitive, but the league has indorsed the measure because it represents the best system obtainable under the existing circumstances and at the present time. The Constitution stands absolutely in the way of a requirement that the President must make selections from the top of an eligible list.

The main purpose of the original bill was to enact into statute the provisions of the Executive orders providing for examinations for admission to the Consular and Diplomatic Service promulgated by President Roosevelt on June 27, 1906, and President Taft on November 26, 1909, the first order relating mainly to the Consular Service and the second order extending the same system to the Diplomatic Service.

The secretary of this league in 1912, during the consideration of a similar bill introduced by Congressman Sulzer, made a thorough investigation into the actual working of the Executive orders and examined the records of the Department of State in regard to these examinations. This investigation showed conclusively that, while the orders had not excluded political considerations from appointments, the maintenance of a high standard of examinations has led to the elimination of the old class of place hunters and the substitution of men of good education and capacity to the benefit of the two services. The high standard of these examinations has been maintained and experience has shown that they are successful in weeding out the incompetents. A list of competent persons is created from which the President may select in his discretion, and the constitutional rights of the Senate are protected by the procedure outlined above by the fact that no attempt is made to interfere with its power to confirm or fail to confirm as it sees fit.

It is most desirable that some provisions be made in the bill for the keeping of efficiency records of various employees in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, so that promotions may be made on the basis of merit and fitness. Section 5 of Mr. FLOOD's bill, H. R. 16680, provides that the Secretary of State shall make his recommendations for promotion to the President on the efficiency records which shall be kept in his department. This provision would attract qualified persons who desire to make the foreign service their career, as advancement would depend upon service records.

It is almost inconceivable in this day and generation that a backward step should be taken by a new administration in view of these results, which would sacrifice the business interests of the country by turning these positions back into the spoils arena and permitting again the appointment of incompetents for political considerations; but the system should not be allowed to be imperiled by the fact that it rests only on Executive discretion, when there is no constitutional or other valid objection to its enactment into law.

On behalf of the league, therefore, I venture to ask that you use your influence to secure the insertion in the bill, H. R. 18654, introduced by Mr. FLOOD on September 3 of sections 5, 6, and 7 of his bill, H. R. 16680, introduced on May 19.

Very truly yours,

HARRY W. MARSH,
Assistant Secretary.

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to return to section 1 of the bill and to offer again an amendment to that section which I previously offered, but which I did not press because of the belief that its adoption might imperil the bill in conference. But inasmuch as the bill has to go to conference anyway—

Mr. MANN. It does not have to go to conference.

Mr. ROGERS. The chairman of the committee told me it would have to go to conference. I understand I have the approval of the chairman in offering this amendment?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] asks unanimous consent to return to section 1 so as to offer an amendment which he offered earlier in the day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is to strike out the first proviso in section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following language, which was included as a proviso in the bill as originally reported to the House from the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 1, line 10, of the Senate engrossed copy by striking out the proviso beginning in line 10, which reads as follows: "Provided, That no officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State for a period of more than three years, unless the public interests demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period not to exceed one year and no longer," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That any such officer may be assigned for duty in the Department of State without loss of grade, class, or salary, such assignment to be for a period of not more than three years, unless the public interests demand further service, when such assignment may be extended for a period of not to exceed one year and no longer."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I see a difference in the language. But what is the difference in the effect of the two propositions?

Mr. ROGERS. It was not clear to me, and I think it was not clear to a majority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that a secretary when recalled to the State Department for temporary service would, under the original language, retain his grade and class and salary; this ambiguity was called to the attention of some of the officials of the State Department, who agreed that it was desirable that there should be no possibility of dispute upon this point.

Mr. MANN. The Senate proposition does not provide that. It provides for the assignment to the Department of State.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The man is in a certain grade as a certain officer with a certain salary. When you assign him he, of course, retains his grade and salary.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman understands that the right of a secretary to retain while temporarily in departmental work his full secretarial salary is a departure and a modification of the present practice in that regard?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; but now we appoint a man as a consular officer at a particular port, and when he leaves there and goes into the State Department he is not performing the duties for which he is appointed; but when a man is appointed as consul in a certain place, he may be in Persia, or he may be in the United States doing some work. I do not think there is any possible question myself about the effect of it. It certainly would not be contemplated that we would authorize a consul to be transferred to the State Department without any salary.

Mr. ROGERS. The presumption would be that as at present he would then take the salary of the ordinary clerk in that department.

Mr. MANN. But he can not draw his salary now as consul, because he is not at his post.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not suppose it is necessary that a man be at his post in order that he may be able to draw his salary.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. ROGERS. He can be on leave temporarily.

Mr. MANN. He might be on leave temporarily; but he can not be on leave temporarily and transferred to some other place, under the law. Now, they are violating the law at this time, or straining it, at least, and that is one reason for the urgency of passing this bill, I suppose. During the war in Europe a number of consular officers have been transferred from one place to another. Under the law they are not entitled to draw their salaries. Well, they are winking at that. So far the comptroller or the auditor have not held them up. Probably they have not discovered it officially, and that is one of the reasons for haste on this bill. There is no question that under this bill, if a man is assigned to the State Department, he is in a particular grade to which he is appointed and confirmed.

Mr. ROGERS. But he is doing different work, and he may be considered, as before, to be doing the work at the salary provided for that work in the Department of State. At all events, this makes it clear beyond peradventure.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection. I wondered why the Senate used other language. What was the reason for that?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Because that was the way it was drawn in the bill as originally introduced.

Mr. ROGERS. That is the identical language embodied in the original bill introduced in the Senate by Senator STONE, and this is a perfecting amendment adopted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House. There is no question as to the desirability of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. FLOOD of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will ask to have the similar House bill (H. R. 18654) laid on the table.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 18654 lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the corresponding House bill (H. R. 18654) be laid on the table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 20975) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, 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. 1287), ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

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

POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement to the House. It will take but a minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this morning the bill (H. R. 18783) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building and site at St. Petersburg, Fla., was objected to. I want to say that the situation there is this: In this city of St. Petersburg, Fla., which has a population of 20,000 or 25,000 people, land can not be bought for less than it can be bought for in the average city of 100,000 to 150,000 people. If this bill passes, the outside appropriation will be only \$120,000. The postal receipts last year were practically \$45,000. The lease which the Government had on a building that was occupied as a post office has expired, and I am reliably informed that the Government was out in the street because the owners of the property could rent it to private persons for a sum that the Government could not afford to pay, and the Government is to-day occupying the city hall in that town, by the grace of the city, for postal purposes. I ask unanimous consent to return to that bill, and for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to return to the bill which he mentions. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. KENT. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Florida—

Mr. KENT. I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California demands the regular order. The regular order is to put the question. Is there objection? If nobody objects—

Mr. DONOVAN. I am going to object if I can not get some information.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let the gentleman ask his question. It will take only a minute.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for the regular order.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman from Florida have any information about how many other public buildings the State of Florida has for its first and second class post offices at the present time?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The State of Florida has a number of public buildings.

Mr. DONOVAN. How many?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know how many—Jacksonville for one.

Mr. DONOVAN. You do not know anything about it, do you?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; I do. I can tell you if the House will give me the time.

Mr. DONOVAN. You do not know about the lease expiring, do you?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has the lease expired?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have the word of the Comptroller of the Treasury, Judge Downey.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is that all you know about it?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have no reason to doubt it.

Mr. DONOVAN. I want to tell the gentleman that it has not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman doubts the word of Judge Downey. That is a question between him and Judge Downey; that is all.

Mr. DONOVAN. One thing more. The lease at St. Petersburg has not expired, and the population stated by the gentleman is not correct, and the number of post offices in the State is a matter of conjecture with him. I will say further that there is an immense amount of money collected for public buildings and other purposes; and shall we dump it all into such States as Florida?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. If the gentleman wants to object, let him object.

Mr. DONOVAN. I will make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is not proper to go back to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. ADAMSON rose.

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

Mr. ADAMSON. To submit a request for unanimous consent. I have no personal bill of my own, but I call attention to the bill H. R. 8904, a bill to establish a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg., for the Lighthouse Service, which service asked for that one little project out on the Pacific coast. I ask unanimous consent that it may be immediately considered.

Mr. MANN. I think it ought to be reached in the regular order.

Mr. ADAMSON. But it will not be reached in the regular order. Will not the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut demands the regular order. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the Clerk will read the next bill.

USE OF PORTIONS OF NATIONAL FORESTS FOR RECREATION PURPOSES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17780) providing for the use of certain portions or spaces of ground within the national forests for recreation purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture may, upon such terms as he may deem proper and for periods not exceeding 20 years, permit responsible persons or associations to use and occupy suitable spaces or portions of ground in the national forests for the construction of summer homes, hotels, stores, or other structures needed for recreation or public convenience, not exceeding 5 acres in area to any one person or association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like some information from gentlemen from far Western States where they have so many forest reserves. I was under the impression that the gentlemen from the coast were protesting against the forest reserves because the lumber could not be marketed. The query comes to my mind that as this bill is intended to depart from the policy of forestation and turn these reserves into pleasure grounds, or national parks, that there is a conflict between the two ideas of keeping the forest reserves for forestation and making them national parks and allowing hotel proprietors to erect hotels in favored places.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think there is no conflict between the two policies. There are many places in the forests that are very beautiful in natural scenery and useful for fishing and hunting, and where there are many natural wonders. I have one particular place in mind as an illustration. Near Grants Pass, in Jackson County, Oreg., there is a place known as the Oregon Caves, some 25 miles from the city. The people will build a road over the lands belonging to private individuals to assist in facilitating access to the proposed park. The caves are of vast extent and great interest, and unless some provision is

made by which people going there can receive accommodations, they can not very well visit them. If they can have permission, if the Secretary of Agriculture can have authority to lease a small area of ground for the building of a hotel, people can go and enjoy the scenery and the fishing and hunting. It is a most beautiful place. This is only one instance, as adjacent to many communities there are places of great scenic beauty and interest that could be so used by the people. It will be for the benefit of the forest reserve in which it is located to have visitors come into them under the conditions proposed in this bill. The roads that will be built will help the forest officers in patrolling the forest, and the presence of a large body of people who always turn out to fight the fire will assist the foresters in fighting fires in that vicinity should they occur.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what would prevent in the case instanced by him of creating it into a national monument if these special caves to which the gentleman refers have a scenic value. Why can not the department create it into a national monument?

Mr. HAWLEY. It would be less expensive to have it in the forest reserve, as proposed here, than to have it exist as a monument. During the winter when no people are there, the foresters can look after it, without extra cost. If it is a national monument, it would be without care, and there would be danger from fire and other causes. Unless an additional officer was provided it would be without care for a part of the year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can appreciate that while in this instance the local people might be willing to expend money in building a road, if we adopted a general policy permitting the building of hotels on long-term leases, that there would arise a great demand for the building of roads, so as to turn the forest reserves proper into national parks.

Mr. HAWLEY. I doubt if that will ever be done to any great extent.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a very present doubt in my mind.

Mr. HAWLEY. There are in certain places natural wonders, which people would like to visit as campers and to secure recreation. At present the people have an unlimited right to go upon the public land in the national forests. They can go there and build a temporary camp, put up a tent or a little camp of some kind. They are given now by the Secretary of Agriculture permission to construct temporary structures. But it does not enable them to put up any important building, or justify any considerable expenditure. But if they could get permission for a period of years they can afford to put up a better building and will have an interest in protecting that particular locality, and if they have a building in which they can put a stove there is not the same danger of forest fires as if they built it outside. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief Forester are very much in favor of this legislation, as the following letter indicates:

JULY 22, 1914.

Hon. A. F. LEVER,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LEVER: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 11, inclosing a copy of the bill (H. R. 17780) introduced by Mr. HAWLEY, providing for the use of certain portions or spaces of ground within the national forests for recreation purposes.

You will probably recall that in the hearings (p. 302) on the bill (H. R. 13679) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Graves testified at some length on the need for just such legislation, requiring summer-residence leases, as is proposed in the bill. As a result of his testimony, your committee added an amendment to the Agriculture appropriation bill, which was substantially the language used in Mr. HAWLEY's bill, now referred here for report. The amendment to the Agriculture appropriation bill went out, however, on a point of order made by one of the Members.

There is at the present time some hesitancy on the part of persons who want to use national-forest land upon which to construct summer residences, hotels, stores, and other structures involving a large expenditure, because of the indefinite tenure of the permits to them which the present law provides for. At the present time, however, there are several thousand such permits in use, upon which structures have been erected. In justice to those who desire to construct more substantial improvements it is believed that the present law should be amended to give persons a better right than the revocable permit now authorized.

For the reasons given above this department would approve of the passage of the bill.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON,
Secretary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been benefited by the gentleman's information as to the fact that the public can go there and locate temporarily from season to season, and I think that is better than to grant a permit to hotel proprietors to build for 20 years.

Mr. FERRIS rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

QUITCLAIM DEED TO CERTAIN LANDS IN AKRON, OHIO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18550) empowering and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to convey by quitclaim certain lands in the city of Akron, State of Ohio.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, empowered and directed to convey, by the usual quitclaim deed, to the city of Akron, in the State of Ohio, for street purposes and no other, the northeasterly 5 feet of the new Federal-building site at the southwesterly corner of East Market and Prospect Streets, in said city.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut objects.

Mr. DONOVAN. Did the gentleman from Florida notice that objection?

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 18550.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 18550, with Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk again read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule. [After a pause.] The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk again read the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to convey by the usual quitclaim."

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, that amendment was suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury as giving him the discretion to make this conveyance instead of as in the original bill, directing him to make the conveyance. The committee has no objection to it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. UNDERWOOD, 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. 18550 and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

On motion of Mr. CLARK of Florida, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 6309) to establish the Rocky

Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, with the amendments, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the tract of land in the State of Colorado particularly described by and included within metes and bounds as follows, to wit: Beginning at the southeast corner of section 34, township 3 north, range 73 west of the sixth principal meridian, Colorado, thence north along the section lines to the northeast corner of section 3, said township; thence west to the northwest corner of said section; thence north along the section lines to the northeast corner of section 16, township 4 north, range 73 west; thence west to the northwest corner of said section; thence north to the northeast corner of section 8, said township; thence west along the section lines to the northwest corner of township 4 north, range 74 west; thence north to the first correction line north, to the southeast corner of section 36, township 5 north, range 74 west; thence north along the range line to the northeast corner of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 13, said township; thence west to the northwest corner of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 14, said township; thence north to the northwest corner of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 11, said township; thence east to the northeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, said township; thence south along the range lines to the southeast corner of said section; thence east along the section lines to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of section 10, township 5 north, range 73 west; thence north to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of said section; thence east to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of said section; thence north to the northeast corner of said section; thence east to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 2, said township; thence north to the northeast corner of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of said section; thence east to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter, said section; thence north to the northeast corner of the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of said section; thence east to the southeast corner of the northeast quarter of section 1, said township; thence north along the range line to the northeast corner of section 36, township 7 north, range 73 west; thence west along the section lines to the intersection with the west bank of the Big South Cache la Poudre River in township 7 north, range 75 west; thence southeasterly along the west bank of said river to the mouth of a tributary of said river, probably in section 1, township 6 north, range 75 west; said tributary heading at La Poudre Pass in section 20, township 6 north, range 75 west; thence southwesterly along the west bank of said tributary to its head; thence across the Continental Divide to the headwaters of the North Fork of the Grand River, which also heads at La Poudre Pass; thence down the west bank of the North Fork of the Grand River to its intersection with the section line between sections 29 and 30, township 6 north, range 75 west; thence south along the section lines to the southeast corner of section 18, township 5 north, range 75 west; thence west along the section line to its intersection with the west bank of the North Fork of the Grand River; thence down the west bank of the North Fork of the Grand River to its intersection with the section line between sections 25 and 36, township 4 north, range 76 west; thence east to the northeast corner of section 36, said township; thence south along the range line to the southeast corner of said township; thence east along the township line to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 4, township 3 north, range 75 west; thence south to the southwest corner of the northeast quarter of section 9, said township; thence west along the quarter section line to its intersection with a creek in section 7, said township, this creek being an outlet of Grand Lake, and flowing into the North Fork of the Grand River; thence southerly along the said creek to its junction with the North Fork of the Grand River; thence southerly along the west bank of the North Fork of the Grand River to its intersection with the township line between townships 2 and 3 north; thence east along the township line to the southeast corner of section 34, township 3 north, range 73 west of the sixth principal meridian, Colorado, the place of beginning, all of said above-described tract now being included within the boundaries of the counties of Grand, Boulder, and Larimer, in the State of Colorado, is hereby reserved and withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or disposal under the laws of the United States, and said tract is dedicated and set apart as a public park for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States, under the name of the Rocky Mountain National Park: *Provided*, That the United States Reclamation Service may enter upon and utilize for flowage or other purposes any area within said park which may be necessary for the development and maintenance of a Government reclamation project.

SEC. 2. That nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right of way, or any other purpose whatsoever, or shall affect the rights of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land. Whenever consistent with the primary purposes of the park the act of February 15, 1901, applicable to the location of rights of way in certain national parks and the national forests for irrigation and other purposes, shall be and remain applicable to the lands included within the park. The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion and upon such conditions as he may deem wise, grant easements or rights of way for steam, electric, or similar transportation upon or across the park.

SEC. 3. That no lands located within the park boundaries now held in private, municipal, or State ownership shall be affected by or subject to the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. That the said park shall be under the executive control of the Secretary of the Interior, and it shall be the duty of the said executive authority, as soon as practicable, to make and publish such reasonable rules and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States as the said authority may deem necessary or proper for the care, protection, management, and improvement of the same, the said regulations being primarily aimed at the freest use of the said park for recreation purposes by the public and for the preservation of the natural conditions and scenic beauties thereof. The said authority may, in his discretion, execute leases to parcels of ground not exceeding 20 acres in extent in any one place to any person or company for not to exceed 20 years whenever such ground is necessary for the erection of establishments for the accommodation of visitors, may grant such other necessary privileges and concessions as he deems wise for the accommodation of visitors and may likewise arrange for the removal of such mature or dead or down timber as he may deem necessary and advisable for the protection and improvement of the park. The regulations governing the

park shall include provisions for the use of automobiles therein. All funds derived from concessions, privileges, or other sources within the park shall be expended therein: *Provided*, That no appropriation for the maintenance, supervision, or improvement of said park in excess of \$10,000 annually shall be made unless the same shall have first been expressly authorized by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAY). Is a second demanded?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania to 20 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in arising to present this bill to the House I want to take this first opportunity of expressing to the Speaker the profound appreciation of the State of Colorado for granting my earnest appeal and placing this bill at the head of the Suspension Calendar to-day. With the many thousands of bills before us there was no other possible way that it ever could have been reached for consideration at this session of Congress, or probably within the next year, and I know my constituents will forever feel grateful for his act of special consideration to my State.

I want to also thank the Public Lands Committee for granting my request for a full and patient hearing upon the bill and their authorizing me to make this favorable and unanimous report.

I am aware that it is not customary to publicly express gratitude in this way; but very few people realize the tremendous importance of this measure to Colorado, and I know that this brief acknowledgment is but a very feeble expression of the sentiment of my constituents.

The committee accorded me the privilege of conducting the hearings upon this bill and I presented our retiring governor, Elias M. Ammons; our incoming governor, George A. Carlson; both of our United States Senators, CHARLES S. THOMAS and JOHN F. SHAFROTH; and Mr. R. B. Marshall, the Chief Geographer of the United States Geological Survey, who had made an exhaustive examination of and report on this proposed park; also Mr. Mark Daniels, the general superintendent and landscape engineer of national parks. The committee was also favored with a very attractive presentation by Mr. F. W. Byerly, which I wish you all could have seen, of stereopticon natural-color views of the park. I also presented a large amount of data upon this subject that had been sent to me by many associations and people throughout the country.

In my printed report upon this bill, covering 48 pages, I have incorporated a synopsis of what was presented at the hearing, as well as some other relevant and, I think, interesting information.

INTRODUCTORY.

The project of establishing a national park in this region was started several years ago by a number of our public-spirited citizens. A bill for that purpose was introduced in the Sixty-second Congress, but nothing whatever was done or attempted to be done with it during that Congress. I was requested by a great many people to take the matter up at that time, but I did not do so, because a few enthusiastic individuals were very industriously trying to include a large part of four counties, and embracing some 800,000 acres of land, much of which was mineral land, a large amount of it agricultural land, and a considerable portion was patented and privately owned land. After a large amount of correspondence and many conferences with the chambers of commerce, business men's organizations, and enterprising citizens of Denver, Boulder, and Grand Counties, as well as the Interior Department, and after Secretary Fisher had sent Mr. Marshall out to examine the territory in the fall of 1912, and Mr. Marshall had made his report in January, 1913, Senator THOMAS and I finally succeeded in bringing about an agreement between the Interior and Agricultural Departments and the inhabitants of Larimer, Boulder, and Grand Counties, and the Denver Chamber of Commerce and Real Estate Exchange and others as to the proper boundaries of the park and the appropriate provisions of the bill. Thereupon a compromise bill was prepared in duplicate, and on the opening day of the first session of this Sixty-third Congress, April 7, 1913, I introduced it—H. R. 1634—and on April 8 Senator THOMAS introduced it in the Senate—S. 530.

Those bills were referred to the Interior and Agriculture Departments and investigated and considered by those departments for about 15 months, and after many more conferences and further investigations and correspondence—I have written hundreds and hundreds of letters about this bill—it was determined to eliminate further lands and reduce the size of the

park to about one-third of its original contemplated dimensions. So the bill was again rewritten and reintroduced in the Senate by Senator THOMAS on June 29, 1914, as Senate bill 6007, and a few days afterwards as the present bill (S. 6309), and again reintroduced in the House by myself as House bill 17614, on July 2, 1914. Those bills were again referred to the two departments, and I have incorporated their reports on this bill, which is the fourth amended bill, in my report.

I mention these preliminary matters merely so that the House may know that this is not a hastily prepared or unduly considered measure.

There has been a world of detail work put upon this bill during the past three years by the department officials and by Senator THOMAS and myself, and we have all along been greatly assisted by Mr. Frederick R. Ross, the chairman of the Rocky Mountain National Park Committee of the Denver Chamber of Commerce and the Denver Real Estate Exchange, and by former United States Senator Thomas M. Patterson, Gov. Ammons, and Mr. John C. Shaffer, proprietor of the Rocky Mountain News, and many other organizations and people prominent in Colorado affairs whom I would like to mention.

The Secretaries of both the Interior and Agriculture Departments are now heartily in favor of this bill in its present amended form. I asked for and obtained an additional report from the Interior Department as late as January 9, 1915, in which Secretary Lane says:

I favor the creation of the Rocky Mountain National Park in the State of Colorado. It will give to the country a new national playground, having unsurpassed mountain scenery and a most salubrious climate, and which will be in proximity to the great centers of population in the eastern portion of the United States. I am confident that the affairs of this park could be administered at a moderate cost.

This bill is supported by our State legislature, all political parties, the city of Denver, and a great many business men's organizations, and, in fact, by the entire population of Colorado. There are over 800,000 citizens in my State who are to-day anxiously looking, hoping, and appealing to this House to pass this bill, and if you grant their appeal there will be more general heartfelt rejoicing than there has been over any local measure since the passage by Congress in 1876 of the enabling act by which the Territory of Colorado was admitted into the Union as the Centennial State. However, Colorado is not alone in her appeal for this bill. The National Federation of Women's Clubs, including a million of the good women of this country, are enthusiastically supporting the measure. The Daughters of the American Revolution and hundreds of outing clubs, recreation associations, and unselfish, patriotic, and public-spirited organizations all over the United States have passed resolutions and written me indorsing this bill. I have mentioned a number of these and set out a few of the indorsements in both the hearings and in my report here before us.

DESCRIPTION.

I can not take the time, as I would like, to give a detailed description of the marvelously beautiful region that is sought to be created into a national park. But I will say generally that the area contains 229,062 acres, or 350 square miles of gorgeous scenery. All of it, excepting 3,082 acres, are now included in the Arapahoe and Colorado National Forests. All of the land, excepting 11,200 acres, is surveyed land. There are 2,340 acres of patented land and 1,200 acres of State land in the park, and all the rest of it is public domain. It will be the fourth in size of our national parks. It is situated on the crest of this continent on the main range of the backbone of the Rocky Mountains in the most rugged section of the Continental Divide, about one half on the Atlantic and the other half on the Pacific slope. The territory is located about one-half in Grand County, one-third in Larimer, and one-sixth in Boulder County, and about 80 miles northwest of the city of Denver in the northern-central part of the State. The territory is the source of a number of tributaries of some of our large rivers. The waters from the eastern part ultimately flow into the Missouri River, while on the western slope of the peaks the melting snows reach the Pacific Ocean through the Colorado River. The lowest part of the region is at an altitude of 8,000 feet, and the greater part of it is over 9,000 feet above sea level.

There are over 60 peaks that rise above 12,000 feet and a dozen exceed 13,000 feet within 10 miles along the Continental Divide, with Longs Peak rising 14,255 feet above the ocean's tides—145 feet higher than Pikes Peak. While Longs Peak lacks a few feet of being the highest peak in Colorado, yet, owing to its rugged nature and marvelous surroundings, in a panorama of scenic grandeur, in the heart of the Rockies, it is looked upon as America's gem, and is often called the "King of the Rockies," and frequently compared to Mount Blanc and the Matterhorn. Colorado is the top of the world, and my description of Longs Peak would be the bright jewel set in the crest of the Rockies,

where it shines as the Kohinoor of all the gems of this Continent.

In her book, *A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains*, Miss Isabella L. Bird describes one view of the peak as follows:

Deep, vast canyons, all trending westward, lie in purple gloom. Pine-clad ridges, rising into the blasted top of Storm Peak, all run westward, too, and all the beauty and glory are but the frame out of which rises—heaven piercing, pure in its pearly luster, as glorious a mountain as the sun tinges red in either hemisphere—the splintered, pinnacled, lovely, ghostly, impossible, double-peaked summit of Longs Peak, the Mount Blanc of northern Colorado.

But Longs Peak is only one of the many wonderful features of this park. Nature has lavished many of her choicest gifts upon this region. The entire region is equal in grandeur to the Swiss Alps, and it surpasses Switzerland in the varied glory of its magnificence. There are several large glaciers and one extinct volcano in the park. It is a veritable wonderland. There are many beautiful small parks and valleys, while the foliage is perfectly gorgeous. There is a ruggedness and grandeur in the scenery which no one can describe. It must be seen to be realized.

There are nearly 200 lakes, varying in size from a few rods to a half a mile across. A dozen of the peaks within the park are capped with perennial snow. There are many scraggy peaks, deep canyons, and snow fields; hundreds of cascades and many passes in the Continental Divide above an altitude of 12,000 feet. The timber line, the altitude above which trees will not grow, in the Alps is about 6,500 feet elevation, while in the Rocky Mountains in this proposed park the timber line is 11,500 feet.

There are many kinds of wild life, including the mountain sheep (bighorn); grizzly bear, black and brown bear, deer, and beavers abound; all the lakes and streams contain mountain trout; and a herd of elk has recently been brought from the Jackson Hole, in Wyoming, and placed in the park.

Owing to the wide range of climate, from summer moderation to the perpetual snow line, it is estimated that there are in the park a thousand varieties of wild flowers. The columbine, the official State flower of Colorado, and which we think is the most exquisitely beautiful flower in the world, grows in luxuriant profusion all over the sides of these mountains. It is a native mountain flower, and only grows naturally in that high altitude. Besides the flowers, there is a much greater variety of plant life than is found in the Alps.

There is comparatively little timber that is of a merchantable value, and there is no agricultural land in the park; and, moreover, the altitude is too great for practical farming, and there is very little grazing possibilities in that region. In fact, it has been said thousands of times by people from all over the world that the one great and only thing this region is suitable for is a great national park. It has no value for anything but scenery and climate.

Some of the greatest known travelers, authors, and naturalists of the world have for the past 40 years visited this territory and paid tribute to its scenic worth by writing books and articles upon it. In fact, Estes Park and Grand Lake and the adjacent territory included in this bill have long since attained not only a nation-wide reputation, but are known almost as well throughout Europe as they are in this country. The park is visited every summer by tens of thousands of people because of its scenic beauty and delightful mountain summer climate. Last summer there were 20,250 people visited the Yellowstone National Park, while it is estimated that over 50,000 people visited Estes Park, and many of them stayed there practically the entire summer, because it is not only a very invigorating and healthful climate, but one of the most delightful places in the world. Nowhere in the long range of the Continental Divide is there such scenery as that of this region. This bill will nationalize the State's most beautiful park and will capitalize Colorado's scenery for the benefit of the Nation. Some of the Nation's greatest attractions, from the tourist's standpoint, are located in Colorado.

It is eminently fitting that this region should be selected by Congress and given the name of "the Rocky Mountain National Park." No one can behold and contemplate the magnificent scenery of this region without being bigger and better ever thereafter.

For over 40 years Estes Park has been famous to travelers and tourists, who include it in their itinerary. Kit Carson went through there in 1840. The first house was built there in 1860 by Joel Estes, after whom the park was named. He was one of the earliest settlers of Colorado, who made his home there when it was a wilderness. Later on it became a resort for tourists and an attractive holiday place for thousands of people.

There were 10,000 automobiles from outside the State that visited the park last year, and it is estimated that fully 25,000 nonresident automobiles and from 125,000 to 150,000 people from

all over the United States will visit the park this coming summer. One of the greatest and most important features of this park will be its inexpensive, easy, and ready accessibility. It will be a glorious and immensely popular resort. It will be the one great national park on the eastern slope of our country, and at least one day nearer and much more accessible to the population of the country than any other national park. It will be the one great national recreation ground that will be the most available to all the people, and I predict that more people will visit this park every year than visit all the other parks combined.

By the adoption of this measure one of Colorado's most beautiful districts will be dedicated forever to public use and will be maintained as a national monument for the enlightenment and inspiration of the people of the United States; and Colorado will always be grateful to Congress for the creation of this park. It will indeed make Colorado the great "playground of the Nation." It will soon be the most popular of all the national parks.

All people need recreation, and there is a very great and growing demand for public recreation places out of doors. The tendency of the times, the modern business habits of our people, are such that they will be compelled to more and more seek outdoor life, and these recreation places will be a Godsend to their health and shattered nerves, and benefit the lives of many millions of people physically, mentally, and morally every year. The grown-up children of the Nation need parks just as much as the little ones do.

We want to consecrate this territory to the public use as a national playground. We cordially invite the people of our country to come and be invigorated by and enjoy this delightful spot, the scenery of which is not surpassed by any park or anywhere on earth.

Our State highway commission and the city of Denver and those counties are building magnificent automobile roads from Denver and all the adjoining cities and towns to and across the park. So that everyone can go. There will be no trust or monopoly of any of the highways leading to or through this park. All western railroads run to Denver, and from there it is only a three hours' delightful automobile ride, and it is less than that from the cities of Boulder and Loveland. Many thousands of people will every year come from the east, north, and south in their automobiles over the Lincoln National Highway.

Our people are especially anxious to have this park created now on account of the European war and the Panama-Pacific Exposition, so that the traveling public may learn of its attractive features during the coming summer and be benefited thereby.

The American people have never yet capitalized our scenery and climate, as we should. It is one of our most valuable assets, and these great assets should be realized upon to the fullest extent. We receive comparatively nothing for it, while Switzerland derives from \$10,000 to \$40,000 per square mile per year for scenery that is not equal to ours. But Switzerland knows that the public is ready and willing to pay for scenery and they have developed it for selling purposes. It is estimated that the American people spend approximately \$500,000,000 a year abroad, and a considerable portion of it goes to see scenery that in no way compares with our own. Besides, our mountains are endowed with a climate so far superior to that of the Old World that this park will soon become the mecca of the tourists of the earth.

Now is the time to cultivate the "See America First" movement. We should systematically turn the attention of the American tourists to the fact that there is grander and more beautiful scenery in this country than elsewhere, and keep at home some of the hundreds of millions of dollars of tourist money that is now annually spent abroad. A large per cent of the American population scarcely know that we have national parks, and most of them only have the vaguest notion of what our natural scenic resources are. The closing of European resorts to American travel this year has developed this "See America First" spirit and will be of great aid in the teaching of American citizens to visit and appreciate our own parks. Tens of thousands of Americans who have every year spent their surplus money in Europe will, on account of the present war, many of them visit the mountains, and a large per cent of them will inevitably visit the Rocky Mountain National Park; and a very large per cent of all the people who visit the Panama-Pacific Exhibition will stop off at Denver on their trip across the continent and visit this park.

It is estimated that 300,000 Americans visited Europe last year. Switzerland sells to the world \$250,000,000 worth of scenery every year. The several hundred million dollars that

Americans spend in Europe every year is a net and unnecessary loss to America, because our citizens could derive a better quality of scenery by judiciously spending their money at home. We should popularize our own parks through letting the people know of their beauty and advantages. There should be a tremendous annual movement of our people for vacations in the Government reserves. I hope the Interior Department will use the moving-picture concerns for the purpose of advertising these national parks. Uncle Sam has an unlimited supply of scenery that is worth advertising.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. I demanded a second mainly for the purpose of getting information. I understand some gentlemen may want to oppose the bill. I would like to inquire to what extent the Federal Government will be called upon to bear expense in connection with this enterprise?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will notice, the amendment which the committee has recommended at the end of the bill provides that the entire annual cost is limited to \$10,000, unless otherwise authorized by Congress some time hereafter. That amount is not a great deal in excess of what it is now costing the Federal Government to maintain this territory as a part of two forest reserves. Several forest rangers are required to superintend and protect that territory at the present time. In fact, I understand the Forest Service contemplates spending very much larger sums each year than this bill authorizes. There are 14,500,000 acres of forest reserves in Colorado. This park only comprises about 2 per cent of the forest reserves of my State, and I am asking by this bill to transfer the jurisdiction of less than a quarter of a million acres out of our fourteen and a half million acres of forest reserves from the Agriculture Department to the Interior Department, because our people believe that that grand and rare scenic region, which is one of the most beautiful spots in the entire Rocky Mountains, can be much better administered, protected, and developed by the national park service of the Interior Department as a national park than it possibly could be under the Forest Service. Forest reserves are not public playgrounds and they are not administered for recreation places. I am asking that this very unique scenery be converted into a national park, so that all the people of the United States may see and enjoy it.

Mr. MOORE. I want the gentleman to have a fair chance to explain the bill, and I call to his attention the fact that the report states that the Colorado Democratic State platform of 1914 contained the following plank:

We heartily favor the creation of the Rocky Mountain National Park, and commend our Senators and Representatives in Congress for their labor in its behalf.

Are we to understand from that that the bill has any particular political significance?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not the slightest. If the gentleman will look at page 7 of my report, he will see that I state right in the very next sentence that "all other parties urgently advocated the establishment of the park." I put that in my report to show that the entire State, all organizations and all political parties and everybody, is in favor of it. This is one subject upon which Colorado is absolutely and enthusiastically united. Our legislature has adopted and sent to me a memorial to Congress, which in part says:

That the people of Colorado desire that said park shall be established. It includes the highest mountain peaks in the State; the area is little adapted to either agriculture or grazing; its scenery for sublimity and grandeur is not excelled on the continent. Its location is easy of access to America's millions who seek health and recreation in the summer months, being situated in the front and main range of the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. MOORE. Now, one further question. I am still seeking information. Why is it that the State of Colorado does not take care of this park itself?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Well, there is very little use of our discussing that question, because, in the first place, Congress would not under any circumstances cede that territory to the State. It would be wrong for the Government to ever surrender title to that territory. Secondly, Colorado has a large number of beautiful parks. Half of the State is composed of mountain parks. We have three times as much mountain scenery in our State alone as there is in the entire Swiss nation. Our State does not want this as a local State park. We want the Nation to have this marvelous region so the entire population of the United States will feel a proprietary interest in it. We prefer to surrender jurisdiction over the territory to the Federal Government, and let the entire world feel at liberty to come there as the guest of Uncle Sam.

Mr. MOORE. The maintenance of it, for the first year at least, would be limited to \$10,000?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is limited to \$10,000 a year forever unless Congress grants us an increase.

Mr. MOORE. Ten thousand dollars per annum is all you propose to ask at present?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is all until further additional appropriations are authorized by Congress.

Mr. MOORE. Would \$10,000 a year be sufficient to provide for maintenance and take care of future improvements?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; that amount is not enough; but we will have to get along with that sum for a while, and I am in hopes that we will be allowed to also retain and use toward the improvement of the park all the revenues derived from automobile licenses and concessions from all sources. If we can have those receipts, I feel that we can get along without any additional appropriation for possibly several years to come.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman expects some revenue will be derived from the park to make up the expenses?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir. Mr. Marshall and the Interior Department recommend that we be given those receipts for the maintenance and improvement of the park, especially for road and trail building, and I am relying upon these recommendations and that express provision in this bill. I had that in mind when I reluctantly consented to the adoption by the committee of this \$10,000 a year limitation.

If Congress will permit Secretary Lane to carry out his ideas concerning these national parks, I confidently believe that in the near future they will all be self-supporting.

There are three different types of revenue that may be received from national parks: First, from the natural resources; second, from the public utilities operated there; and, third, from leases and concessions.

If the Rocky Mountain National Park were a purely local project, the outdoor clubs and other patriotic organizations throughout the United States and representative newspapers everywhere would not be supporting this measure as earnestly as they are. But our State administration and prominent men in Colorado affairs and all of our business men's organizations want this territory placed in a national park, so that its scenic features may be preserved and reserved in perpetuity for the people of the United States.

We already have in southwestern Colorado the Mesa Verde National Park, the ruins of the ancient cliff dwellers. From an archeological viewpoint it is one of the wonders of the world. To me it is the most weird and fascinating place I have ever visited. Mr. Daniels says:

If any man wants to find Omar Khayyam's lines expressing the eternal thought of "whence we come and why," let him visit those wonderful remains, steep himself in their mystery, and puzzle over the riddle they present. Who built them? When? Whence came they? Whither did they go? No man knows the answer. The pyramids of Egypt are no more impressive, no more awesome.

We also have the wonderfully unique and picturesque Colorado National Monument, near Grand Junction, Colo., which I had the honor of having created, and of naming it in 1911. We have also the Wheeler National Monument, in southern Colorado. I have had the distinction and pleasure of passing through Congress bills granting parks on the public domain to some 20 different cities and towns in my State. And last summer I had charge of the two bills in the committee and House which set apart a 15,000-acre mountain park for the city of Denver, a portion of which was placed in a forest reserve for that purpose. All of our Colorado cities appreciate the importance of having outing places, recreation and pleasure playgrounds. That sentiment is natural to our people because we have so many wonderfully beautiful natural parks in Colorado. I feel that every city in the United States should have a public park large enough to accommodate its entire population and should be maintained and kept in a way that would make it attractive to the old and young. Instead of having 13 national parks in this country we ought to have at least a hundred.

Your Committee on the Public Lands confidently believe that the time is fast approaching when this Government will need and have many more national parks. The tendency in every State and every city in the United States is toward the creation of more outing places. The strenuous life which the American people are living requires outdoor recreation and relaxation, and our city, State, and national parks are one of our greatest health assets. No money ever expended by the Government will bring greater returns in health and happiness than that expended toward the improvement and maintenance of our national parks. Your committee believes that

from the natural wonders which the proposed territory contains it should be created into a national park, and therefore unanimously and earnestly recommend the passage of this bill.

Grand Lake adjoins the western boundary of this park and geographically is practically a part of it. It is immediately across the range from Estes Park, and the new State highway which is now approaching completion renders it easy of access from the Estes Park portion of the park. The lake is one of the most interesting, attractive, and picturesque spots in the Rocky Mountains, as well as one of the largest natural lakes in Colorado. The surrounding region is unsurpassed in grandeur for beauty of natural scenery, and at the same time it is intensely interesting from a romantic, legendary, and historical point of view. The lake is the source of the Grand River, one of the two streams that constitute the Colorado River, one of the great rivers of the country that finds its way to the Pacific by way of the Gulf of California. The territory was originally occupied by the Ute Indians, and the legendary history of their wars and tribal strifes is intensely interesting in connection with this park. The lake was also the scene of strife in later years. About 1884 a pitched battle was fought on the shores of the lake involving practically all of the white inhabitants of the county, and several of them were killed. "Patience" Thornton, one of Colorado's early and most successful novelists, used the incident in connection with this county-seat war as the basis of a most realistic story. So that it will live as a part of the record of the region and serve to render the lake a place of historical interest.

Prof. Ellsworth Bethel, of the East Denver High School, has made some valuable researches in the Estes Park region that I think are of sufficient interest to justify being inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES ON THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE ESTES PARK REGION.

The flora and fauna of Colorado: Colorado has about 3,000 species of native wild plants, this phenomenally large number being exceeded only by California.

The varying altitude from the Great Plains to the summits, reaching to an elevation of 14,000 feet above sea level, is responsible for the large number of varieties. The flora is acknowledged by all botanists to be the most beautiful, interesting, and varied of any State in the Union.

The proposed Rocky Mountain National Park contains more than 1,500 species, mostly Alpine and sub-Alpine. Many botanists have visited this region and pronounced it one of transcendent interest, and having once visited it they return from year to year. The Rocky Mountain blue columbine (the State flower), acknowledged to be the most beautiful flower in the United States, grows in great profusion. Hardly less attractive are the Mariposa lily, gentians, cowslips, buttercups, bluebells, and harebells in many varieties. The Alpine flora is exceedingly attractive and in variety and brilliancy of color are quite equal to those of the Alps; in fact, many of them are the same as those found in the high mountains of Europe. Attractive forests cover the hills and slopes. These are composed chiefly of pines (three species), spruce (two species), firs (two species), junipers (two species). The aspen, birches, alders, willows, poplars, etc., intermingle with the coniferous forests, and, unlike their habit in the East, turn to a brilliant red and orange in the fall, presenting a landscape effect of indescribable beauty. The snows linger in the forests until July, and Alpine flowers grow right through the snow and in close proximity thereto, so that almost anywhere near timber line one can pick up snow with one hand and beautiful wild flowers with the other.

The fauna: More than 400 kinds of birds are found in the State, which number is exceeded by only one other State. Many of these breed in the Estes Park region, so that bird life is abundant. Mammals of many kinds abound, such as chipmunks, squirrels, rabbits, cones, beaver; and there are some of the larger forms, such as mountain sheep, bear, lions, deer, coyotes, and wildcats.

Physiography: Glaciation, with its resultant cirques and moraines and impounded lakes, is in evidence everywhere. A half dozen small glaciers occur, and gorgeous and steep slopes are clad with perpetual snow. The rocks are chiefly granitics, schists, and quartzites, though eruptive rocks are also found within the park. Specimen Mountain, an old volcanic cone and crater, has vast deposits of black obsidian (volcanic glass) and geodes.

The proposed national park includes about 10 miles of the Great Continental Divide, with Longs Peak nearly 3 miles (14,253 feet) above the ocean tides. A dozen other peaks exceed 13,000 feet, and a score rise to 12,000 feet. Scenically it is America's gem, a wonderland of such transcendent beauty that the tourist is sure to return many times.

There are scores of unscalped peaks and dizzy heights to tempt the most arduous mountain climber. It would take one many summers to explore all the canyons, high peaks, and lakes and waterfalls.

Prof. Bethel has also compiled some interesting information upon the peaks of Colorado, as follows:

THE HIGH PEAKS OF COLORADO.

[Being a list gathered from the latest available authorities of the named mountain summits in this State exceeding 14,000 feet in altitude. Compiled for the club by Ellsworth Bethel.]

Colorado is the mountain State of the Union. Of the 49 named peaks of the United States which exceed 14,000 feet in height, Colorado has 36, California 12, and there is 1 in Washington. There are probably at least 10 more peaks of this altitude in Colorado which remain unnamed. It is estimated that one-fifth of the State stands above 10,000 feet in altitude, that it contains 350 peaks above 11,000 feet, 220 above 12,000 feet, 150 above 13,000 feet, and about 45 above 14,000 feet.

The highest peak in the United States proper is Mount Whitney (Cal.), altitude 14,501 feet. Mount Massive, Mount Elbert, and Blanca Peak, which head the table in this leaflet, are, respectively, the second, third, and fourth highest in the United States. Massive and Elbert,

after elaborate recent surveys, have been found to differ less than a foot in altitude.

In the following table the first column gives the name of the mountain, the second column the altitude of the peak above sea level, the third column the survey or other authority from which the figure is derived, the fourth column the mountain range to which the peak belongs, and the fifth the county in which it lies. In the fourth column the letters "U. S. G. S." signify that the figure given is fixed by the records of the United States Geological Survey; Hayden, that it is derived from the Hayden survey of Colorado; Wheeler, from the Wheeler survey; and C. A. C. from work done by Prof. L. G. Carpenter and students of the Colorado Agricultural College. Pikes Peak and Longs Peak were determined by checked spirit leveling, and are probably correct within 1 foot. Those credited to the United States Geological Survey were determined by vertical angulation, and are probably correct within 10 feet; while those credited to Hayden and Wheeler were determined many years ago by mercurial barometer, and may be in error as much as 100 feet.

The altitudes of Mount Massive and Mount Elbert were recently determined by vertical angulation by R. B. Marshall, chief geographer of the United States Geological Survey, for the Colorado Academy of Sciences, upon request of its secretary, Mr. J. Clarence Hersey.

Recent determinations have reduced the elevations of Mount of the Holy Cross and Buckskin Mountain so that they no longer belong in this list. The name Crestone supplants Three Tetons, and Mount Wilson has been adopted in place of Glacier Mountain.

Grays Peak, Torreys Peak, Mount Evans, Longs Peak, and Pikes Peak are visible from Denver, and the last named also from Pueblo and Colorado Springs.

Mountain peaks in Colorado exceeding 14,000 feet in altitude.

| Mountain. | Altitude. | Authority. | Range. | County. |
|--------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Mount Massive..... | 14,402 | U.S.G.S. | Sawatch..... | Lake-Pitkin. |
| 2. Mount Elbert..... | 14,402 | do..... | do..... | Lake. |
| 3. Blanca Peak..... | 14,330 | do..... | Sangre de Cristo.. | Huerfano-Costilla. |
| 4. Mount Harvard..... | 14,375 | Hayden | Sawatch..... | Chaffee-Gunnison. |
| 5. Grays Peak..... | 14,341 | do..... | Front..... | Summit-Clear Creek. |
| 6. Torreys Peak..... | 14,336 | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| 7. La Plata Mountain.. | 14,332 | U.S.G.S. | Sawatch..... | Chaffee. |
| 8. Uncompahgre Peak.. | 14,305 | do..... | San Juan..... | Hinsdale. |
| 9. Mount Lincoln..... | 14,287 | do..... | Park..... | Park-Summit. |
| 10. Mount Evans..... | 14,260 | do..... | Front..... | Clear Creek. |
| 11. Castle Peak..... | 14,259 | do..... | Elk Mountain..... | Pitkin-Gunnison. |
| 12. Quandary Peak..... | 14,255 | do..... | Park..... | Park. |
| 13. Longs Peak..... | 14,255 | C. A. C. | Front..... | Boulder-Larimer-Grand. |
| 14. Mount Wilson..... | 14,250 | U.S.G.S. | San Juan..... | San Miguel. |
| 15. Mount Antero..... | 14,245 | Hayden. | Sawatch..... | Cha'ee. |
| 16. Mount Shavano..... | 14,239 | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| 17. Crestone Peak..... | 14,233 | do..... | Sangre de Cristo.. | Saguache-Custer. |
| 18. Mount Princeton.. | 14,196 | do..... | Sawatch..... | Cha'ee. |
| 19. Yale Mountain..... | 14,187 | do..... | do..... | Cha'ee-Gunnison. |
| 20. Old Baldy Peak..... | 14,176 | do..... | Sangre de Cristo.. | Ouray. |
| 21. Mount Sneffels..... | 14,143 | U.S.G.S. | San Juan..... | Pitkin. |
| 22. Maroon Peak..... | 14,126 | do..... | Elk Mountains..... | El Paso. |
| 23. Pikes Peak..... | 14,110 | do..... | Front..... | Mineral-Saguache. |
| 24. San Luis Peak..... | 14,100 | Hayden. | La Garita..... | La Plata. |
| 25. Mount Windom..... | 14,084 | U.S.G.S. | Needle Mountains. | Do. |
| 26. Mount Eolus..... | 14,079 | do..... | do..... | Las Animas. |
| 27. Culebra Peak..... | 14,069 | Hayden. | Culebra..... | Do. |
| 28. Simpson Mountain.. | 14,055 | Wheeler | do..... | Do. |
| 29. Sunlight Mountain.. | 14,053 | U.S.G.S. | Needle Mountains. | La Plata. |
| 30. Red Cloud..... | 14,050 | do..... | San Juan..... | Hinsdale. |
| 31. Mount Sherman..... | 14,048 | do..... | Park..... | Park. |
| 32. Stewart Peak..... | 14,032 | Hayden. | Sawatch..... | Saguache. |
| 33. Wetterhorn Peak..... | 14,020 | U.S.G.S. | San Juan..... | Ouray-Hinsdale. |
| 34. Grizzly Mountain.. | 14,020 | do..... | Sawatch..... | Pitkin. |
| 35. Sunshine Peak..... | 14,018 | do..... | San Juan..... | Hinsdale. |
| 36. Handies Peak..... | 14,008 | do..... | do..... | Do. |

Hon. Mark Daniels, general superintendent and landscape engineer of national parks, has furnished me with some data upon this subject that I feel is of sufficient general importance to warrant being inserted in the RECORD in connection with this bill. His letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, January 11, 1915.

Hon. EDWARD T. TAYLOR,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: Your request for a more full opinion from me as to my reasons for advocating the creation of the Rocky Mountain National Park brings up a rather broad subject, and one which in order to be entered into exhaustively would take considerable time and space.

It seems to me that the question of our national parks, like other subjects involving art and esthetics, is constantly being confronted with a demand for reasons for its existence, and yet to one who understands the functions which they perform in the scheme of things it seems impossible that they should be so frequently challenged.

That scenery is a national asset has been proven in many instances in the older countries, where all resources have been carefully considered. Switzerland derives a revenue of over \$250,000,000 annually from her scenery. She has made the scenic resources of her country one of the best revenue producers within her boundaries.

It has been estimated that over \$400,000,000 annually leave this country and are spent abroad by tourists and travelers. Undoubtedly a very large proportion of this is for the purpose of transacting business, and to acquaint the traveler with the customs of the foreign people; a very large proportion, however, is spent by the tourist who goes to see scenery, and so spending his money he is purchasing a commodity which is inferior to the home product.

If the Secretary of the Interior were to announce to the press that a new mineral product had been discovered which would produce to this country, after being thoroughly developed, \$50,000,000 net annually for a period of 25 years, there would undoubtedly be a great hue and cry to undertake the enterprise at once, and yet, if the national park system

were properly developed and placed before the public in all of its wonderful phases there is no doubt that more than \$50,000,000 that are spent annually abroad by scenery lovers would be diverted and be spent within the boundaries of the United States.

In order that the people of this country shall derive the benefit, from a commercial point of view, of our national scenery, it is necessary that the scenic areas of national interest be set aside and administered in a way that will satisfy the demands of the tourist and the traveling public. This is the real and fundamental reason why it is necessary, in order to develop scenery as a national resource, to set aside the scenic areas as national parks.

As to the administrative cost or the cost of maintenance and development of these parks there are two general policies which have been adopted by different countries, namely, the establishment and administration of the parks upon the principle that they should be free to all visitors as against the policy of developing along the lines of self-support. I may say that it is only in the older countries, with the exception of the Dominion of Canada, where such parks are administered as free institutions. There is much to be said in favor of both policies, but suffice it to say that the policy which has developed in this country is one of administering the parks as nearly as possible in such a way as to make them self-supporting.

This can be done by charging hotel concessioners, transportation concessioners, etc., a rental for the privilege of operating their concessions in the park areas. The Secretary of the Interior has recently taken steps to accomplish as economic administration as possible and to develop the revenue-producing phases of the parks in a manner that will in no wise interfere with their scenic values.

We have, therefore, the following condition: The scenery of our country is a great national resource and once through which many millions of dollars annually may be kept in this country which are now being spent outside. The policy which looks to the eventual establishment of these reservations upon a self-supporting basis, so that the cost of maintaining the parks as a national resource will be of little or no expense to the Federal Government. It is difficult to understand, therefore, any reticence on the part of Congress to set aside any area which has proven itself to be one of national interest and one of such magnitude and glorious scenery as to attract, without assistance on the part of the Federal Government, such numbers as 56,000 visitors, which, I am told, was the number that visited the proposed Rocky Mountain National Park last year.

Cordially, yours,
 MARK DANIELS,
*General Superintendent and Landscape Engineer,
 National Parks.*

Mr. Marshall in his report to which I have referred concludes his statement and recommendations concerning the park as follows:

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

There is no predominant, commanding natural feature in Estes Park, such as is found in the Crater Lake, the Yellowstone, or the Yosemite, or along the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, but the region as a whole is as beautiful as any to be found in the United States, or, indeed in the world. There is spread before the eye a gorgeous assemblage of wonderful mountain sculpture, surrounded by fantastic and ever-changing clouds, suspended in an apparently atomless space. At first view, as one beholds the scene in awe and amazement, the effect is as of an enormous painting, a vast panorama stretching away for illimitable distances; gradually, this idea of distance disappears, the magnificent work of nature seems to draw nearer and nearer, reduced apparently by an unseen microscope to the refinement of a delicate cameo. Each view becomes a refined miniature, framed by another more fascinating, the whole presenting an impressive picture, never to be forgotten.

ACCESSIBILITY.

Perhaps the most attractive feature of the plan to create this park, viewed from both the National and the State standpoints, is the accessibility of the area. In considering the probable success of this proposed park, I have kept constantly in mind the enormous population of the eastern part of the United States, which would derive benefit from it, its nearness to the large centers of population, and the low transportation charges in effect during the season in which it would be most visited. Estes Park can be reached from Chicago in about 30 hours and from Denver by automobile in about 3 hours. These factors will lead to a large amount of travel into the park from outside the State and undoubtedly will result in its assuming a much more national character than any of the existing parks. Denver being the center of practically all the railroad systems west of Mississippi River, the number of visitors that may be expected annually in the proposed park will add enormous revenues to the State of Colorado and will make this one of its most productive sections.

There has been a marked increase within the last few years in the annual number of visitors to Estes Park and vicinity. It is estimated that this number has increased from 1,800 to 30,000 within a comparatively short time and, with the added attraction of the national park, it seems safe to predict that within a decade or two 100,000 or more people from all sections of the United States will visit this area each year. From a purely commercial standpoint, then, the proposed national park should certainly appeal to the people of the State of Colorado. Moreover, every citizen of Colorado realizes full well the value of the entire State as a health resort, and, reputed for their hospitality as they are, I am sure that none of them would wish, from selfish motives, to prevent the enjoyment of the benefits of his State by the greatest number of people of the whole country; but the State does need the help of the National Government in this, and I know of no way in which this assistance can be better rendered than in the establishment and maintenance of a national park. There is even now in the Estes Park one good hotel, the Stanley, which probably cost in the neighborhood of \$500,000, and numerous smaller ones, which seem to indicate clearly the confidence of the public in the permanency of the attractions of this mountain park.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

I therefore respectfully recommend—

(1) That Congress be asked to create for the benefit and enjoyment of the people a national park in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado in the vicinity of Longs Peak, to be known as the "Rocky Mountain National Park," with boundary as defined on the map accompanying this report;

(2) That wherever practicable lands included within the boundary of the proposed park which are now in private ownership be exchanged for public lands outside said boundary;

(3) That a civilian superintendent and necessary guards be appointed through the United States civil service for the proper administration of the park;

(4) That leases of suitable acreage for the erection of hotels and camps for the accommodation of visitors within the park and of 1-acre tracts for the erection of private homes be granted, all such leases to cover periods of not more than 25 years, subject to renewal under conditions governing leases in the other national parks;

(5) That the use of dead and down timber for building purposes within the park be permitted;

(6) That suitable roads and trails be constructed within the park;

(7) That the use of automobiles within the park be permitted;

(8) That leases be granted, under suitable conditions, for the development of mining, hydroelectric, and grazing privileges within the park;

(9) That a fish hatchery be maintained within the park to keep the streams stocked with fish;

(10) That the destruction of game or birds within the park be prohibited; and

(11) That all revenues derived from the park, from whatever source, be applied to its development and improvement.

Very respectfully,

R. B. MARSHALL, *Chief Geographer.*

The present Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane, is one of the most earnest and forcible advocates of public parks in this country. A statement of his appearing in the Washington Evening Star a few days ago is exceedingly timely and interesting, as follows:

PREPARING FOR TOURIST TRAVEL.

Secretary Franklin K. Lane is a believer in preparedness. The Secretary of the Department of the Interior naturally leaves to his associates in the Cabinet, Secretaries Garrison and Daniels, the study of preparedness related to war equipment. What he is interested in is the preparedness on the part of the Government to handle properly the tremendous tourist travel in America, which is expected to be one of the results of the great war.

In the opinion of the Interior Department officials and others who are familiar with conditions in the national parks of the West these great natural show places have never been visited by as many American people as should have toured them, because there have not been the same kind of facilities to care for travelers which are found in Europe, where the tourist trade has been catered to for hundreds of years, and where in many places it is the chief source of income of the people.

Secretary Lane believes that many thousands of Americans will travel in this country during the coming season and following years who have heretofore spent their money in Europe, and that the national parks of the West and points in Alaska, with their scenic wonders, will be the places sought out by large numbers of American tourists. The work of reorganizing the system of caring for and developing the national parks is now going on, and in the near future it is believed that most of the American parks will have facilities which will rival Europe for completeness in providing for tourists.

Mark Daniels, the California landscape engineer, whom Secretary Lane has secured as the new general superintendent of the national parks, is now working on plans for reorganizing the system of management and bettering conditions generally in all of the great Government reservations which are under the Department of the Interior. Mr. Daniels is now planning along two lines, one to develop an economic policy for the parks and a system of administration to provide for the constant increase of visitors and an increase of revenue of the parks; and, secondly, to develop a system to care for the physical features of the parks, such as the construction of roads, trails, and buildings used by the hotel men and others who have concessions.

At the present time the Government appropriates slightly more than \$300,000 to care for the national parks of the country. Canada appropriated \$700,000 this year for her parks. The amount of revenue collected from national parks in the United States is approximately \$100,000 a year. Revenue comes from three sources, rental and leasing of concessions, the operation of public utilities, and from natural resources, such as dead and down timber and water power.

Supt. Daniels believes that the revenues of the parks can be increased very materially without any great increase in the cost of operation, and that the national parks of the country in time can be made entirely self-sustaining. This condition will be brought about not by commercializing the parks any more than they ever have been in the past, but by increasing and perfecting facilities and conditions for caring for the tourists and encouraging a greatly increased tourist travel throughout all the reservations.

The new general superintendent of the parks thinks that the American people have been too slow to look upon scenery as an asset which is just as valuable in its way as is coal, timber, water power, or any other natural resource. The scenery of Switzerland is estimated to be worth more than \$250,000,000 a year to the people of that little country. It has also been estimated that the Americans who go abroad each year carry to the various European countries more than \$400,000,000.

One of the features in increasing accommodations for the parks is the proposed establishment in each park of a bureau of information and transportation. At the present time visitors have fallen into the habit of going to the nearest concession stand to ask for information, and, naturally, the advice is governed by the financial interest of the concessionaire.

Another feature in the development of the park system will be the organization of a national park ranger service. This will include the building up of a force of able men who will be uniformed, and, as representatives of the Government, will set a new standard of service in America in providing for every care of tourists who are Uncle Sam's guests in the parks. The plans for organization of the ranger service are now being developed by Col. L. M. Brett, the United States Army officer who is superintendent of the Yellowstone National Park, and who has just been detailed to Washington especially to cooperate with Supt. Daniels in perfecting plans for the organization of this service.

Concerning the financial policy of the Government in relation to these parks, and as a matter of information, it may be stated that in the sundry civil act approved March 14, 1911 (33 Stat., 1421), provision is made that hereafter the Secretary of the Interior shall submit in the annual Book of Estimates, following the estimates for each of the national parks, a classified statement of receipts and expenditures for the complete fiscal year next preceding the fiscal year for which the estimates of appropriations are submitted. Pursuant to this statute, the data required have been embodied in succeeding Books of Estimates. (H. Doc. 129, 62d Cong., 2d sess., p. 412 et seq.; H. Doc. 944, 62d Cong.,

3d sess., p. 638 et seq.; and H. Doc. 398, 63d Cong., 2d sess., p. 574 et seq.) In the Book of Estimates for 1916 (H. Doc. 1394, 63d Cong., 3d sess.) will be found detailed statements showing, as required by section 6 of the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, the number of persons employed, rates of compensation paid, and amounts expended for various purposes, with estimated unit cost of construction done or proposed to be done in the parks, showing amounts expended in 1914 and the purposes of the various items for which expenditure is to be incurred in 1916.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, just published, contains much interesting data on this subject, and I will ask to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting several extracts therefrom, as follows:

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVATIONS.

The policy of setting aside tracts of land as national parks or pleasure grounds for all the people was inaugurated by Congress with the establishment, by the act of March 1, 1872, of the Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho. Since that time 11 additional parks in various sections of the country have been created, embracing in all over 4,436,000 acres of land. The areas of these national parks, with date of establishment of each, are as follows:

Areas of national parks.

| Name. | Date of establishment. | Area. |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------|
| | | <i>Acres.</i> |
| Yellowstone, in Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho..... | Mar. 1, 1872 | 2,142,730 |
| Yosemite, in California..... | Oct. 1, 1890 | 719,622 |
| Sequoia, in California..... | Sept. 25, 1890 | 161,597 |
| General Grant, in California..... | Oct. 1, 1890 | 2,536 |
| Mount Rainier, in Washington..... | Mar. 2, 1899 | 207,360 |
| Crater Lake, in Oregon..... | May 22, 1902 | 159,360 |
| Wind Cave, in South Dakota..... | Jan. 9, 1903 | 10,522 |
| Sullys Hill, in North Dakota..... | Apr. 27, 1904 | 780 |
| Platt, in Oklahoma..... | July 1, 1902 Apr. 21, 1904 | 848.22 |
| Mesa Verde, in Colorado..... | June 29, 1906 June 30, 1913 | 48,966.40 |
| Hot Springs Reservation, in Arkansas..... | June 16, 1880 | 911.63 |
| Glacier, in Montana..... | May 11, 1910 | 981,681 |
| Total..... | | 4,436,904.25 |

Visitors: The increasing number of visitors to these national reservations and the many requests that are received for literature in relation thereto clearly indicate the interest of the public therein. The last national park was created May 11, 1910, and since that time bills have been introduced in Congress looking to the establishment of additional national parks in various sections of the country, none of which has as yet become a law. During the year the total number of visitors in all the parks aggregated 239,693, as against 251,703 during 1913. While the travel to these parks was not as great as in 1913, there is every reason to believe that there will be a material increase in the number of visitors during the next fiscal year, when the Panama-Pacific International Exposition will be held in San Francisco.

Economic value of national parks: Without taking into consideration the cost to visitors of transportation from their homes to the parks, a fair idea of the economic value of tourist travel in four of the larger parks may be obtained by consideration of the financial reports of concessionaires, to wit, the gross receipts in the Yellowstone for 1913 amounted to \$1,186,811.36, as compared with \$1,067,161.34 for 1912; in the Yosemite, \$359,481.45 for 1913, as compared with \$311,444.32 for 1912; in the Mount Rainier, \$66,942.76 for 1913, as against \$56,735.93 for 1912; and in the Glacier National Park, \$161,510.87 for 1913.

Appropriations and revenues: The total appropriations made by Congress for protection and improvement of these parks during the year, expendable under this department, was \$302,490, and the total revenues received from concessionaires in all the parks was \$56,949.01.

Expenditures of revenues: The several acts of Congress setting aside lands for national park purposes, except in the cases of the Crater Lake National Park, Oreg., and the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., authorize the expenditure of the revenues derived from the privileges or concessions therein in the management and protection of the respective reservations. In the case of the two parks above mentioned, however, the revenues therefrom are under existing law deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts and the reservations receive no direct benefit therefrom. It is desirable that these parks, so far as the revenues therefrom are concerned, be put upon the same footing as are other national parks, and in submitting the annual estimates to Congress for the park service appropriate legislation has been recommended.

Senate bill 2223, to authorize the use of the revenues in the Crater Lake National Park in the management of the same and the construction, repair, and improvement of roads, trails, and bridges therein, passed the Senate April 14, 1914, and is now pending before the House Committee on the Public Lands. This bill should be enacted into law at an early date.

Automobiles in the parks: Automobiles have heretofore been admitted, under strict regulations governing travel of the roads, in the Mount Rainier National Park, the Crater Lake National Park, the Glacier National Park, the Wind Cave National Park, the Platt National Park, the General Grant National Park, over the Giant Forest Road in the Sequoia National Park, over the Coulterville Road from the Merced Grove of Big Trees into the Yosemite Valley in the Yosemite National Park, and over a road in the northwestern section of the Yellowstone National Park not forming a part of the generally traveled routes in that reservation, for the special accommodation of people of Gallatin County, Mont.

During the year automobiles, under appropriate regulations, were admitted over the roads in the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and were also admitted on the Wawona Road leading to the Mariposa Big Tree Grove and the Big Oak Flat Road in the Yosemite National Park. The generally traveled roads in the Yellowstone National Park, Mont., and the Hot Springs Reservation, Ark., are not in such a condition, considering the safety of individuals and animals, as to permit of their

joint use by motor-driven vehicles and vehicles drawn by horses. Licenses have been issued during 1914, as follows:

Automobile licenses issued, season of 1914.

| | Auto-mobiles. | Motor cycles. |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Mount Rainier..... | 1,594 | 188 |
| Crater Lake..... | 1,107 | 18 |
| Glacier..... | 267 | 4 |
| Sequoia..... | 158 | |
| General Grant..... | 392 | 12 |
| Yosemite..... | 673 | |
| Wind Cave..... | 11 | |
| Mesa Verde..... | 34 | 4 |

The policy of the department in admitting automobiles to the parks, where road conditions make motoring safe, has met with general approval. It enables the traveling public to make trips to the parks more expeditiously than formerly, and in addition to materially increasing the number of visitors to the reservation has been productive of considerable revenues, the receipts from this source in 1914 being \$14,243.07 as against \$8,435.45 during 1913.

Jurisdiction: In the Yellowstone National Park and the Platt National Park the United States has exclusive jurisdiction thereof, and Congress has provided a means of enforcement of the laws and regulations pertaining thereto. The Legislature of the State of Montana, by the act of February 17, 1911, ceded exclusive jurisdiction to the United States of the territory within the metes and bounds of the Glacier National Park, and by act approved August 22, 1914, Congress accepted the cession by the State of Montana of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Glacier National Park, and the United States District Court for the District of Montana has, as required by section 6 of said act, appointed a commissioner to reside in the park, who has jurisdiction to hear and act upon all complaints made of any violations of law or of the rules and regulations made by the Secretary of the Interior for the government of the park and for the protection of the animals, birds, and fish, and objects of interest therein, and for other purposes authorized by said act. In the other national parks, however, over which the laws of the States in which they are located obtain, great difficulties in administration have been encountered, owing to the fact that the department has no jurisdiction to punish offenses in violation of the regulations relating thereto, and particularly in the matter of preventing depredations on game and the selling of liquor therein.

Removal of troops from the parks: Under the act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat., 618), the Secretary of War has, on request of this department, detailed troops during the summer months to the Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant National Parks for protective purposes therein. The expense to the War Department in maintaining these details was considerable, and the expenditures from the park revenues resulting from their presence in the park were large; furthermore, the conditions in and around these reservations which led to the authorization of the use of the military force in these parks having radically changed, the conclusion was reached that their presence was no longer required in the Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant National Parks, and the Secretary of War was so advised. During the past year, therefore, troops have no longer been employed in these reservations and have been superseded by civilian rangers, bringing the latter in closer touch with the actual work of the park management than was formerly practicable when troops were only in the reservations for a few months.

General superintendent of national parks: On March 10, 1914, Mr. Mark Daniels, of California, was commissioned as landscape engineer in the Yosemite National Park for the purpose of preparing a comprehensive general plan for the development and improvement of the floor of the Yosemite Valley covering the best locations for roads, trails, and bridges, so as to bring into view the full scenic beauty of the surroundings, the clearing and trimming of suitable areas of woods to provide attractive vistas, the proper location and arrangement of a village in the Yosemite Valley, etc. Subsequently, with a view to increasing the efficiency in the administration of the parks and the reduction in the cost of superintendence, Mr. Daniels was commissioned, on June 4, 1914, general superintendent and landscape engineer for all the national parks under this department, and the titles of the officers in charge of the immediate work in the reservations changed from superintendents to supervisors at lower salaries than were paid the superintendents. Since the date of his appointment Mr. Daniels has inspected the Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant National Parks in California; Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.; Glacier National Park, Mont.; Crater Lake National Park, Oreg.; and the Yellowstone National Park, Wyo., and submitted recommendations in relation thereto; and before the close of the year he will inspect the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.; Platt National Park, Okla.; Hot Springs Reservation, Ark.; the Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.; and Sullys Hill National Park, N. Dak.

Roads: Under a cooperative agreement with the Good Roads Office of the Agricultural Department, and with a view to bringing about the wisest possible expenditure of available funds for road building and maintenance thereof in the parks, the services of experienced highway engineers have been secured to make comprehensive surveys for a system of roads and trails in the reservations, the salaries of such engineers to be paid by the Agricultural Department and their expenses by the Interior Department. This work is satisfactorily progressing and preliminary surveys have been made in the Glacier, Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant National Parks. Through cooperation by the employees of the Forest Service in the field with the employees in the various parks, more effective control of forest fires have been secured and much valuable timber has been preserved.

Sanitary inspections: The reports of the sanitary inspections heretofore made by the chemist of the United States Geological Survey of camp, hotel, sewerage, and other conditions of the Glacier, Yellowstone, and Yosemite National Parks were brought to the attention of the superintendents of these reservations as well as the concessionaires therein, and active work has been inaugurated looking to the protection from pollution of the water for drinking purposes, the proper disposition of sewage, and the enforcement of hygienic regulations necessary to the protection of the health of the visitors in the parks. Similar inspections will be made where necessary in other national parks as funds available for the work will permit.

Hotels: In the Yellowstone National Park the hotel at Mammoth Hot Springs has been reconstructed, additions have been made to the Old

Faithful Hotel, the pavilions for housing and caring for people at the permanent camps materially improved, and a 20 per cent reduction in the transportation rates from the western entrance of the park has been secured without any deterioration of the character of service rendered. In the Yosemite National Park a contract is under consideration under which new hotel and camps will be provided for the accommodation of tourists in the Yosemite Valley, and in the other parks material improvements have been made in the permanent camps and other services.

Hetch Hetchy Valley, Yosemite National Park: In prior annual reports the permit issued to the city and county of San Francisco in 1908 granting the right of way over certain lands in the Yosemite National Park, with permission to take water from Lake Eleanor and Hetch Hetchy Valley in that park under conditions therein set forth, was very fully discussed, and reference was made to a bill then pending in Congress granting the city and county of San Francisco such right of way in said park. On December 19, 1913, House bill 7207 became a law, granting to the city and county of San Francisco certain rights of way in, over, and through certain public lands, the Yosemite National Park, and Stanislaus National Forest, and certain lands in the Yosemite National Park, the Stanislaus National Forest, and the public lands in the State of California, and for other purposes. The maps required under this act showing the right of way have been filed and approved and the city has taken steps to effectuate the provisions of this statute.

Proposed national-park service: In the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior for 1911, in discussing national-park affairs, he stated:

"While public interest in and use of these reservations is steadily increasing, as shown by the growing number of visitors, adequate provision has not been made for their efficient administration, and sufficient appropriations have not been made for their proper care and development. At present each of these parks is a separate and distinct unit for administrative purposes. The only general supervision which is possible is that obtained by referring matters relating to the national parks to the same officials in the office of the Secretary of the Interior. Separate appropriations are made for each park, and the employment of a common supervising and directing force is impossible. Many of the problems in park management are the same throughout all of the national parks, and a great gain would be obtained and substantial economies could be effected if the national parks and reservations were grouped together under a single administrative bureau. Bills to create a bureau of national parks have heretofore been introduced in Congress, and, in my judgment, they should immediately receive careful consideration so that proper legislation for this purpose may be enacted. Adequate appropriation should also be made for the development of these pleasure grounds of the people, especially through the construction of roads and trails and their proper care and maintenance."

A bill (S. 826, 63d Cong., 1st sess.) to establish the national-park service, and for other purposes, is now pending in Congress and has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Public Lands, and its early enactment into law is earnestly recommended.

There are hereto appended tables giving the location, date of establishment, area, private holdings, if any, and number of visitors, and the special characteristics of the various national parks under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, the appropriations made by Congress for the protection and improvement thereof during 1914 and eight years prior thereto, as well as revenues derived from leases, privileges, and concessions in said reservation received during said period; also a statement of the automobile receipts during 1914.

NATIONAL MONUMENTS AND PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN ANTIQUITIES.

By an act approved June 8, 1906, entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," the President of the United States is authorized, "in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments." Under such authority the President has created the 29 monuments:

National monuments administered by Interior Department.

| Name. | State. | Date. | Area. |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Devils Tower..... | Wyoming..... | Sept. 24, 1906 | Acres. 1,152 |
| Montezuma Castle..... | Arizona..... | Dec. 8, 1906 | 160 |
| El Morro..... | New Mexico..... |do..... | 160 |
| Chaco Canyon..... |do..... | Mar. 11, 1907 | 120,629 |
| Muir Woods ¹ | California..... | Jan. 9, 1908 | 295 |
| Pinnacles..... |do..... | Jan. 16, 1908 | 2,080 |
| Tumacacori..... | Arizona..... | Sept. 15, 1908 | 10 |
| Mukuntuweap..... | Utah..... | July 31, 1909 | 15,840 |
| Shoshone Cavern..... | Wyoming..... | Sept. 21, 1909 | 210 |
| Natural Bridges ² | Utah..... | Sept. 25, 1909 | 12,740 |
| Gran Quivira..... | New Mexico..... | Nov. 1, 1909 | 160 |
| Sitka..... | Alaska..... | Mar. 23, 1910 | 57 |
| Rainbow Bridge ⁴ | Utah..... | May 30, 1910 | 160 |
| Lewis and Clark Cavern..... | Montana..... | May 16, 1911 | 160 |
| Colorado..... | Colorado..... | May 24, 1911 | 13,883 |
| Petrified Forest..... | Arizona..... | July 31, 1911 | 25,625 |
| Navajo ³ |do..... | Mar. 14, 1912 | 360 |
| Papago Saguaro..... |do..... | Jan. 31, 1914 | 2,059 |

¹ Estimated area.

² Donated to the United States.

³ Originally set aside by proclamation of Apr. 16, 1908, and contained only 120 acres.

⁴ Within an Indian reservation.

One new monument, the Papago Saguaro, was created during the fiscal year. It embraces approximately 2,050 acres of rocky and desert land in Maricopa County, Ariz. Within the tract is found a splendid collection of characteristic desert flora, including many striking examples of giant cactus and other interesting species of cacti as well as fine examples of the yucca palm. Within the tract historic pictographs may be found upon the faces of the rocks, adding to the interest of the reservation ethnologically and archeologically.

Administrative conditions: The supervision of these various monuments has, in the absence of any specific appropriation for their protection and improvement, necessarily been intrusted to the field officers of the department having charge of the territory in which the several monuments are located.

As stated in the last annual report, the administrative conditions continue to be unsatisfactory, since no appropriation of funds has yet been made available for this important, protective, and preservative work. Such supervision as has been possible in the cases of a few monuments only has been wholly inadequate and has not prevented vandalism, unauthorized exploitation or spoliation of relics found in those prehistoric ruins, whose preservation is contemplated by the passage of the act of June 8, 1906. An estimate in the sum of \$5,000 for protection of these monuments was submitted last year, but no appropriation was made, and a similar estimate will again be submitted to Congress, not so much for the purpose of preserving by restoration the objects reserved in the national monuments as to prevent the removal of valuable relics and vandalism. Monuments suffering from these causes should be provided with a custodian or superintendent, and in this way a small general appropriation can be made most useful and its expenditure will be wholly in the interest of the public. The protection and preservation of the national monuments as public reservations are of great interest and importance, because a great variety of objects, historic, prehistoric, and scientific in character are thus preserved for public use intact instead of being exploited by private individuals for gain and their treasures scattered. These reserves should be administered in connection with the national parks, which they strongly resemble. It would be difficult to define one in terms that would exclude the other. The renewal of the estimate for a small appropriation has been made for the purpose of keeping this class of reserves intact until such time as Congress shall authorize the creation of some administrative unit which shall take over both the parks and monuments and administer them under a general appropriation.

National monuments under other departments: The following national monuments are not administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

National monuments administered by Department of Agriculture.

| Name. | State. | Date. | Area. |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Cinder Cone..... | California..... | May 6, 1907 | Acres. 15,120 |
| Lassen Peak..... |do..... |do..... | 11,283 |
| Gila Cliff Dwellings..... | New Mexico..... | Nov. 18, 1907 | 160 |
| Tonto..... | Arizona..... | Dec. 19, 1907 | 1640 |
| Grand Canyon..... |do..... | Jan. 11, 1908 | 1,806,400 |
| Jewel Cave..... | South Dakota..... | Feb. 7, 1908 | 11,280 |
| Wheeler..... | Colorado..... | Dec. 7, 1908 | 1,800 |
| Oregon Caves..... | Oregon..... | July 12, 1909 | 1480 |
| Devil Postpile..... | California..... | July 6, 1911 | 1,800 |
| Mount Olympus..... | Washington..... | Apr. 17, 1912 | 1,603,490 |

¹ Estimated area.

National monuments administered by War Department.

| Name. | State. | Date. | Area. |
|--|-----------------|---------------|----------|
| Big Hole battle field ¹ | Montana..... | June 23, 1910 | Acres. 5 |
| Cabrillo..... | California..... | Oct. 14, 1913 | 1 |

¹ Set aside by Executive order.

Excavation of ruins: Paragraph 3 of the uniform rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and War under date of December 28, 1906, to carry out the provisions of the act for the preservation of American antiquities, reads as follows:

"Permits for the excavation of ruins, the excavation of archaeological sites, and the gathering of objects of antiquity will be granted by the respective Secretaries having jurisdiction to reputable museums, universities, colleges, or other recognized scientific or educational institutions, or to their duly authorized agents."

During the year five permits were granted for the examination, excavation, and gathering of specimens, as follows:

To Prof. Byron Cummings, of the University of Utah, to make examinations and excavations as continuation of explorations under similar permits granted him by the department on June 26, 1912, and July 11, 1913, with the Navajo National Monument, in the Navajo and Piute Indian Reservations, and in San Juan County, Utah, as well as on lands 30 miles northwest of Bluff, Utah.

To Prof. F. W. Putnam, honorary director of the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, to make examination and excavation of ruins in the Chinlee Valley and the tributary canyons heading against the Navajo Mountains, on its east and north sides, on behalf of the Peabody Museum, as continuation of explorations under a similar permit granted by the department on June 18, 1913. This locality is in the vicinity of the Navajo National Monument, and approaches, but does not overlap, the region of Prof. Cummings's explorations.

To Prof. Lull, representing the department of geology, of Yale University, to enter upon the Rosebud Indian Reservation and the Pine Ridge Reservation, in South Dakota, and the Fort Niobrara Abandoned Military Reservation, in Nebraska, for the purpose of collecting vertebrate fossils, specimens of which are to be used in the museums of Yale University.

To Prof. Livingston Farrand, president of the University of Colorado, to carry on archeological research in Montezuma and La Plata Counties, Colo., and in San Juan County, N. Mex., including such parts of the Ute and Navajo Indian Reservations as lie within those counties, and to take specimens for the benefit of the University of Colorado.

To Dr. E. Bonmert, of Dornach-Mulhausen, Germany, for removal of not exceeding 500 pounds of silicified wood from the Petrified Forest National Monument in Arizona, for presentation to the Geological Institute of Elsass-Lothringen, in Germany.

BIRD RESERVES.

All of the bird reserves have been created through reference from the Interior Department to the President of forms of Executive orders providing therefor. These reserves are regarded as in all essential particulars reservations of public lands for public use or other purposes, for which there are numerous precedents. The first specific act of Congress providing for the protection of birds by bird reserves created by Executive order was introduced by Hon. John F. Lacy, of Iowa, and became a law on June 28, 1906 (34 Stat., 536). This act made it unlawful to kill birds, to take their eggs, or to willfully disturb birds upon the reservations, and it provides a fine of not exceeding \$500 or imprisonment for

not exceeding six months, or both fine and imprisonment, for each conviction secured. This law was substantially reenacted in the new penal code approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat., 1104), in the following language: "Sec. 84. Whoever shall hunt, capture, willfully disturb, or kill any bird of any kind whatever, or take the eggs of any such bird, on any lands of the United States which have been set apart or reserved as breeding grounds for birds by any law, proclamation, or Executive order, except under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time prescribe, shall be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both."

During the year two new reservations for the protection of native birds were created, as follows:

Smith Island, Wash., created June 6, 1914.
Blackbeard Island, Ga., created July 17, 1914.
The reservations now existing are 67 in number, of which 65 are being administered under the direction of the Biological Survey, Department of Agriculture. The Pribilof Reservation, in Alaska, is administered by the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce, and the Canal Zone Reservation, Panama, by the Isthmian Canal Commission.

Bird reserves created.

| Name of reservation. | Date. | Location. | Area. |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Pelican Island..... | Mar. 14, 1903 | East Florida coast..... | 5.50 acres. |
| Breton Island..... | Oct. 4, 1904 | Southeast coast of Louisiana. | Unknown. |
| Stump Lake..... | Nov. 11, 1905 | North Dakota..... | 27.39 acres. |
| Huron Islands..... | Mar. 9, 1905 | Lake Superior, Mich..... | Unknown. |
| Siskiwit Islands..... | Oct. 10, 1905 | do..... | do. |
| Passage Key..... | do..... | Tampa Bay, Fla..... | 36.37 acres. |
| Indian Key..... | do..... | do..... | 90 acres. |
| Tern Islands..... | Feb. 10, 1906 | do..... | do. |
| | Aug. 8, 1907 | Mouths of Mississippi River, La. | Unknown. |
| Shell Keys..... | Aug. 17, 1907 | South Louisiana coast..... | Do. |
| Three Arch Rocks..... | Oct. 14, 1907 | West Oregon coast..... | Do. |
| Flattery Rocks..... | Oct. 23, 1907 | West Washington coast..... | Do. |
| Quillayute Needles..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Copalis Rock..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| East Timbalier Island..... | Dec. 7, 1907 | South Louisiana coast..... | Do. |
| Mosquito Inlet..... | Feb. 24, 1908 | East Florida coast..... | Do. |
| Tortugas Keys..... | Apr. 6, 1908 | Florida Keys, Fla..... | Do. |
| Klamath Lake..... | Aug. 8, 1908 | Oregon and California..... | Do. |
| Key West..... | do..... | Florida Keys, Fla..... | Do. |
| Lake Malheur..... | Aug. 18, 1908 | Oregon..... | Do. |
| Chase Lake..... | Aug. 28, 1908 | North Dakota..... | Do. |
| Pine Island..... | Sept. 15, 1908 | West Florida coast..... | Do. |
| Matlacha Pass..... | Sept. 26, 1908 | do..... | Do. |
| Palma Sola..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Island Bay..... | Oct. 23, 1908 | Florida..... | Do. |
| Loch Katrine..... | Oct. 26, 1908 | Wyoming..... | Do. |
| Hawaiian Islands..... | Feb. 3, 1909 | Hawaii..... | Do. |
| East Park..... | Feb. 25, 1909 | California..... | Do. |
| Cold Springs..... | do..... | Oregon..... | Do. |
| Shoshone..... | do..... | Wyoming..... | Do. |
| Pathfinder..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Bellefourche..... | do..... | South Dakota..... | Do. |
| Strawberry Valley..... | do..... | Utah..... | Do. |
| Salt River..... | do..... | Arizona..... | Do. |
| Deer Flat..... | do..... | Idaho..... | Do. |
| Minidoka..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Willow Creek..... | do..... | Montana..... | Do. |
| Carlsbad..... | do..... | New Mexico..... | Do. |
| Rio Grande..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Keechelut Lake..... | do..... | Washington..... | Do. |
| Kachess Lake..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Clealum Lake..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Bumping Lake..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Conconully..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Bering Sea..... | Feb. 27, 1909 | Alaska..... | Do. |
| Pribilof ¹ | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Tuxedni..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Farallon..... | do..... | California..... | Do. |
| Culebra..... | do..... | Porto Rico..... | Do. |
| Yukon Delta..... | do..... | Alaska..... | Do. |
| St. Lazaria..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Bogoslof..... | Mar. 2, 1909 | do..... | Do. |
| Clear Lake..... | Apr. 11, 1911 | California..... | Do. |
| Forrester Island..... | Jan. 11, 1912 | Alaska..... | Do. |
| Hazy Islands..... | do..... | do..... | Do. |
| Niobrara..... | do..... | Nebraska ² | 14,640 acres. |
| Green Bay..... | Feb. 21, 1912 | Wisconsin..... | 1.87 acres. |
| Chamisso Island..... | Dec. 7, 1912 | Alaska..... | Unknown. |
| Pishkun..... | Dec. 17, 1912 | Montana..... | Do. |
| Desecheo Island..... | Dec. 19, 1912 | Porto Rico..... | Do. |
| Gravel Island..... | Jan. 9, 1913 | Wisconsin..... | Do. |
| Aleutian Islands..... | Mar. 3, 1913 | Alaska..... | Do. |
| Canal Zone ³ | Mar. 19, 1913 | Panama..... | Do. |
| Walker Lake..... | Apr. 21, 1913 | Arkansas..... | Do. |
| Petit Bois Island..... | May 6, 1913 | Alabama and Mississippi..... | Do. |
| Anaho Island..... | Sept. 4, 1913 | Nevada..... | 247.73 acres. |
| Smith Island..... | June 6, 1914 | Washington..... | Unknown. |
| Blackbeard Island..... | July 17, 1914 | Georgia..... | Do. |

¹ Transferred to Bureau of Fisheries.

² Approximate area.

³ Under jurisdiction of Isthmian Canal Commission, Canal Zone. Strictly speaking, not a bird reservation, but birds are protected by Executive order.

Total reservations, including Canal Zone, 67.

Bird reserves enlarged and reduced.

| Name of reservation. | Date. | Location. | Area. |
|----------------------|---------------|--|-----------------|
| Pelican Island..... | Jan. 26, 1903 | Florida (enlarged)..... | Unknown. |
| Mosquito Inlet..... | Apr. 2, 1909 | do..... | Do. |
| Cold Springs..... | Nov. 25, 1911 | Oregon (enlarged)..... | Do. |
| Clear Lake..... | Jan. 13, 1912 | California (reduced)..... | Do. |
| Minidoka..... | Feb. 21, 1912 | Idaho (enlarged)..... | Do. |
| Niobrara..... | Nov. 14, 1912 | Nebraska (enlarged) ¹ | 15,253.7 acres. |

¹ Approximate area.

As appears from this list, these reservations are scattered between Alaska and Porto Rico. After careful consideration, based upon representations made by this department, the Isthmian Canal Commission secured an Executive order for the protection of the native birds within the zone, which, in its punitive features, conforms to section 84 of the United States Penal Code. Jurisdiction over the Canal Zone reservation is, however, retained by the Isthmian Canal Commission instead of being placed with the Department of Agriculture, as is the case in all other Government bird reserves.

NATIONAL-PARK STATISTICS.

Appropriations and revenues of national parks for the fiscal years 1906-1914.

| | Appropriation. | Revenue. | Total. |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| Yellowstone National Park: | | | |
| 1906..... | \$7,500.00 | \$1,522.50 | |
| 1907..... | 7,500.00 | 2,808.96 | |
| 1908..... | 8,000.00 | 4,699.65 | |
| 1909..... | 8,000.00 | 4,790.20 | |
| 1910..... | 8,000.00 | 18,188.82 | |
| 1911..... | 8,500.00 | 23,420.13 | |
| 1912..... | 8,500.00 | 16,476.38 | |
| 1913..... | 8,500.00 | 21,980.10 | |
| 1914..... | 8,500.00 | 15,439.23 | |
| Yosemite National Park: | | | |
| 1906..... | 73,000.00 | 109,325.97 | \$182,325.97 |
| 1907..... | 5,400.00 | 1,000.00 | |
| 1908..... | 5,750.00 | 9,193.04 | |
| 1909..... | 30,000.00 | 14,390.06 | |
| 1910..... | 30,000.00 | 16,051.17 | |
| 1911..... | 30,000.00 | 21,373.18 | |
| 1912..... | 62,000.00 | 35,765.48 | |
| 1913..... | 50,000.00 | 23,855.77 | |
| 1914..... | 80,000.00 | 19,495.83 | |
| | 125,000.00 | 23,405.14 | |
| Sequoia National Park: | | | |
| 1906..... | 418,150.00 | 164,530.67 | 582,680.67 |
| 1907..... | 10,000.00 | 159.50 | |
| 1908..... | 10,000.00 | 43.15 | |
| 1909..... | 15,550.00 | 46.57 | |
| 1910..... | 15,550.00 | 121.78 | |
| 1911..... | 15,550.00 | 255.65 | |
| 1912..... | 15,550.00 | 305.16 | |
| 1913..... | 15,550.00 | 353.85 | |
| 1914..... | 15,550.00 | 4,094.21 | |
| General Grant National Park: | | | |
| 1906..... | 128,850.00 | 5,379.87 | 134,229.87 |
| 1907..... | 2,000.00 | | |
| 1908..... | 2,000.00 | 63.75 | |
| 1909..... | 2,000.00 | | |
| 1910..... | 2,000.00 | 50.00 | |
| 1911..... | 2,000.00 | 324.39 | |
| 1912..... | 2,000.00 | 173.54 | |
| 1913..... | 2,000.00 | 158.63 | |
| 1914..... | 2,000.00 | 429.64 | |
| Crater Lake National Park: | | | |
| 1906..... | 18,000.00 | 1,200.00 | 19,200.00 |
| 1907-8..... | 3,000.00 | | |
| 1909..... | 7,315.00 | 25.00 | |
| 1910..... | 3,000.00 | | |
| 1911..... | 3,000.00 | 11.00 | |
| 1912..... | 3,000.00 | 30.00 | |
| 1913..... | 3,000.00 | 323.00 | |
| 1914..... | 3,000.00 | 784.18 | |
| | 7,540.00 | 793.00 | |
| Mesa Verde National Park: | | | |
| 1906-8..... | 32,855.00 | 1,966.18 | 34,821.18 |
| 1909..... | 7,500.00 | | |
| 1910..... | 7,500.00 | | |
| 1911..... | 7,500.00 | | |
| 1912..... | 20,000.00 | 100.00 | |
| 1913..... | 7,500.00 | 898.62 | |
| 1914..... | 15,000.00 | 615.21 | |
| | 10,000.00 | 679.00 | |
| | 75,000.00 | 12,292.83 | 77,292.83 |

¹ Carried to credit of "Miscellaneous receipts" and "General fund" in Treasury.

Receipts collected from automobiles and motor cycles admitted into the national parks during the period from July 1, 1913, to Oct. 30, 1914.

| Name of national park, source of receipt, and fee charged per automobile or motor cycle. | Number of permits issued. | | Receipts, season 1913. | | Receipts, season 1914. | | Total receipts, automobiles and motor cycles. |
|--|---------------------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------|---|
| | Automobiles. | Motor cycles. | Automobiles. | Motor cycles. | Automobiles. | Motor cycles. | |
| Mount Rainier (Wash.): | | | | | | | |
| Fee, \$5 per automobile..... | 1,190 | | \$5,950.00 | | | | |
| Fee, \$1 per motor cycle..... | 1,594 | 184 | | \$184.00 | \$7,970.00 | | |
| Deduction of transmission fees..... | | 188 | | 20.82 | 24.90 | \$188.00 | |
| | | | 5,929.18 | | 7,945.10 | | \$14,243.28 |

Receipts collected from automobiles and motor cycles admitted into the national parks during the period from July 1, 1913, to Oct. 30, 1914—Continued.

| Name of national park, source of receipt, and fee charged per automobile or motor cycle. | Number of permits issued. | | Receipts, season 1913. | | Receipts, season 1914. | | Total receipts, automobiles and motor cycles. |
|--|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------------|------------------|---|
| | Automobiles. | Motor cycles. | Automobiles. | Motor cycles. | Automobiles. | Motor cycles. | |
| Yosemite (Cal.): | | | | | | | |
| Fee, \$5 for single round-trip automobile permits.... | 129 | (¹) | \$845.00 | (¹) | | (¹) | |
| Fine for each failure to secure permit, \$5..... | | | 10.00 | | | | |
| | | | 655.00 | | | | |
| Deduction of transmission fees..... | 673 | | .90 | | \$3,365.00 | 8.75 | |
| | | | 654.10 | | 3,356.25 | | \$4,010.35 |

¹ Motor cycles not admitted into Yosemite Park.

Visitors to national parks, 1907 to 1914.

| Name of park. | 1907 | 1908 | 1909 | 1910 | 1911 | 1912 | 1913 | 1914 |
|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Yellowstone National Park..... | 16,414 | 19,542 | 32,545 | 19,575 | 23,054 | 22,970 | 24,929 | 20,290 |
| Yosemite National Park..... | 7,102 | 8,850 | 13,182 | 13,619 | 12,530 | 10,884 | 13,735 | 15,145 |
| Sequoia National Park..... | 900 | 1,251 | 854 | 2,407 | 3,114 | 2,923 | 3,823 | 4,667 |
| General Grant National Park..... | 1,100 | 1,773 | 798 | 1,178 | 2,169 | 2,240 | 2,756 | 3,735 |
| Mount Rainier National Park..... | 2,068 | 3,511 | 5,968 | 8,000 | 10,305 | 8,946 | 13,501 | 15,038 |
| Mesa Verde National Park..... | (¹) | 80 | 165 | 250 | 205 | 230 | 280 | 502 |
| Crater Lake National Park..... | 2,600 | 5,275 | 4,171 | 5,000 | 4,500 | 5,235 | 6,253 | 7,093 |
| Wind Cave National Park..... | 2,751 | 3,171 | 3,216 | 3,387 | 3,887 | 3,199 | 3,988 | 3,592 |
| Platt National Park..... | 28,000 | 26,000 | 25,000 | * 25,000 | 30,000 | * 31,000 | * 35,000 | * 30,000 |
| Sullys Hill National Park..... | 400 | 250 | 190 | 190 | * 200 | * 200 | 300 | 500 |
| Hot Springs Reservation..... | (¹) | (¹) | (¹) | 120,000 | 130,000 | 135,000 | * 135,000 | * 125,000 |
| Glacier National Park..... | | | | | * 4,000 | 6,257 | 12,138 | 14,168 |
| Total..... | 61,335 | 69,703 | 86,089 | 198,606 | 223,957 | 229,084 | 251,703 | 239,633 |

¹ No record kept.

* Estimate.

Location, area, and characteristics of national parks.

| Name. | Location. | When established. | Area (acres). | Private lands (acres). | Visitors, 1914. |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Yellowstone (1)..... | Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho..... | Mar. 1, 1872 | 2,142,720 | None. | 20,250 |
| Yosemite (2)..... | California..... | Oct. 1, 1890 | 719,622 | 19,827 | 15,145 |
| Sequoia (3)..... | do..... | Sept. 25, 1890 | 161,597 | 3,716.96 | 4,667 |
| General Grant..... | do..... | Oct. 1, 1890 | 160 | 160 | 3,735 |
| Mount Rainier (4)..... | Washington..... | Mar. 2, 1899 | 207,360 | 18.2 | |
| Crater Lake (5)..... | Oregon..... | May 22, 1902 | 159,360 | 2,458.11 | 7,093 |
| Wind Cave (6)..... | South Dakota..... | Jan. 9, 1903 | 10,522 | 180 | 3,952 |
| Platt (7)..... | Oklahoma..... | July 1, 1902 Apr. 21, 1904 | 848.22 | None. | * 30,000 |
| Mesa Verde (8)..... | Colorado..... | June 29, 1906 | 42,376 | 880 | |
| Boundary changed..... | do..... | June 30, 1913 | 48,966.4 | 993 | 502 |
| Hot Springs Reservation (9)..... | Arkansas..... | June 16, 1880 | 911.63 | None. | * 125,000 |
| Glacier (10)..... | Montana..... | May 11, 1910 | 981,681 | 16,668.11 | 14,168 |
| Sullys Hill (11)..... | North Dakota..... | Apr. 27, 1904 | 780 | None. | 500 |
| Casa Grande Ruins (12)..... | Arizona..... | Mar. 2, 1889 | 480 | None. | * 500 |

* Estimated.

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS.

- (1) Wonderful scenery, geysers, boiling springs, mud volcanoes and springs, mountains, grand waterfalls, brilliant-hued canyons, great lake 8,000 feet above the level of the sea, wild animals.
- (2) Mountain scenery, magnificent waterfalls, the Hetch Hetchy and Yosemite Valley, ice-sculptured canyons, glacier lakes, forests.
- (3) The home of the "big tree" (sequoia gigantea), growing to a height of 300 feet, with a diameter of 30 feet, the bark being 2 feet thick; rugged and picturesque scenery, beautiful cascades and falls, and wonderful caves.
- (4) Glaciers and wild mountain scenery.
- (5) Rugged mountain scenery, beautiful lake within the crater of an extinct volcano, etc.
- (6) Well known by reason of a cavern therein having many miles of galleries and numerous chambers of considerable size containing many peculiar formations.
- (7) Noted for its bromide and other springs, the waters of which have medicinal qualities; park well wooded, scenery picturesque.
- (8) Set aside to preserve the prehistoric ruins of an ancient people; rugged scenery.
- (9) Famous for its thermal springs, having wonderful medicinal qualities.
- (10) Famed for its beautiful lakes derived from glaciers, lofty mountains clad with forests, magnificent glacial formations, numberless waterfalls. Game, fish, and birds abound.
- (11) Small rugged hills containing prehistoric ruins. Practically a local park.
- (12) These ruins are one of the most noteworthy relics of a prehistoric age and people within the limits of the United States. Discovered in ruinous condition in 1694.

All of the Presidents of the United States and all of the Secretaries of the Interior have for several years past been enthusiastically in favor of the establishment of national parks and the development of the national-park service in order that our country and our people may obtain some of the benefits of our unparalleled scenery and climate, and so the visitors and tourists from the world at large, as well as from the various States, may be accommodated and suitably cared for in their visits to our public playgrounds and outdoor recreation centers.

President Taft in his message to Congress on February 2, 1912, in advocacy of the establishment of a bureau of national parks, used the following language:

I earnestly recommend the establishment of a bureau of national parks. Such legislation is essential to the proper management of those

wondrous manifestations of nature, so startling and so beautiful that everyone recognizes the obligations of the Government to preserve them for the edification and recreation of all the people.

The Yellowstone Park, the Yosemite, the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, the Glacier National Park, and the Mount Rainier National Park and others furnish appropriate instances. In only one case have we made anything like adequate preparation for the use of a park by the public. That case is the Yellowstone National Park. Every consideration of patriotism and the love of nature and of beauty and of art requires us to expend money enough to bring all these natural wonders within easy reach of our people. The first step in that direction is the establishment of a responsible bureau, which shall take upon itself the burden of supervising the parks and of making recommendations as to the best method of improving their accessibility and usefulness.

Soon thereafter President Taft delivered an address upon the subject, from which the following extracts may be appropriately quoted:

PRESIDENT TAFT'S ADDRESS.

Ladies and gentlemen: It costs a good deal of money to run a government, and the first ambition of anyone responsible for a government is economy—at least it ought to be. Therefore the proposition to add a bureau or a department sends goose flesh all over the body of anyone who has any sort of responsibility in respect to the finances of the Government, for it means another nucleus for the increase of governmental expenses. Yet a modern government, in order to be what it ought to be, must spend money. Utility involves expense.

Now, we have in the United States a great many natural wonders, and in that lazy way we have in our Government of first taking up one thing and then another, we have set aside a number of national parks, of forest reservations, covering what ought to be national parks, and what are called national monuments. We have said to ourselves: "Those can not get away. We have surrounded them by a law which makes them necessarily Government property forever, and we will wait in our own good time to make them useful as parks to the people of the country. Since the Interior Department is the 'lumber room' of the Government, into which we put everything that we don't know how to classify and don't know what to do with, we will just put them under the Secretary of the Interior." That is the condition of the national parks to-day.

Those of you who have first been in the Yellowstone Park and admired its beauties and thought of the ability of the Army engineers to construct such roads as are there, and then have gone on to the Yosemite and have seen its beauties and have found the roads not quite so good, and then have gone to Grand Canyon and have found a place where you could bury the Yellowstone Canyon and the Yosemite and never know that they were there, and found no roads at all except a railroad, that was built at a great expense and probably at great loss,

to the side of the canyon, and only a trail, called the "Bright Angel Trail," down into the canyon—down which they would not let me go, because they were afraid the mules could not carry me—you will understand that something needs to be done in respect to those parks if we are all to enjoy them.

I am in favor of equality of opportunity, and I resent an exclusion from the enjoyment of the wonders of the world that it only needs a little money to remove.

Now, the course that was taken in respect to the Yellowstone Park ought to be taken in respect to all of our parks. If we are going to have national parks, we ought to make them available to the people, and we ought to build the roads, as expensive as they may be, in order that those parks may become what they are intended to be when Congress creates them. And we can not do that, we can not carry them on effectively unless we have a bureau which is itself distinctly charged with the responsibility for their management and their building up.

When the Secretary of the Interior, therefore, asked me to come here and told me the subject of the meeting to-night, I was glad to come. It is going to add to the expense of the Interior Department, and it is going to swell those estimates, but it is essential that we should use what the Lord has given us in this way and make it available for the people. We have the money. It is not going to take enough to exhaust the Treasury. It is a proper expense, a necessary expense. Let us have the bureau.

The Hon. Walter L. Fisher, Secretary of the Interior during the last administration, made many eloquent and earnest appeals to Congress for suitable recognition and development of the national parks and for the establishment of a park service. In one of his addresses he used the following language:

ADDRESS OF HON. WALTER L. FISHER, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

In the first place, the national parks, like Topsy, have "just grown"; at least that is the impression which has been produced upon my mind from such investigation and discussion as I have given to them. There is no consistent theory of legislation with regard to the national parks. While some of them follow the general lines of previous statutes, there are wide variations in the statutory authority under which the parks are carried on to-day. The whole park work of some States is wholly different from that of others, and the situation in detail is almost radically divergent. For instance, I find some such question as this: Whether the revenue derived from a particular national park shall be available for the use of that park, its improvement and development. We have no consistent action. Two of our important parks are without statutory authority to that effect, so that such revenue as is derived from the park itself in any way has to go back into the general fund of the Nation, to be used in such a way as that derived from any other general source is used, and appropriated directly and specifically for that purpose. In other parks a very large per cent of the money available is directly available without appropriation. The same thing is true with regard to appropriations which Congress gives to the parks. The importance and the political pressure which a particular park possesses bring to it appropriations larger than those which may be given to another. The result is that we have no consistent theory of park administration.

There are many questions which anyone could see at a glance are similar in all these parks. Take, for instance, the question of road making. We have practically the same problems in all of the parks with regard to road making, at least in a very considerable number of them. For instance, there may be three or four parks where these problems are so similar that the general specifications, the general principles that should be applied, are identical, but they may differ from another class of these parks.

Take many of the other questions that are raised in the parks. The whole question of the protection and the disposition of the trees, the concessions, how the hotel concessions shall be managed, what requirement shall be made of the hotel proprietors, what regulations shall be made with regard to the casual, ordinary visitor for his protection and so that he may receive the proper sort of service. These are very similar in all these parks, or, at all events, it is quite apparent that an examination into any given question in one of the parks would throw a great deal of light upon the same problem when it arises in other of the parks.

I mention these things, simple as they may seem, to call your attention to the singular fact that although there has been a great deal of talk of improved efficiency in our Government affairs, we have absolutely no machinery and no legal authority to use any machinery for the coordination of these parks, so we may state this problem as a whole. The only thing we can possibly do in the way of coordination in the Interior Department is to see that questions that come to us for determination are referred to the same individuals in the department. We can see that the chief clerk or his assistant shall primarily pass upon these matters. We may say that the assistant secretary—as distinguished from the first assistant, there being two—shall be the person to whom appeals shall go, the person to whom the chief clerk shall go for final determination of questions of importance; and we do. When we have done that we are through. We may use our Division of Mails and Files. We may use our Division of Publications and get a certain amount of effective work there; and we have Mr. Schmeckebier, of that division, who has accomplished some quite remarkable results, in my judgment, in the publicity line simply in getting out some material to those who are eager to have it. We have found that the American public is greedy for real news about the national parks; that it is genuinely interested in the national parks and ready to get anything that is not simply perfunctory news upon this subject. But when we have done these things the Department of the Interior is through. That is all that it can do toward coordination. It would seem that it required practically no argument to convince that the one thing we need at once for the efficiency of administration and economy in expenditure is to get these parks together under some division or bureau where they can receive the benefit of a central staff, where we can take the men who are now studying road making, or the management of roads, or the sprinkling problem, which is, after all, to the traveling public probably the most important question connected with the administration of the park, because the hotels will do a certain amount of looking after their own interests along the lines of intelligent and enlightened selfishness; and the revenue is there. But if the roads are to be sprinkled and taken care of, that must be done purely as a matter of expenditure, and unless it is looked after by the administrative force it will not be looked after at all.

Now, it is perfectly apparent what we ought to have. We ought to have some sort of a central organization—something in the nature of a bureau, with a head and subordinates—so we can get proper expert talent and men who will devote their time to the matters not merely with regard to one park, but all the parks where the question arises. It is perfectly apparent that if we were studying any one of these questions with regard to any one of these parks and were confined to that and the appropriations for that park we could not get as good a man to study these problems in the case of the others. And, in the second place, after we have done it once, unless we can utilize his advice and experience some place else, we don't get it at all. Then, another thing. We get rid of a good many of these isolated and separate and distinct appropriations. We would not have several appropriations made distinctly for the Yellowstone Park and made for the Yosemite Park, and so on down the line, and each appropriation confined to that particular or some particular function or interest in that park, but we would begin to learn that many of these problems are alike; that it is not enough to treat one park in one way and another in another way. We would have our bureau bring forward the things in our parks which now do not receive particular attention, very largely through ignorance of the subject, because the experience of the particular man who has that park in charge has not been so great as has been that of some other man.

The famous explorer and geologist, Dr. Hayden, in describing this wonderful scenic region as early as 1875, wrote:

Not only has nature amply supplied this region with features of great beauty and surroundings of admirable character, but it has thus distributed them that the eye of the artist may rest with perfect satisfaction on the complete picture presented.

Right Hon. James Bryce, British ambassador to the United States, in his address before the American Civic Association, November 20, 1912, among other things stated:

I have lived long enough in the United States and have known the United States long enough, having come here for the first time 42 years ago, to feel just as much interested in all those questions that relate to your welfare, in city and country, as if I were one of your citizens, and I hope you will allow me to speak to you with that freedom which you would allow to one of your citizens. I do not think I need to feel those limitations when discussing a subject of this kind, so far removed from politics or any other controversial fields.

Now, a word about additional parks. Although you have done splendidly in creating these I have mentioned and some others, there are still other places where national parks are wanted. * * * Then you might have some additional parks in Colorado also.

The places of scenic beauty do not increase, but, on the contrary, are in danger of being reduced in number and diminished in quantity, and the danger is always increasing with the accumulation of wealth, owing to the desire of private persons to appropriate these places. There is no better service we can render to the masses of the people than to set about and preserve for them wide spaces of fine scenery for their delight.

From these propositions I draw the conclusion that it is necessary to save what we have got and to extend the policy which you have wisely adopted by acquiring and preserving still further areas for the perpetual enjoyment of the people.

Mr. J. Horace McFarland, president of the American Civic Association, in an address to this society entitled "Are national parks worth while?" stated, among other things:

So I hold that in safeguarding and stimulating the essential virtue of patriotism the beauty of the American park stands forth as most of all worth while. I urge that as an antidote to the teachings of social disorder, as a counterirritant to the saloon, as a relentless foe to the slum, the American park idea in the playground is most completely justified.

The primary function of the national forests is to supply lumber. The primary function of the national parks is to maintain in healthful efficiency the lives of the people who must use that lumber. The forests are the Nation's reserve wood lots. The parks are the Nation's reserve for the maintenance of individual patriotism and Federal solidarity. The true ideal of their maintenance does not run parallel to the making of the most timber, or the most pasturage, or the most water power.

On another occasion Mr. McFarland also stated:

The value of great scenic possessions is being increasingly recognized the world over. Its value is now known to have great influence upon the development of that best citizenship, without which a country is poor, indeed.

LORD DUNRAVEN ON ESTES PARK.

No one ever has shown a higher appreciation of the attractiveness of Estes Park, which is an essential part of the proposed national park, than the Earl of Dunraven, an English peer, who has achieved an enviable reputation both as an author and a sportsman, and no one has had a better opportunity to form an opinion on the subject. In the early days, when Colorado still was a Territory and he was a young man, the Earl was attracted there by the reports of the abundance of big game. He was among the first to enter the park, and he was so entranced by the beauties of the scenery and by the presence of elk, deer, mountain sheep, and other wild animals that he undertook to establish himself there permanently. He obtained possession of about 10,000 acres of land, including the greater part of the park, with the idea of establishing an immense game preserve and, incidentally, of entering into the cattle business upon a great scale. He took in a large number of stock and spent several years in the park, but, while he met with no obstacles in the beginning, increasing population ultimately had the effect of causing him to surrender control of this natural

beauty spot, and he long since ceased to maintain his proprietary rights there. That, however, his interest did not cease with the cessation of his property tenure has been made manifest by his utterances on the subject. In one of his books, "The Great Divide," devoted in the main to an account of a camping trip through Yellowstone Park, and written as early as 1876, he makes many pleasant references to Estes Park, and in a recent work, entitled "Canadian Nights," he devotes an entire chapter to the Colorado park, which it is proposed now to transform into a national park. The chapter is entitled "A Colorado sketch," and it is so full of appreciation and withal so enlightening that I ask to have it inserted as a part of these hearings. The sketch is as follows:

A COLORADO SKETCH.

It would appear that the American Continent was originally of considerably larger dimensions than it is at present. It was probably found to be altogether too large for comfort or convenience, and it was reduced by the simple process of pressing or squeezing it together from the sides—an operation which caused it to crumple up toward the center, and produced that great, elevated, tumbled, and tossed region generally and vaguely known as the Rocky Mountains. If this simple theory of the formation of a continent sounds somewhat infantile, you must remember that I am not a scientific man, and that it is not more unscientific than many other theories of creation. There is no such thing as a chain of Rocky Mountains. Under that name are included various ranges and belts of mountains and hills, which embrace within their far stretching arms fertile valleys, arid deserts, sunny hill slopes clothed with valuable timber, parks full of pastoral beauty basking beneath a sun that warms them into semitropical life, but which never melts the virgin snow whitening the hoary heads of the mountains that forever look down upon those smiling scenes. Rich and extensive plains, tracts of inhabitable land almost large enough to be the cradle and home of nations, are included in the Rocky Mountains. Among all the States and Territories that lie wholly or partially within the borders of this vast, upheaved region there is none, so far as I am aware, more favored by nature and at the same time more accessible to man than Colorado. It is easily reached from all the great cities of the Eastern States; its scenery is varied, beautiful, grand, and even magnificent. Crystal streams of pure, wholesome water rush down the hillsides, play at hide and seek in the woods, and wander deviously through the parks. The climate is health-giving—unsurpassed, as I believe, anywhere—giving to the jaded spirit, the unstrung nerves, and weakened body a stimulant, a tone, and a vigor that can only be appreciated by those who have had the good fortune to travel or reside in that region.

The parks of Colorado constitute its special feature; there is nothing elsewhere on the American Continent resembling them in natural characteristics. They are not valleys; they are too flat and extensive for that. They can not be called plains, for they are not flat enough; and, besides, plains are generally bare and destitute of trees, while the parks are rich in timber, with beautifully undulating surfaces, broken up by hills, spurs from the parent range, and isolated mountains. The term "park" is usually applied to ground more or less artificially made; and these places are very properly called parks, for they look, if it be not rank heresy to liken nature to art, as if ground naturally picturesque had been carefully laid out and planted with most consummate skill and taste. Some of them are of great size, such as the North, Middle, South, and St. Louis Parks; others—and it is with them I am best acquainted—are comparatively small.

There are many things to arouse deep interest in that favored region. Where you find lofty mountains, foothills, plain, valley, forest, and quick-flowing stream, in a southern latitude, you have in combination all that can gratify the scientific student, as well as all that can content the eye of man, in the way of scenery. The philosopher who devotes himself to the study of atmospheric conditions could nowhere find a more fitting field for observation. The mountain ranges and extensive level spaces comprised within their limits are important factors in the economy of nature. The great masses of heat-radiating rock temper the winds that blow over them and shed genial warmth far and wide.

The whole region is one vast brewery of storms. Chemical changes are constantly going on. Electricity is working with exceptional vigor, riving the solid rocks, devastating trees, and putting forth most vividly the awful and mysterious manifestations of its strength. Hot currents and cold currents fight aerial battles round those patient peaks, that stand unmoved amidst the roar and racket of elemental strife. Frequent lightnings blaze or flicker round the mountain heads; continuous thunder crashes on their slopes and rolls and rumbles in the caverns and valleys that seam their sides. Tempests shriek round the crags and moan dismally as they toss the gnarled and matted branches of the stunted trees that force their adventurous way up the broad shoulders of the range. Snow in winter, rain and hail in summer, pour upon the higher summits, while beneath the land is glowing under a cloudless sky. Contending air currents of different density discharge their moisture on the hills. The sun draws up fresh moisture from the valleys, like drawing water from a well. All nature seems seething in that region of heat and cold, sunshine and tempest, dryness and damp, constantly fabricating those great cloud masses that, breaking away from their cradle, carry rain and fertility over thousands and thousands of miles. Sometimes they overexert themselves, carry their good intentions too far, exceed their proper limits, and, transgressing the boundaries of their native land, cross the wide Atlantic and pour their accumulated store of rain upon those already sodden little islands, Great Britain and Ireland.

The parks and valleys which spread out beneath the mountains or nestle cosily amid the warm folds of the forest mantles which clothe them play also an important part. They act as reservoirs; they catch the little, tiny, ice-cold rills that trickle out from under the ever-melting but never-melted snow, gather them together, hold them till they grow strong enough to carve their way through the granite flanks that hem them in, and launch them out into the world, forming rivulets bright and sparkling, flecked with light and shade, over which the quivering aspen bends from banks sweet and bright with flowers; growing into brooks down which lumber may be rafted; swelling into streams which carry irrigation and fertility to arid wastes, becoming rivers upon which steamboats ply and ships ride at anchor.

Physical geography is a fascinating science, and to the student of it nothing can be more interesting than to stand upon some commanding

mountain top and, with a large, comprehensive view, study the configuration of the country that gives birth to those rivers that in their course determine the natural geographical features of a continent, and consequently shape the destiny of a race. From many a peak in Colorado the geographer can trace the devious line of the "watershed," the "divide" that separates the rivers and sends them out, each on its appointed course, and can see, shining like silver threads, the rivulets from which they spring. Looking westward and to the north and south he can see the fountains of both Platte, of the Rio Grande—the grand river—the Arkansas, the Blue, the White, and the Bear Rivers, and other streams which unite to form that most extraordinary of all rivers on the American continent, the Colorado. Turning to the east a very different scene greets his eye. There, spread out like an ocean beneath him, lies the prairie, that great deposit of gravel, sand, and unstratified clays, the débris of the mountain range on which he stands.

Where could the geologist find a region more suitable for the exercise of his peculiar branch of science than one which combines the vast deposit of the prairies with mountain masses obtruded from the bowels of the earth, and deep canyons exposing broad sections of the earth's crust to his view? And where is the mineralogist more likely to be rewarded for his pains? As to the botanist, I would almost warn him from visiting those scenes, lest he should never be able to tear himself away; for the variety of the flora is infinite, ranging from Alpine specimens blooming amid everlasting snows, to flowers of a very different character, growing in rich luxuriance in deep valleys under a subtropical sun.

I have not included hunting among the sciences, but in reality I might have done so. It is a very exact science, and one in which excellence is rarely obtained. Many men never become, never can become, good hunters. They are not endowed with the necessary faculties; and those who are gifted with them require years of study and hard work before they can be entitled to call themselves masters of the art. I hope no one labors under the delusion that hunting is a mere barbarous, bloodthirsty sport. Every good hunter will agree with me that it is not the killing of the animal that gives pleasure. The charm lies in overcoming difficulties—in matching your natural intelligence and acquired knowledge and skill against the instinct, cunning, intellect, and reason of the animal you are endeavoring to outwit.

The reward of the hunter is the same as that of the student of languages, of the archeologist, of the geologist—in fact, of all scientific people. His triumph is the triumph of unraveling a mystery, tracing and discovering a hidden fact, grappling with and overcoming a difficulty. It is the fact of overcoming, not the act of killing, that brightens the hunter's eye and renders his occupation so charming. The hunter's craft gives health, its surroundings are beautiful, it calls forth some of the best qualities of man, it is full of fascination, and it is no wonder that primitive races find it difficult to emerge from the hunting condition. It is most annoying that everything that is pleasant is all wrong. We all know that peoples, in their progress toward civilization, advance from the hunting to the pastoral state, from the pastoral to the agricultural, and from thence to a condition of existence in which the manufacturing instincts of man are fully developed. This is the sequence—hunting, cattle tending, sheep herding, fresh air, good water, lovely scenery, wholesome excitement, healthy lives, and—barbarism; agriculture, manufactures, great cities, hideous country, poisoned water, impure air, dirt, disease, and—civilization. It is difficult sometimes to know exactly what to say when preaching civilization to the savage. It is certain that in so far as the masses of the people are concerned the highest aim of civilization is to secure to a large number the same blessings that a small number obtain, freely and without trouble, in an uncivilized state.

It was sport, or, as it would be called in the States, hunting, that led me first to visit Estes Park. Some friends and I had visited Denver at Christmas to pay our proper devotions to the good things of this earth at that festive season, and hearing rumors of much game at Estes Park we determined to go there. We spent a day or two laying in supplies, purchasing many of the necessaries and a few of the luxuries of life, and wound up our sojourn in Denver with a very pleasant dinner at an excellent restaurant, not inaptly styled the "Delmonico" of the West. During dinner one of those sudden and violent storms peculiar to that region came on. When we sat down the stars were shining clear and hard with the brilliancy that is so beautiful in those high altitudes on a cold, dry midwinter night, and not a breath of wind disturbed the stillness of the air, but before we had half satisfied the appetites engendered by the keen, frosty atmosphere the stars were all shrouded in cloud, the gale was howling through the streets, and snow was whirling in the air, piling up in drifts wherever it found a lodgment and sifting in fine powder through every chink and cranny in the door. It did not last long. Before morning the sky was clear, cloudless, steely, star-bespangled as before, and when we left by an early train for Longmont Station the sun was shining undimmed upon the fields of freshly fallen snow.

By way of enlivening the journey we were treated by thoughtful nature to a magnificent spectacle—a beautiful exhibition of that phenomenon known, I believe, as a parhelion. The sun was only a few degrees above the horizon. The sky was very clear and intensely blue overhead, but slightly clouded with a thin gauzy film round the horizon, and, on looking up, one could see that the air was full of minute crystals of ice. It was tolerably cold—probably about 15° or 20° below zero—and perfectly calm. All around the horizon ran a belt of pure bright white light, passing through the sun. This belt was not exactly level, but dipped a little to the east and west, and rose slightly to the north and south. The sun was surrounded by a halo showing rainbow colors on the inside, which faded into white light on the outside edge. A bright perpendicular ray of white light cut through the sun, forming, with the belt that ran round the horizon, a perfect cross. There was a similar cross in the west, and another in the north, but none in the south at first, but after an hour or so a fourth cross formed in that quarter also. Right overhead was a partially formed horizontal rainbow, the colors of which were very bright. Sometimes this rainbow would develop into an almost perfect circle, then, again, it would diminish till there remained only a small segment of the circle. The points where the solar halo cut the belt which encircled the horizon were intensely brilliant—almost as bright as the sun—and rays of white light struck down from them. As the sun rose the halo surrounding it became very dazzling, and assumed the colors of the rainbow, and a second rainbow-tinted circle formed outside it. The rainbow in the zenith increased at the same time in brilliancy, and a second circle formed outside that also. The whole phenomenon was very beautiful; it continued some hours, gradually fading away, and finally disappeared about 3 in the afternoon.

The next morning we loaded up a wagon with stores and started on our toilsome expedition to the park. It is very easy work—it is not

work at all, in fact—to get into the park nowadays. It was a very different affair at that time. There are two good stage roads now. There was no road at all then, only a rough track going straight up hill and down dale and over rocks and through trees and along nearly perpendicular slopes, with the glorious determination to go straight forward of an old Roman road, but without any of the engineering skill and labor expended upon the latter. It was a hard road to travel, covered with snow and slippery with ice; but, by dint of literally putting our shoulders to the wheel uphill, by chaining the wheels downhill, and by holding up the wagon by ropes and main strength on precipitous hillsides, we got to our destination very late at night, with only one serious accident—the fracture of a bottle containing medical comforts.

The road from Longmont to the park traverses the level plain for about 15 miles, and then enters a canyon flanked on either side by strange-shaped masses of bright red sandstone, outcropping from the surface, and in some places tilted nearly on end. It then follows along the bank of the St. Vrain River, teeming with trout, crosses that stream, and works its way, with many curves and twists, up through the foothills, along grassy slopes, through pine forests, past fantastic masses of rock, crosses a little creek hiding deep among aspens and poplars, and, after plunging down two violent descents and mounting up again, enters a long valley rejoicing in the euphonious title of "Muggins Gulch." I do not know who Muggins was—no doubt an honest citizen—but he should have changed his name before bestowing it upon such a pretty spot. You ascend this valley at an easy gradient till you reach the summit, when suddenly a lovely view bursts upon you, and the park lies spread out at your feet. On the left the hillside rises steeply, crowned with a buttress of frowning rock. On the right a mountain of almost solid rock stands naked and savage. In front, beyond the park, the main range of mountains rears itself, topped with snow, rent in great chasms, pierced by the gloomy heavily timbered depths of black canyon. On the extreme left and in the distance Longs Peak towers above its fellows, and beneath you, in strange contrast with the barren foothills through which you have passed and the savage, stern grandeur of the range, lies the park—undulating, grass covered, dotted with trees, peaceful, and quiet, with a silver thread of water curving and twining through its midst.

A log house is comfortable enough at any time, and on that particular night it appeared eminently so to us, as, cold and wearied, we passed the hospitable threshold. What a supper we devoured, and what logs we heaped upon the fire, till we made the flames leap and roar on the open hearth; and then lay down on mattresses on the floor and listened to the howling of the wind, till the noise of the tempest, confusedly mingling with our dreams, was finally hushed in deep, unbroken sleep.

The winter weather in northern Colorado is most enjoyable. At the high altitude of Estes Park, between 7,000 and 8,000 feet above sea level, it consists of alternate short storms and long spells of fine weather. You will have several days of bright clear weather, hard frost, the thermometer very low, but the sun so powerful that you can lie down and go fast asleep, as I have frequently done, on a warm, sunny, and sheltered bank, in the very depth of winter. Then the clouds begin to accumulate, growing denser and denser, till they break and descend in a snowstorm of some hours' duration. The cattle, which before dotted all the open ground, disappear as if by magic, seeking and finding shelter in little hidden gulches and unnoticed valleys, and the land looks utterly desolate. The snowstorm is invariably succeeded by a violent tempest of wind, which speedily clears the ground of snow, heaping it up in drifts, and blowing the greater part of it into the air in such a thin powdery condition that it is taken up by the atmosphere and disappears completely. So dry is the air and so warm the winter's sun that snow evaporates without leaving any moisture behind it. Another period of clear, still, cold weather then follows after the gale.

The violence of these tempests is very great. Many a night have I lain awake listening to the screams and clamor of the gale; now rising suddenly to a shriek as a fresh gust of wind came tearing down the level plain, snatching up pebbles and stones, sending them hopping over the ground, and hurling them against the log house; then sinking to a long melancholy moan; whistling shrilly around the walls, hoarsely howling in the wide chimney; while, under all, the low continuous roar of the tempest raging in the distant forest sounded like a mighty bass note in the savage music of the storm.

That is the time to appreciate the comfort of a warm weather-proof house, to snuggle up in your blanket and idly watch the merry sparks fly up the chimney, and the warm ruddy flicker of the fire casting shadows on the rough brown pine logs; gazing and blinking, listening and thinking, one's thoughts perhaps wandering very far away, and getting less and less coherent. The storm chimes in with your fancies, mingles with your dreams, till with a start you open your eyes, and find to your astonishment the level rays of the rising sun lighting up a scene as calm and peaceful as if the tempest had never been.

In spring and summer the scene and climate are very different. Ice and snow and withered grass have passed away, and everything is basking and glowing under a blazing sun, hot but always tempered with a cool breeze. Cattle wander about the plain—or try to wander, for they are so fat they can scarcely move. Water fowl frequent the lakes. The whole earth is green, and the margins of the streams are luxuriant with a profuse growth of wild flowers and rich herbage. The air is scented with the sweet-smelling sap of the pines, whose branches welcome many feathered visitors from southern climes; an occasional humming-bird whirrs among the shrubs, trout leap in the creeks, insects buzz in the air; all nature is active and exuberant with life.

I and a Scotch gillie, who had accompanied me from home, took up our abode in a little log shanty close to the ranch house, and made ourselves very cozy. There was not much elegance or luxury in our domicile, but plenty of comfort. Two rough rooms—a huge fireplace in one of them—two beds, and no other furniture of any kind whatever, completed our establishment. But what on earth did we want with furniture? We were up before daylight, out hunting or fishing all day, had our food at the ranch, sat on the ground and smoked our pipes, and went to bed early. One's rest is a good deal broken in wintertime, and it is necessary to go to bed early in order to get enough sleep, because in very cold weather it is highly advisable to keep a fire burning all night; and as yet hunters have not evolved the faculty of putting on logs in their sleep. It would be most useful if they could do so; and, according to the law of evolution, some of them by this time ought to have done it. However, I was not much troubled, for Sandie, who slept by the fire, was very wakeful. I would generally awake about 2 or 3 in the morning to find the logs blazing and crackling merrily, and Sandie, sitting in the ingle smoking his pipe, plunged in deep thought.

"Well, Sandie," I would say, "what kind of a night is it, and what are you thinking of?"

"Oh, well, it's a fine night, just a wee bit cheely outside [thermometer about 25° below zero]; and I'm thinking we did not make that stalk after the big stag just right yesterday; and I'm thinking where we'll go to-day to find him." Then we would smoke a little—have a little, as Sandie would call it—and discuss the vexed question of how we made the mistake with the big stag; and having come to a satisfactory conclusion and agreed that the stag had the biggest antlers that ever were seen—which is always the case with deer you don't get—we would put out our pipes and sleep till daylight warned us to set about our appointed task, which was to find a deer somehow, for the larrier wanted replenishing.

In those days you had not far to seek for game, and you could scarcely go wrong in any direction at any season of the year. In winter and spring the park still swarms with game; but it is necessary in summer to know where to look for it, to understand its manners and customs, to go farther and to work harder than formerly, for Estes Park is civilized. In summer time beautiful but dangerous creatures roam the park. The tracks of tiny little shoes are more frequent than the less interesting but harmless footprints of mountain sheep. You are more likely to catch a glimpse of the flicker of the hem of a white petticoat in the distance than of the glancing form of a deer. The marks of carriage wheels are more plentiful than elk signs, and you are not now so likely to be scared by the humanlike track of a gigantic bear as by the appalling impress of a No. 11 boot.

That is as it should be. There is plenty of room elsewhere for wild beasts, and nature's beauties should be enjoyed by man. I well remember the commencement of civilization. I was sitting on the stoop of the log shanty one fine hot summer's evening, when to me appeared the strange apparition of an aged gentleman on a diminutive donkey. He was the first stranger I had ever seen in the park. After surveying me in silence for some moments he observed, "Say, is this a pretty good place to drink whisky in?" I replied, "Yes," naturally, for I have never heard of a spot that was not favorable for the consumption of whisky, the State of Maine not excepted. "Well, have you any to sell?" he continued. "No," I answered, "got none." After gazing at me in melancholy silence for some moments, evidently puzzled at the idea of a man and a house but no whisky, he went slowly and sadly on his way, and I saw him no more.

On the morning that Sandie and I went out, it was not necessary to go far from the house. We had not ridden long before we came to likely looking country, got off, unsaddled and tethered our horses, and started on foot, carefully scanning the ground for fresh sign. Soon we came upon it—quite recently formed tracks of three or four deer. Then we had to decide upon the plan of operations in a long and whispered conversation; and finally, having settled where the deer were likely to be, and how to get at them, we made a long circuit, so as to be down wind of the game, and went to work. The ground to which I am referring is very rough. It slopes precipitously toward the river. Huge masses of rock lie littered about on a surface pierced by many perpendicular jagged crags, hundreds of feet high, and long ridges and spurs strike downward from the sheer scarp that crowns the canyon of the river, forming beautiful little glades—sheltered, sunny, clothed with sweet grass—on which the deer love to feed.

In such a country there was no chance of seeing game at any distance; so we had to go very cautiously, examining every sign, crawling up to every little ridge, and inch by inch craning our heads over and peering into every bush and under every tree. In looking over a rise of ground it is advisable for the hunter to take off his head covering unless he wears a very tight-fitting cap. I have often laughed to see great hunters (great in their own estimation) raising their heads most carefully, forgetting that a tall felt hat, some 6 inches above their eyes, had already been for some time in view of the deer. Many hunters seem to think that the deer can not see them till they see the deer.

The sportsman can not go too slowly, and it is better to hunt out one little gully thoroughly than to cover miles of ground in the day. If he walks rapidly he will scare heaps of deer, hear lots of crashing in the trees and scattering of stones, and perhaps see the whisk of a white tail, or the glance of a dark form, through the trees, but never get a shot for his pains. We pursued a different plan—took each little gulch separately, and carefully crept up it, searching every inch of ground, using redoubled caution toward the end where the bush is thickest, and especially scanning the north side; for, strange to say, deer prefer lying on the north side of valleys in the snow, even during the coldest weather, to resting on the warm sunny grass on the southern slopes. Patiently we worked; but our patience was not well rewarded, for not a sign of anything did we see till our entirely foodless stomachs and the nearly shadowless trees indicated that it was past noon. So we sat us down in a nice little sheltered nook, from whence we commanded a good view of the precipitous cliffs and gullies that led down to the tortuous and icebound creek, some thousands of feet below us, as well as of the face of the mountain that reared itself on the opposite side, and betook ourselves to food and reflection. It is very pleasant to lie comfortably stretched out with nothing to do but to gaze with idle pleasure and complete content upon grand and varied scenery. The eye, now plunging into the abyss of blue crossed at intervals by swiftly moving clouds, now lowered and resting on the earth, pauses for a minute on the dazzling snow-white summits, then travels down through dark-green pine woods, wanders over little open glades or valleys gray with withered grass, glances at steep cliffs and great river masses of rock which time and weather have detached and hurled down the mountain side, and falls at last upon the pale-green belt of aspens that fringes the rivers, white with snow where spanned with ice, but black as ink where a rapid torrent has defied the frost. Nor is the eye wearied with its journey; for mountain, valley, cliff, and glade are so mingled, and are so constantly changing with light and shade, that one could look for hours without a wish to move. The mind goes half asleep and wonders lazily whether its body is really there in the heart of the Rocky Mountains leading a hunter's life, or whether it is not all a dream—a dream of schoolboy days which seemed at one time so little likely to be realized, and yet which is at length fulfilled.

It must not be supposed that, because we were half asleep and wholly dreaming, we were not also keeping a sharp lookout; for in a man who is very much accustomed to take note of every unusual object, of every moving thing, and of the slightest sign of any living creature—more especially if he has roamed much on the prairies where hostile redskins lurk and creep—the faculty of observation is so constantly exercised that it becomes a habit unconsciously used, and he is all the time seeing sights, and hearing sounds, and smelling smells, and noting them down, and receiving all kinds of impressions from all external objects, without being the least aware of it himself. However, none of our senses were gratified by anything that betokened the presence of game, and,

after resting a little while, we picked up our rifles and stole quietly on again. So we crept and hunted, and hunted and crept, and peered and whispered, and wondered we saw nothing, till the pine trees were casting long shadows to the east, when suddenly Sandie, who was a pace or two in front of me, became rigid, changed into a man of stone, and them, almost imperceptibly, a hairbreadth at a time, stooped his head and sank down. If you come suddenly in sight of game, you should remain perfectly motionless for a time, and sink out of sight gradually; for if you drop down quickly, the movement will startle it. Deer seem to be shortsighted. They do not notice a man, even close by, unless he moves. I never saw a man so excited at the sight of game, and yet so quiet, as Sandie. It seemed as if he would fly to pieces; he seized my arm with a grip like a vise, and whispered, "Oh, a great stag within easy shot from the big rock yonder. He has not seen me." So, prone upon the earth, I crawled up to the rock, cocked the rifle, drew a long breath, raised myself into a sitting position, got a good sight on the deer, pulled, and had the satisfaction of seeing him tumbling headlong down the gulch, till he stopped stone dead jammed between two trees.

Leaving Sandie to prepare the stag for transportation, I started off as fast as I could and brought one of the ponies down to the carcass. It was pretty bad going for a four-footed animal; but Colorado horses, if used to the mountains, will go almost anywhere. The way they will climb up places, and slither down places, and pick their way through "windfalls" is marvelous. They seem to be possessed of any number of feet and to put them down always exactly at the right moment in the right place. I do not suppose they like it, for they groan and grunt the while in a most piteous manner. My pony was sure-footed and willing, and, moreover, was used to pack game; so we had little trouble with him, and before long had the deer firmly secured on the saddle and were well on our way home. It was well for us that we killed the deer in a comparatively accessible place or we should not have got him in that night or the next day. It was almost dark when we topped the ridge and could look down into the park and see the range beyond, and there were plenty of signs there to show that a storm was at hand. Right overhead the stars were shining, but all the sky to the west was one huge wall of cloud. Black Canon, the canon of the river, and all the great rents in the range were filled with vapor, and all the mountains were wrapped in cloud.

When we left the ranch that night after a good supper, a game of euchre, and sundry pipes it was pitch dark and light flakes of snow were noiselessly floating down to the earth, and when we got up the next morning behold there was not a thing to be seen. Mountains, ranch house, and everything else were blotted out by a densely falling white, bewildering mass of snow. Toward noon it lightened up a little, and great gray shapes of mountains loomed out now and then a shade darker than the white wall that almost hid them; but the weather was not fit for hunting, and as there was nothing else to be done out of doors we made a fête of it, as a French-Canadian would say, and devoted ourselves to gun cleaning and spinning yarns.

When deep snow lies upon the higher grounds surrounding Estes Park wapiti come down into the park in considerable numbers. The wapiti is a splendid beast, the handsomest by far of all the deer tribe. He is called an elk in the States—why, I do not know; for the European elk is identical with the American moose, and a moose and a wapiti are not the least alike. But I presume the wapiti is called by the Americans an elk for the same reason that they call thrushes robins and grouse partridges. The reason, I dare say, is a good one, but I do not know what it is.

The wapiti enjoys a range extending from the Pacific seaboard to the Mississippi and from the northwest territories in British possessions down to Texas, and he formerly was found all the way across the continent and in the Eastern States. He is exactly like the European red deer—only about twice as large—carries magnificent antlers, and is altogether a glorious animal. Wapiti are very shy. They require quiet and large undisturbed pastures, and they are hunted with a thoughtless brutality that must shortly lead to their extermination in civilized districts. They do not accustom themselves to civilization as easily as do moose or antelope, but resent deeply the proximity of man; that is to say, of civilized man, for Indians do not interfere with them very much. Indians, as a rule, are not really fond of hunting; they hunt for subsistence, not for pleasure, and where buffalo are to be found never trouble their heads about smaller game. Elk are plentiful in any Indian country that suits them. In fact, as a rule, there is very little use in hunting wapiti in any country that is not exposed to Indian incursions, and the more dangerous the country the better sport you are likely to have; but this is not an invariable rule. There are some places where wapiti may be found in quite sufficient numbers to repay a sportsman's labor and where he need not incur the smallest risk to life or limb. I imagine there are more wapiti to be found in Montana and the adjacent territories than in any other part of the United States. Wapiti are to be met with in forests of timber, among the mountains, and on the treeless prairie. They are, I think, most numerous on the plains, but the finest specimens are found in timbered districts.

One might suppose that branching antlers would cause inconvenience to an animal running through the tangle of a primeval forest, but the contrary appears to be the case, for in all countries the woodland deer carry far finer heads than the stags of the same species that range in open country. The size of the antlers depends entirely on the food which the animal can procure. Where he is well fed, they will be well developed; where food is scarce, they will be small. In a timbered country there is more shelter than on the plains, the grass is not so deeply covered with snow in winter, and consequently food is more plentiful at that time of year and the animal thrives better. You always find heavier deer in woodland than in an open country. Early in the fall the stags gather large herds of hinds about them; about the end of October they separate, and the big stags wander off alone for a while, and then later on join in with the big bands of hinds and small stags. During the winter they run in great numbers—it is not unusual to find herds of two or three hundred together, and I have seen, I believe, as many as a thousand different wapiti within a week. A large herd of these grand animals is a magnificent sight and one not soon to be forgotten. They are to be killed either by stalking them on foot, or partially on foot and partially on horseback, or by running them on horseback as you would run buffalo.

THE PARK REGION AS SEEN BY AN ENGLISH LADY.

Fortunately for the region embraced in the proposed park, that part of Colorado was visited while yet in its primitive state by Miss Isabella L. Bird, who, like Lord Dunraven, was English, and like him also a traveler and writer of many books. She went to Colorado in 1873, after a visit to the tropical islands of the Pacific Ocean, and became so entranced with the beauties

of the Longs Peak country that she spent two years in that vicinity, practically camping out. She wrote many letters to friends at home in England, which afterwards were collected and published in book form under the title of "A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains." The book was published in England and by Putnam's, of New York, in 1880. These letters fairly teem with ecstatic praise of the atmosphere, the scenery, and the wild life of the country, and all are portrayed in such choice language and such graphic style as to render the little book a classic in travel literature.

Much of the text is occupied with Estes Park, but Miss Bird also spent considerable time in the adjoining mountains, and she was entranced by every spot. She was one of the first women to make an ascent of Longs Peak, that great sentinel of the Front Range. Her ascent of the peak, which is within this proposed national park, was made late in the fall and was replete with danger and hardship. Her account of the experience would be worth producing as a whole, but I present only a few descriptive extracts. To her this great mountain was king of all other Colorado peaks, and time and again she compares it to Mont Blanc and the Matterhorn. She first views the mountain from a glade much to her liking, of which she says:

This is an upland valley of grass and flowers, of glades and sloping lawns, and cherry-fringed beds of dry streams, and clumps of pines artistically placed, and mountain sides densely pine clad, the pines breaking into fringes as they come down upon the park and the mountains breaking into pinnacles of bold gray rock as they pierce the blue of the sky. A single dell of bright green grass on which dwarf clumps of the scarlet poison oak look like beds of geraniums slopes toward the west. Deep vast canyons, all trending westward, lie in purple gloom. Pine-clad ridges, rising into the blasted top of Storm Peak, all run westward, too, and all the beauty and glory are but the frame out of which rises—heaven piercing, pure in its pearly luster, as glorious a mountain as the sun tinged red in either hemisphere—the splintered, pinnacled, lovely, ghostly, impossible, double-peaked summit of Longs Peak, the Mount Blanc of northern Colorado. This is a view to which nothing needs to be added. This is the lodge in some vast wilderness for which one often sighs when in the midst of a bustle at once sordid and trivial. This scenery satisfies my soul.

This place is, indeed, far removed. It seems farther away than any place I have been to yet, except the frozen top of the volcano of Mauna Loa. It is so little profaned by man that if one were compelled to live here in solitude one might truly say of the bears, deer, and elk, which abound, "their tameness is shocking to me." It is the world of big game. Just now a big, heavy-bearded elk, with much branched horns fully 3 feet long, stood and looked at me and quietly trotted away. He was so near that I heard the grass, crisp with hoarfrost, crackle under his feet. Bears stripped the cherry bushes within a few yards of us last night. Now two lovely bluebirds, with crests on their heads, are picking about within a stone's throw.

Coming to Estes Park, where Miss Bird spent much of her time, she says:

From a ridge at a height of 9,000 feet we saw at last Estes Park, lying 1,500 feet below in the glory of the setting sun, an irregular basin, lighted up by the bright waters of the rushing Thompson, guarded by sentinel mountains of fantastic shape and enormous size, with Longs Peak rising above them all in unapproachable grandeur while the Snowy Range, with its outlying spurs heavily timbered, came down upon the park slashed by stupendous canyons lying deep in purple gloom. The rushing river was blood red, Longs Peak was aflame, the glory of the glowing heaven was given back from earth. Never, nowhere, have I seen anything to equal the view into Estes Park.

We had an ascent of four hours through a ravine which gradually opened out upon this beautiful park. But we rode for some miles before the view burst upon us. The vastness of the mountain range, like astronomical distances, can hardly be conceived of. At this place I suppose it is not less than 250 miles wide, and with barely a break in its continuity it stretches almost from the Arctic Circle to the Straits of Magellan.

From the top of Longs Peak, within a short distance, 22 summits, each above 12,000 feet in height, are visible, and the Snowy Range—the backbone or divide of the continent—is seen snaking distinctly through the wilderness of ranges, with its waters starting for either ocean.

From the first ridge we crossed we had a singular view of range beyond range, cleft by deep canyons and abounding in elliptical valleys, richly grassed. The slopes of all the hills as far as one could see were waving with fine grass for the scythe, but the food of wild animals only. All these ridges are heavily timbered with pitch pines, and where they were down on the grassy slopes they looked as if the trees had been arranged by a landscape gardener. Far off, through an opening in a canyon, we saw the prairie, simulating an ocean. Far off, through an opening in another direction, was the glistening outline of the Snowy Range.

You will ask, "What is Estes Park?" This name, with the quiet midland counties sound, suggests "park palings" well lichened, a lodge with a courtseying woman, fallow-deer, and a Queen Anne mansion. Such as it is, Estes Park is mine. It is unsurveyed, "no man's land," and mine by right of love, appropriation, and appreciation; by the seizure of its peerless sunrises and sunsets, its glorious afterglow, its blazing noons, its hurricanes sharp and furious, its wild auroras, its glories of mountain and forest, of canyon, lake, and river, and the stereotyping them all in my memory. Mine, too, in a better than the sportsman's sense, are its majestic wapiti, which play and fight under the pines in the early morning, as securely as fallow-deer under our English oaks; its graceful blacktails, swift of foot; its superb big-horns, whose noble leader is to be seen now and then with his classic head against the blue sky on the top of a colossal rock; its sneaking mountain lion with his hideous nocturnal caterwaulings, the great grizzly, the beautiful skunk, the wary beaver, who is always making lakes, damming and turning streams, cutting down young cottonwoods, and setting an example of thrift and industry; the wolf, greedy and cowardly; the coyote and the lynx, and all the lesser fry of mink,

marten, wildcat, hare, fox, squirrel, and chipmunk, as well as things that fly, from the eagle down to the crested bluejay. May their number never be less, in spite of the hunter who kills for food and gain, and the sportsman who kills and marauds for pastime.

But still I have not answered the natural question, "What is Estes Park?" Among the striking peculiarities of these mountains are hundreds of high-lying valleys, large and small, at heights varying from 6,000 to 11,000 feet. The most important are North Park, held by hostile Indians; Middle Park, famous for hot springs and trout; South Park, rich in minerals; and San Luis Park. South Park is 10,000 feet high, a great rolling prairie, 70 miles long, well grassed and watered, but nearly closed by snow in winter. But parks innumerable are scattered throughout the mountains, most of them unnamed, and others nicknamed by hunters or trappers who have made them their temporary resorts. They always lie far within the flaming foothills, their exquisite stretches of flowery pastures dotted artistically with clumps of trees, sloping lawnlike to bright, swift streams full of red-waicoated trout, or running up in soft glades into the dark forest, above which the snow peaks rise in their infinite majesty. Some are bits of meadow, a mile long and very narrow, with a small stream, a beaver dam, and a pond made by beaver industry. Hundreds of these can only be reached by riding in the bed of a stream or by scrambling up some narrow canyon till it debouches on the fairylike stretch above. These parks are the feeding grounds of innumerable wild animals, and some, like one 3 miles off, seem chosen for the process of antler casting, the grass being covered for at least a square mile with the magnificent branching horns of the elk.

Estes Park combines the beauties of all. Dismiss all thoughts of the midland counties. For park palings there are mountains, forest skirted, 9,000, 11,000, 14,000 feet high; for a lodge, two sentinel peaks of granite guarding the only feasible entrance; and for a Queen Anne mansion, an unchinked log cabin with a vault of sunny blue overhead. The park is most irregularly shaped, and contains hardly any level grass. It is an aggregate of lawns, slopes, and glades, about 18 miles in length, but never more than 2 miles in width. The Big Thompson, a bright, rapid trout stream, snow born on Longs Peak, a few miles higher, takes all sorts of magical twists, vanishing and reappearing unexpectedly, glancing among lawns, rushing through romantic ravines, everywhere making music through the still, long nights. Here and there the lawns are so smooth, the trees so artistically grouped, a lake makes such an artistic foreground, or a waterfall comes tumbling down with such an apparent feeling for the picturesque, that I am almost angry with nature for her close imitation of art. But in another hundred yards nature, glorious, unapproachable, inimitable, is herself again, raising one's thoughts reverently upward to her Creator and ours. Grandeur and sublimity, not softness, are the features of Estes Park. The glades which begin so softly are soon lost in the dark, primeval forests, with their peaks of rosy granite and their stretches of granite blocks piled and poised by nature in some mood of fury. The streams are lost in canyons nearly or quite inaccessible, awful in their blackness and darkness; every valley ends in mystery; seven mountain ranges raise their frowning barriers between us and the plains, and at the south end of the park Longs Peak rises to a height of 14,700 feet, with his bare, scathed head slashed with eternal snow.

The lowest part of the park is 7,500 feet high; and though the sun is hot during the day, the mercury hovers near the freezing point every night of the summer. An immense quantity of snow falls, but partly owing to the tremendous winds which drift it into the deep valleys, and partly to the bright, warm sun of the winter months, the park is never snowed up, and a number of cattle and horses are wintered out of doors on its sun-cured, saccharine grasses, of which the gramma grass is the most valuable. The soil here, as elsewhere in the neighborhood, is nearly everywhere coarse, gray, granite dust, produced probably by the disintegration of the surrounding mountains. It does not hold water and is never wet in any weather. There are no thaws here. The snow mysteriously disappears by rapid evaporation. The wild flowers are gorgeous and innumerable, though their beauty, which culminates in July and August, was over before I arrived, and the recent snow furies have finished them. Here are dandelions, buttercups, larkspurs, harebells, violets, roses, blue gentian, columbine, painter's brush, and 50 others, blue and yellow predominating. Snakes and mosquitoes do not appear to be known here. Coming almost direct from the Tropics, one is dissatisfied with the uniformity of the foliage; indeed, foliage can hardly be written of, as the trees properly so called at this height are exclusively Coniferae and bear needles instead of leaves. In places there are patches of spindly aspens, which have turned a lemon yellow, and along the streams bear cherries, vines, and roses lighten the gulches with their variegated crimson leaves. The pines are not imposing, either from their girth or height. Their coloring is blackish green, and though they are effective singly or in groups, they are sadder and almost funereal when densely massed, as here, along the mountain sides.

The timber line is at a height of about 11,000 feet and is singularly well defined. The most attractive tree I have seen is the silver spruce, *Abies engelmanni*, near of kin to what is often called the balsam fir. Its shape and color are both beautiful. It looks as if a soft, blue, silver powder had fallen on its deep-green needles, or as if a bluish hoarfrost, which must melt at noon, were resting upon it. Anyhow, one can hardly believe that the beauty is permanent and survives the summer heat and the winter cold. The universal tree here is the *Pinus ponderosa*, but it never attains any very considerable size.

Miss Bird's account of her two days' climb of Longs Peak is accentuated by many interesting references to the scenery. Describing the view from "the Lift," about 500 feet below the summit, she says:

At the foot of the precipice below us lay a lovely lake, wood embosomed, from or near which the bright St. Vrain and other streams take their rise. I thought how their clear, cold waters, growing turbid in the affluent flats, would heat under the tropic sun and eventually form part of the great ocean river which renders our far-off islands habitable by infringing on their shores. Snowy ranges, one behind the other, extended to the distant horizon, folding in their wintry embrace the beauties of Middle Park. Pikes Peak, more than 100 miles off, lifted that vast but shapeless summit which is the landmark of southern Colorado. There were snowy patches, snow slashes, snow abysses, snow forlorn and soiled looking, snow pure and dazzling, snow glistening above the purple robes of pine worn by all the mountains, while away to the east in limitless breadth stretched the green gray of the endless plains. Giants everywhere reared their splintered crests. From thence with a single sweep the eye takes in a distance of 300 miles—that distance to the west, north, and south being made up of mountains ten, eleven, twelve, and thirteen thousand feet in height, dominated by

Longs Peak, Grays Peak, and Pikes Peak, all nearly the height of Mount Blanc. On the plains we traced the rivers by their fringes of cottonwood to the distant Platte, and between us and them lay glories of mountain, canyon, and lake sleeping in depths of blue and purple most ravishing to the eye.

As we crept from the lodge round a horn of rock I beheld what made me perfectly sick and dizzy to look at—the terminal peak itself—a smooth, cracked face or wall of pink granite as nearly perpendicular as anything could well be up which it was possible to climb, well deserving the name of the American Matterhorn.

Her description of the mountain top itself was brief. She contents herself by saying of it simply that it was "an acre of boulders."

From the summit we saw in unrivaled combinations all the views which had rejoiced our eyes during the ascent. It was something at last to stand upon the storm-rent crown of this lonely sentinel of the Rocky Range, on one of the mightiest of the vertebrae of the backbone of the North American Continent, and see the waters start for both oceans, uplifted above love and hate and storms of passion. Calm amidst the eternal silences, fanned by zephyrs, and bathed in living blue, peace rested for that one bright day on the peak as if it were some region "where falls not rain, or hail, or any snow, or ever winds blow loudly."

In closing my extracts from this fascinating book, I can not refrain from the author's reference to the color of the Rocky Mountains, which she says "beats all I have seen." She gives many bits of description in support of this statement, of which the following sentence is a fair sample:

The sky and the earth combine to form a wonderland every evening—such rich velvety coloring in crimson and violet; such an orange-green and vermilion sky; such scarlet and emerald clouds; such an extraordinary dryness and pureness of atmosphere, and then the glorious after-glow which seems to blend earth and heaven.

When this bill is signed by President Wilson there will be bequeathed to the United States and the world one of the most beautiful and attractive places ever evolved by nature for the pleasure of mankind. And its dedication to the present and future generations is a noble and patriotic act, for which the men and women who have supported this measure may all well feel proud.

The creation by Congress to-day of this national park will be a milestone in the development of Colorado, and I am supremely proud to be able to render this service to my beloved Commonwealth. It will be worth many millions of dollars to Colorado and many times that sum to the Nation.

The State of Colorado has always been one of the most enthusiastic champions of the slogan "See America first." President Roosevelt referred to the Centennial State as the "Playground of the Nation," and many citizens of our country proudly and affectionately refer to the State as "the Switzerland of America." The State has more than 5,000 miles of excellent State highways, 20,000 miles of improved county roads on the plains, the foothills, through the mountains and valleys, amidst magnificent scenery. With fine camping, hunting, hundreds of good trout streams, and 320 days of sunshine in every year, she invites the human race to come and enjoy her superb health-giving climate and unique mountain scenery of unparalleled grandeur and marvelous beauty.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I know the State of Colorado will be exceedingly grateful to him for speaking in behalf of this bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the passage of this bill. I have seen a good deal of the country in Colorado. I believe the most valuable purpose for which a country like this can be used is for the preservation of its scenery. I think the time will come, and I hope it will not be very long in the future, when the vast hordes of Americans who now go across the Atlantic to see some mild scenery over there will restrain their curiosity for the other side of the ocean and visit some of the grand scenery in this country which is to be found in the Rocky Mountains. It will be a good thing even financially, and it would broaden the minds of those gentlemen who live along the Atlantic coast, many of whom never have gone as far west as the Allegheny Mountains and who do not know that there exists a portion of the country west of the Mississippi. [Applause.] This makes into a national park what in the main is now a national forest. As I understand, nearly all of this territory embraced in this bill is now covered by reservations for national forests and it makes it into a national park. It does not make a large appropriation, but leaves to the people who manage the park the problem of working out some method by which the park will pay for itself in the way of maintenance and improvements. Personally, next to working in a garden, I would rather climb one of the Colorado mountains in August, way above the snow line, than do anything else. I believe it will be inspiring to all of our people who will do that. There can be no damage in creating such a park, and I hope that every Member of Congress as he crosses the continent this summer, if he does, will stop on the way coming or going and see

the Rocky Mountains. There is no other part of the world, unless it be in the high places in Asia or in the Andes, which compares in grandeur with the Rocky Mountains, and there is nothing that makes a man feel that he ought to be great and grow big like it does to go out and see what nature has done. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, I believe in having the public domain used for those things for which it is fitted. This piece of property is peculiarly adapted to the purpose designated, and is not adapted, in my opinion, to any other purpose. It should be dedicated as a pleasure ground and a scenic attraction to all our people, and the difference between its being held under the forest reserve and under the Department of the Interior as a national park is simply this—that as a national park the animal life will be forever free from molestation. Moreover, there will be no question of timber cutting for utilitarian purposes, but the property, which has few available commercial resources, will be held in a state of nature, and for which it is peculiarly adapted. I know of no other part of the United States better fitted for park purposes. It should be dedicated to the people of the United States as a public park forever. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to use five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How much time does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be about the only bill that is going through this Congress on greased skids, except some of the bills on the administration program. Here is a bill referred to the Committee on the Public Lands on January 12, and here it is before the House under suspension of the rules on January 18.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken about the dates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am reading from the bill here.

Mr. MANN. October 9 it was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And reported out on the 12th, and acted on in just one week. I find here in the Rocky Mountain News of January 6 a statement to the effect that this bill will be passed on the 18th day of January, and telling just how it will be done. I find a report of 48 pages accompanying this bill. The report reads as if it were a one-sided hearing on the bill. I understand hearings were held on the bill, but they have not been printed, and they can not be had.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that hearings were held. The report was referred to the gentlemen who appeared before the committee so that they could correct their testimony. The governor of the State and two United States Senators and a number of other distinguished people appeared before the committee, and the hearings were sent around to these gentlemen for correction, and they got back to the committee only the other day, when they were sent down here, two or three days ago, to the printer. I was in hopes that they would be here by this time, but it is no fault of anybody.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. At any rate, the bill itself has gotten ahead of the hearings. There will now be no need of printing the hearings.

The statement has been made here that there is no opposition whatever to the bill. I hold in my hand a letter signed by the Front Range Settlers' League, dated December 8, in which quite a number of substantial arguments are made against this bill. I have received the past week quite a number of letters from citizens of Colorado who oppose the measure. I call attention to the fact that the park you are about to create is in a forest reserve; that it cuts the reserve in two; that it will increase the number of Federal employees; that the park scheme adds nothing to the great natural scenic beauty, nor will it make the locality one bit more accessible; in fact, it will simply give tourists an opportunity to pay more, and will develop the schemes of real estate speculators and hotel men, who have already secured the available hotel sites, which are, by the way, outside of the proposed park area and will not be subject to regulations governing national parks.

A magnificent road to Estes Park is already constructed, built by the State and the Forestry Bureau—principally by the State. The Forest Service proposes additional roads, but here, all of a sudden, it is proposed to yank Estes Park away from its pres-

ent control and change its name to Rocky Mountain National Park. One citizen of Colorado writes:

More work has been done in road building by the State and the Forest Service in one year than we could hope to get from the Government in 10 years. I base this observation on a study of the yearly appropriations of Congress for national parks.

Another gentleman says in a letter:

In talking with a former forest rider I learned that Enos A. Miles, owner of Longs Peak Inn, at the foot of Longs Peak, is the originator of this national-park idea, and that he and his associates have purchased and obtained options on large tracts and on all the best grounds about Horse Shoe Park, all of which will be taken in by the Rocky Mountain National Park.

I have no information as to whether that statement is exactly correct or not.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman that since those original lines were proposed they have changed the lines and have eliminated all of that Estes Park, so it is not in the park.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The writer of the letter says further:

I can not see where there is any benefit to the people of the United States or of Colorado in making this ground into a national park only to enrich Mills and his associates by advertising his hotel and lands, for the amount of money to be obtained will only police the park partly, and nothing will be expended on roads and trails for the next 20 or 30 years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What does this fellow want to use it for?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He sees, no doubt, that the tract is now as great a scenic attraction as it ever will be without going to additional Government expense. In the 48 pages of this report—a most remarkable report—you will find on the last page an argument saying all the other national parks are on the west of the Rocky Mountains and to a greater or less extent inaccessible.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to know what this kicker wants to do with this national park.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The roads and trails have been built in there. It is now accessible to everyone for its scenic beauty. You can go through it in an automobile or a wagon or a motor cycle without cost, whereas if it is made into a park it will cost \$5 a vehicle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to have two minutes more.

Mr. MOORE. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to obstruct the passage of this bill to the extent of making a point of no quorum. I simply want to call attention to the difficulties that so many important bills are having—no hearings and no chance—while this one, for which no emergency exists, gets a peculiar right of way. It provides for a park to be maintained by the Government. The plan is to take over a beautiful natural tract for the benefit of the automobilists principally. It gets the right of way in the Committee on the Public Lands, while 400 other bills which do not relate to playgrounds or to play of any kind repose peacefully in the pigeon-holes of that committee's room. Particularly I want to call attention to the haste with which this bill has been sent out of the committee, into the House for passage, on to the calendar, and up for passage—if not by unanimous consent, then by suspension of the rules. As I said a moment ago, it is one that skids in the good old-fashioned way.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Are there any other national park bills pending before that committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think so.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Have any of them been reported?

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield more time, but I thought the gentleman from Colorado wanted to use some.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Do I understand this is in a forest reserve?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is there any timber there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Not of much value, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think, if there should be, it ought to be preserved as a natural curiosity. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We have not the timber in our State that you have in your State.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. If there is any forest preserve that has any timber on it, that timber ought to be preserved.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I now yield, Mr. Speaker, two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is anything that I could add to the eloquent statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] and to the more than eloquent statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] on the establishment of parks in the Rocky Mountains. I am glad to say that I think this is the very purpose for which this land should be used. It is already a reserved area, and this bill transfers it from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior. There is no friction about it. Both departments agree to it. Both have reported in favor of it. It can be administered economically, and the people of Colorado are very desirous of it. Both their outgoing governor and their incoming governor and different conservation societies from Chicago and elsewhere, all over the country, are in favor of it, and telegrams have been received from everywhere asking that this park be created.

We have only 13 parks in the United States. They do not cost the Government very much to maintain, and even if they did, it would be worth while. So many citizens, I think, are so far removed from any personal contact with the Federal Government now that it is wise to arrange these national playgrounds for them where appropriate. This is an ideal spot for it. It ought to have been done years ago. The Colorado delegation are entitled to great credit for it. I am proud to have been an humble member of the great Committee on the Public Lands who have reported it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is it true that the gentleman's Committee on the Public Lands has caused it to be stated that it would authorize no more national parks during this session of Congress?

Mr. FERRIS. No. No such statements have been made to us or by us, so far as I know. I can not think any such statement has been made by anyone. It does not sound like our committee. I think there must be some mistake about that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERRIS. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The gentleman's committee does not intend any such policy as that, I hope?

Mr. FERRIS. Oh, not at all. I never heard of it before. There is nothing of that sort intimated by anyone.

I merely desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that the committee used every precaution in consulting the local people and the Interior Department and the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service and the Geological Survey people and everybody that would know anything about it. I think this park is well conceived and the details are well worked out. It follows the usual procedure in the establishment of national parks, and it is not a park for the State of Colorado alone, but it is a park for the enjoyment of the people of other States as well. The people of my own State, in the hot and arid months, and the people from the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Texas, and adjoining States journey out there in one form and another and spend a month or two in that locality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman what is the recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture in regard to this park?

Mr. FERRIS. It is in favor of it, and so is the Interior Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why did the committee not follow the recommendation of the department in creating a bureau of na-

tional parks? The department says that on several occasions they have approved of the creation of such a bureau, and several bills have been reported separately creating these national parks. The Secretary recommends that there should be a uniform bill apply to all of them.

Mr. FERRIS. The committee has such bills before it, and they have been urged very vigorously to do so by the officials of the department. So far as I am concerned, I do not care to create any more officials or add to the expense of the Government at this time. We have too many officers now I fear, and we ought to go slow on new ones until the war lets up and our commerce again gets started.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to my colleague from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the passage of this bill. I represent the district in which the greater part of the national park herein proposed is located. I have never received a single line from any resident of that district protesting against the passage of this bill. My constituents clearly recognize the value of this legislation in benefiting not only the State, but the entire country.

I wish I could take the Members of this House to Colorado and give them an opportunity to observe the natural beauty of this park and the wonderful scenery it contains. It comprises some of the loftiest snow-covered peaks in the Rocky Mountain States, with a large number of lakes, valleys, and parks. I know, Mr. Speaker, that it will afford every American citizen who visits this region a feeling of pride and satisfaction that he has a proprietary interest in this great natural scenic property. In common with citizens of Colorado and Representatives of other States, I believe that Congress is doing something not only for the State, but also for the Nation in passing this bill.

I wish to express on behalf of the citizens of our State our appreciation of the generous and friendly interest which Members from other States have shown in this bill.

We are particularly grateful to the Speaker of the House, who has afforded my colleague [Mr. TAYLOR] an opportunity to bring the bill before the House under suspension of the rules, and to the able leader of the minority [Mr. MANN], who has given material assistance in advocating the passage of the measure.

The people of Colorado will not be backward in contributing to the care and maintenance of the park, in cooperation with the General Government. They will see to it that the scenic attractions, not only of this park but of the entire Rocky Mountain region, are brought more fully to the attention of the American people. For many years thousands of American tourists have contributed to the support and development of European tourist centers, unmindful of the fact that we have in this country some of the greatest natural wonders of the world. While we deplore the calamity of war which is now devastating Continental Europe, we hope that it will have one effect at least, and that to interest our American citizens in the natural beauties of our own country. Every section of the Nation has a wealth of physical beauty that should appeal to citizens of other sections. There should be an intermingling of tourist travel within our own borders. We have all degrees of climate, and there is no limit to the number and variety of medicinal and healthful springs. "See America first" should be the slogan in every section. Transportation lines should be encouraged to aid in this movement; and if we can retain within our borders a large share of the wealth which we have been sending abroad through American tourists we will do much to develop and enlarge our natural scenic assets. The people of Colorado, through their Representatives in Congress, will always be willing to aid in the creation of national parks in other States where their creation is justified.

The park provided for in this bill is most accessible to the great population of the Middle West and Southwestern States. It is directly on the line of travel between the two oceans; and when its attractions are more fully known it will draw many thousands annually, not only to Colorado but to the Pacific coast and the great Yellowstone and Glacier Parks. Constructive legislation of this character not only directly benefits the locality affected but indirectly helps other sections. The support which the bill has received from nature lovers whose attention has been directed to it is most gratifying, and the passage of the bill will be welcomed by citizens generally who are actively interested in the preservation and protection of our natural resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I have made two or three trips that led me over the Rocky Mountains. I do not know that I have been through that portion of the mountains that is described within the limits of the proposed park, but from my general knowledge of the Rocky Mountains I believe the lands within these described boundaries are not suitable for agricultural purposes. In fact, I do not know of any other purpose to which the mountains or the scenery could be put, or any to which it is so well adapted, as that of a park. I think the Committee on Public Lands is rendering the entire country a great service by reporting favorably upon this bill and urging that a national park be established there.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that every citizen of our country should see as much of the Rocky Mountains as possible. It should be made as attractive as may be for our citizens to go there, and every convenience for their comfort while they are there in the way of travel and hotels should be provided, and if perchance some hotel keeper can be induced to spend his money to build a hotel for the accommodation of such guests as may pass that way, the writer of the letter to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] will have no real ground for complaint. It probably will not cost him anything.

There is no reasonable objection that can come from any source to the establishment of this park, and there is every argument in its favor. I heartily favor the bill, and hope it will have the necessary votes to insure its passage.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, all of the land that is comprised within this proposed national park is now within national forest reservations, and with the limitation of expense contained in the bill there will be little or no increased expense unless Congress shall hereafter expressly authorize it. Therefore from any standpoint there is no reason why this bill should not pass, and there are many reasons why it should.

I am especially glad for one thing, Mr. Speaker, to find that these gentlemen who have thundered so long and so loudly against bureaucracy in reference to our national domain in the West have come before our committee, and now come on the floor of the House and ask for a little more bureaucracy with reference to the 230,000 acres comprised within this proposed park. When our committee held its hearings I was amazed to hear some gentlemen, not Members of this body, but of another, urge most strenuously before our committee the creation of this park because of the fact that the National Government could so well administer it and take such splendid care of it; and it struck me at the time that if those gentlemen would apply a little more of the same reasoning with reference to certain other portions of the national domain, we might get along very much better in the consideration of some of these matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think it would take any less money to care for the remaining portion of the forest reserve after the 240,000 acres were taken out for this park?

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, yes; it would cost considerably less, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I doubt it.

Mr. LENROOT. From every standpoint I am heartily in favor of this bill.

Mr. MOORE. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY].

[Mr. LAFFERTY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. KENT. I should like to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to say that to the members of the committee? Because I am quite sure that the Public Lands Committee as a whole have no knowledge of any such alleged facts and do not tolerate any such statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was rather inclined to be against this bill until I heard the moving appeal of my friend from Illinois, the distinguished leader of the minority [Mr. MANN], who is a learned and earnest lover of nature. When he held out to us the prospect of seeing him climb that mountain in August, I found that I could not resist his argument. I trust he will realize, however, that in making that ascent, considering the present state of social aridity in Colorado, he will

remember to carry something more than the coat on his back. I promise him that with that prospect in view, and the other that he hinted at of having the privilege to go out there this summer, I shall cordially indorse him and follow him in this vote. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] has one minute, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I desire to make an inquiry and a suggestion in regard to this bill.

Mr. MOORE. I have but three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I notice that most of the time has been given to those in favor of the bill. I think there ought to be an opportunity for a suggestion about it by those who may not be in favor of it.

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman had better direct his inquiry to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. You were supposed to have the time in opposition to the bill.

Mr. MOORE. I am going to yield to myself, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time is running.

Mr. MOORE. If my time is running, I shall have to decline to yield.

Mr. SHERLEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I want to know if it is in order for a person in charge of the time in opposition to yield all the time to gentlemen who speak in favor of the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky knows that the gentlemen in charge of time can distribute it to whom they please.

Mr. SHERLEY. But men get time in opposition under the statement that they are opposed to legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] demanded a second. No one else demanded a second, nor did anyone indicate that he was opposed to the bill, nor did the gentleman from Pennsylvania indicate it. The Chair can not now control the parceling out of the time.

Mr. MOORE. I should have been glad to have yielded to the gentleman from Kentucky if he had asked it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the request of the gentleman from Kentucky ought to be granted; but the suggestion that the gentleman made is unfair to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who, like anyone else in control of time, if people do not come who are opposed to the bill, he yields the time to those in favor of it. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky have three minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to talk on the bill, except to call attention to some language in it which I think ought to be corrected. I do not want to be arbitrary or make any point of no quorum, but I do want to call attention to some of the language in the bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Kentucky had been in the Chamber—

Mr. SHERLEY. I was at work in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. I understand the gentleman was busy in the Committee on Appropriations, but if he had been here he would have had no difficulty in getting time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky have three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to the language in the proviso, which, as has been suggested, may create a permanent appropriation of \$10,000 annually, and which nobody would desire to do. I also want to suggest the wisdom of striking out the language which requires that all funds derived from concessions, privileges, or other sources within the park shall be expended therein.

At this time there is no reason why that should not be done, and probably there will not be any reason in the near future, but I hope we are reaching a point where we are going to adopt some system for making national parks yield some revenue that may help to sustain them, and we ought not to tie up by this all the revenues that may come from a particular park.

It is a mistaken notion that parks belong to the localities where they exist. That is one of the vices I find running all through the arguments of gentlemen from public-land States—the assumption that the public land belongs to those States,

which I will never agree to as long as I may be able to protest against it.

Now, we ought not to reserve all the revenues that come from any particular park and say that they must be expended in that park. My committee makes appropriations for these parks. At present we do spend in the parks all the revenue that comes from them, but we may reach a time when it will be desirable to place the revenue in a general fund and expend that fund for park purposes generally and not on any particular locality.

Mr. MANN. The amendment which is offered provides that not more than \$10,000 shall be appropriated in any one year. Does not the gentleman think that the park will come and ask for a change, and we can make the other change?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think they will ask for one change, but will not concede the other.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman from Kentucky and I will be here, and if we are they will not get it.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Illinois may not be here and I may not.

Mr. MANN. Well, some one will be here to take care of it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I see no reason why we should have the provision in the bill, and I suggest that there is no need for it. We ought not to segregate the fund in this way.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, one reason for demanding a second on this bill was to give an opportunity for just such questions as the gentleman from Kentucky has raised.

The practice of the House in calling up bills suddenly without notice is very unfair to the main body of the Members who might be interested in them but who are engaged in committee work or are at their offices. Because of it bills that are not wholly meritorious might occasionally get through except for the watchfulness of two or three careful Members on the floor.

I sought information as to the wisdom of passing this bill. I did not say that I opposed the bill, but I did want to have it discussed. The arguments in favor of the bill have been quite convincing, but the discussion has invited comment from those of us who come from the Atlantic seaboard.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made an intensely interesting talk advising people who live in the eastern part of the country to go out to the Rocky Mountains and "see America first." He wanted them to get a grasp of the beauty and the magnificence of this land of ours. That is exactly what most of us have done. Many of us have gone over the Rocky Mountains, over the Canadian Pacific, riding by the snow-capped peaks, and we have enjoyed to the full the grandeur of the scenery. We glory in all this, but sometimes, when these reports come in from the Committee on Public Lands, and we recall that in a State like Pennsylvania, for instance, where we have great forest reserves which we take care of ourselves at the expense of the people of the State, we wonder why we should be criticized for seeking river and harbor improvements to create revenue to care for the forests and parks of other States. This, however, is only in passing. I am inclined to think that this is a good bill. We ought to preserve our natural beauty spots, not alone for those who come from foreign shores, but for the people in our own land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some question is being made concerning lines 14 and 15, on page 7, about the expenditure of funds derived from concessions, and as I do not want to jeopardize the bill by meeting opposition, I ask unanimous consent to strike those two lines out.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to modify his motion so as to make that one of his amendments?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to modify his motion by the amendment which he proposes and which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 14, after the word "therein," strike out "all funds derived from concessions, privileges, or other sources within the park shall be expended therein."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill as amended.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection of the request of the gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. SELDOMRIDGE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] to extend and revise their remarks in the Record?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR STOCK-RAISING HOMESTEADS.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 15799) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes, as amended, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act it shall be lawful for any person qualified to make entry under the homestead laws of the United States to make a stock-raising homestead entry for not exceeding 640 acres of unappropriated unreserved public land in reasonably compact form: *Provided, however,* That the land so entered shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as "stock-raising lands."

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, on application or otherwise, to designate as stock-raising lands subject to entry under this act lands, the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, do not contain merchantable timber, are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply, and are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family.

SEC. 3. That any qualified homestead entryman may make entry under the homestead laws of lands so designated by the Secretary of the Interior, according to legal subdivisions, in areas not exceeding 640 acres, and in compact form so far as may be subject to the provisions of this act, and secure title thereto by compliance with the terms of the homestead laws: *Provided,* That instead of cultivation as required by the homestead laws the entryman shall be required to make permanent improvements upon the land entered before final proof is submitted tending to increase the value of the same for stock-raising purposes, of the value of not less than \$1.25 per acre, and at least one-half of such improvements shall be placed upon the land within three years after the date of entry thereof.

SEC. 4. That any homestead entryman of lands of the character herein described, who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry, shall have the right to enter, subject to the provisions of this act, such amount of contiguous lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act as shall not, together with the amount embraced in his original entry, exceed 640 acres, and residence upon the original entry shall be credited on both entries, but improvements made be made on the additional entry equal to \$1.25 for each acre thereof.

SEC. 5. That persons who have submitted final proof upon, or received patent for, lands of the character herein described under the homestead laws, and who own and reside upon the land so acquired, may, subject to the provisions of this act, make additional entry for and obtain patent to contiguous lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act, which, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead law, shall not exceed 640 acres, on proof of the expenditure required by this act on account of permanent improvements upon the additional entry.

SEC. 6. That in the event there are not contiguous lands in area sufficient to complete an entry of 640 acres, as provided for in this act, the entryman or patentee shall have the right to enter within a radius of 10 miles from his first entry subject to the same requirements as specified for contiguous additional entries, lands in reasonably compact form which have been designated for entry under the provisions of this act, that shall, together with the first entry, not exceed 640 acres: *Provided,* That the entryman shall be required to enter all contiguous areas open to entry prior to the entry of any noncontiguous land.

SEC. 7. That any person who is the head of a family, or who has arrived at the age of 21 years and is a citizen of the United States, who has entered or acquired under the homestead laws, prior to the passage hereof, lands of the character described in this act, the area of which is less than 640 acres, and who is unable to exercise the right of additional entry herein conferred because no lands subject to entry under this act adjoin the tract so entered or acquired or lie within the 10-mile limit provided for in this act, may, upon submitting proof that he resides upon and has not sold or encumbered the land so entered or acquired, relinquish or reconvey to the United States the land so occupied, entered, or acquired, and in lieu thereof, within the same land-office district, may enter and acquire title to 640 acres of the land subject to entry under this act, but must show compliance with all the provisions of this act respecting the new entry and with all the provisions of existing homestead laws except as modified herein: *Provided,* That the lands so relinquished or reconveyed as herein provided shall thereafter be subject to disposition only on such terms and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

SEC. 8. That the commutation provisions of the homestead laws shall not apply to any entries made under this act.

SEC. 9. That any homestead entrymen or patentees who shall be entitled to additional entry under this act shall have, for 30 days after the designation of lands subject to entry under the provisions of this act and contiguous to those entered or owned and occupied by him, the preferential right to make additional entry as provided in this act: *Provided,* That where such lands contiguous to the lands of two or more entrymen or patentees entitled to additional entries under this section are not sufficient in area to enable such entrymen to secure by additional entry the maximum amounts to which they are entitled, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make an equitable division of the lands among the several entrymen or patentees, applying to exercise preferential rights, such division to be in tracts of not less than 40 acres, and so made as to equalize as nearly as possible the area which such entrymen and patentees will acquire by adding the tracts embraced in additional entries to the lands originally held or owned by them: *Provided further,* That where but one 40-acre tract of vacant land may adjoin the lands of two or more entrymen or patentees entitled to exercise preferential right hereunder, the tract in question may be entered by the person who first submits to the local land office his application to exercise said preferential right.

SEC. 10. That any person who has heretofore acquired title to land of the character designated in this act under any of the homestead

laws of the United States and who is the owner and occupant of the land so acquired may purchase from the United States not exceeding 320 acres of stock-raising lands, as designated by this act, or unappropriated and unreserved lands valuable only for grazing contiguous to his said homestead, upon paying to the United States the sum of \$1.25 per acre for such lands, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, which said land, together with the area theretofore acquired under the homestead laws, shall not exceed 640 acres.

SEC. 11. That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other minerals in the lands so entered and patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The coal and other mineral deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the coal and mineral land laws in force at the time of such disposal. Any person qualified to locate and enter the coal or other mineral deposits, or having the right to mine and remove the same under the laws of the United States, shall have the right at all times to enter upon the lands entered or patented, as provided by this act, for the purpose of prospecting for coal or other mineral therein, provided he shall not injure, damage, or destroy the permanent improvements of the entryman or patentee, and shall be liable to and shall compensate the entryman or patentee for all damages to the crops on such lands by reason of such prospecting. Any person who has acquired from the United States the coal or other mineral deposits in any such land, or the right to mine and remove the same, may reenter and occupy so much of the surface thereof as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the coal or other minerals, first, upon securing the written consent or waiver of the homestead entryman or patentee; second, upon payment of the damages to crops or other tangible improvements to the owner thereof, where agreement may be had as to the amount thereof; or, third, in lieu of either of the foregoing provisions, upon the execution of a good and sufficient bond or undertaking to the United States for the use and benefit of the entryman or owner of the land, to secure the payment of such damages to the crops or tangible improvements of the entryman or owner, as may be determined and fixed in an action brought upon the bond or undertaking in a court of competent jurisdiction against the principal and sureties thereon, such bond or undertaking to be in form and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be filed with and approved by the register and receiver of the local land office of the district wherein the land is situate, subject to appeal to the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided*, That all patents issued for the coal or other mineral deposits herein reserved shall contain appropriate notations declaring them to be subject to the provisions of this act with reference to the disposition, occupancy, and use of the surface of the land.

SEC. 12. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations in harmony with the provisions and purposes of this act for the purpose of carrying the same into effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, before I take up the bill, I ask unanimous consent to modify my original motion, by incorporating in section 10, line 8, page 6, after the word "land," the words "of the character designated in this act." It is obvious that that was the intention.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent to modify his motion by inserting an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 8, after the word "land," insert the words "of the character designated in this act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I take the liberty of asking what were the amendments which were offered with the bill? No one could tell from the reading of the bill what the amendments were. They were not committee amendments, reported in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments which were read into the bill.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "family," strike out the words: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act lands of such character that, in his opinion, 640 acres will not support a family."

Page 4, line 24, after the word "provisions," strike out the words "of the homestead law and," and in line 25, after the word "entry," insert the words "and with all the provisions of existing homestead laws except as modified herein."

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

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to restore the beef and mutton producing capacity of the semiarid States of the West, and at the same time enable the settlers to get homes, and thus promote the settlement and pros-

perity of these semiarid States by inducing settlers to get title to the land and to become taxpayers.

It is conceded by those who want to lease parts of this semiarid country, and also maintained by those who are in favor of homesteading all that can be reduced to homes, that the meat-producing capacity of the West—beef and mutton—has been reduced; some claim at least 50 per cent, about half of what they could produce in that semiarid country, comprising something like 330,000,000 acres. It has been reduced from overcrowding. There is no order. First there is sheep and then cattle. A man takes a homestead and can not raise anything because there is not enough land in 160 or even 320 acres to enable him to do anything in the way of grazing. The title of this bill is, "To provide for stock-raising homesteads." Now, the advantage of a grazing homestead is obvious to anybody. He will farm all that he can. The land will be subject to taxation. He will improve the stock; he will provide for winter feed for his stock; he will improve the kind of forage—sudan grass and fedrietta—and all improvements; whereas on an immense cattle range a man leases 10,000 or 20,000 acres of land; it will be impossible for him to improve or produce any quantity of meat. That is the general idea of introducing this bill. The question of leases is not disposed of by the enactment of this bill for this reason, that there are many hundreds of thousands of acres of land in these semiarid States. Six hundred and forty acres of land will be enough for a man to raise 20 or 30 beeves and do any farming. There is no sort of doubt about that, and the balance of all this immense area will be subject to disposition by Congress hereafter if it should be advisable under the leasing laws. Mr. Speaker, under the time to which I am limited I will not have time to go into the details of the various provisions of the bill, and I will be glad to submit it with these few preliminary remarks, reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the homestead laws provide for a homestead of 160 acres. In some instances the provisions of law have been changed so that some homesteads are authorized at 320 acres, some at 640 acres, but everyone, I think, has realized that there was occasion from time to time to make some changes as to the amount of acreage which might be required in a homestead where the conditions of the land require it. Now, here is a bill coming in here to-day, 8 pages long, 12 sections long, a bill which necessarily is largely a matter of detail and form. You want to describe the particular circumstances under which you authorize the larger homestead. A motion is made to suspend the rules and pass the bill, with no opportunity for anyone, except the mover of the motion, to offer an amendment, not even to correct the grammar of the bill, and it is seriously in need of correction, a bill that has a privileged status, could have been called up in the House any day since May 6 last when it was reported. It does not require a motion to suspend the rules to consider it. The Committee on Public Lands any day, except on Calendar Wednesday or possibly unanimous-consent day, could move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of this bill, because the rules provide—Rule XI, paragraph 56:

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated. The Committee on Rules, etc. The Committee on the Public Lands—

And among other things—

And bills for the reservation of public lands for the benefit of actual and bona fide settlers.

Under that rule all bills relating to homesteads and providing for homesteads are privileged, and yet the Committee on the Public Lands bring in a bill covering 12 sections, necessarily in the main a matter of detail, propose to suspend the rules and pass it, with no chance for amendment, with only 20 minutes' debate on a side, to give 640 acres of land as a homestead. No one can read this bill and tell what it means. The first provision in the bill is that this homestead shall not exist unless the land is of such a character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family. If 630 acres will support a family, this bill will not apply. It does not apply unless the Secretary says that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family.

Then the bill goes on and provides that if 641 acres are necessary for the support of a family, this bill will not apply. The Secretary, under the terms of the bill, if he finds a piece of land where 639 acres will support a family, this bill does not apply. Or if he finds 641 acres are necessary to support a family, this bill does not apply. Well, gentlemen will say, of course, the

Secretary will not draw the line that fine. He does not know how large the family is to be.

Now, my distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] might be able to live on 640 acres and support his family while the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] would not be able to support his family, because the size of the families is very different. Yet under the terms of this bill the Secretary is required to make a finding which no man on earth can truthfully make. What is the use of imposing duties upon an executive officer which he can not perform and which it is not intended he shall perform?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Now, for instance, we can not amend this bill, and yet it would be vastly improved if you could insert, on page 2, line 2, after the word "crops," the words "and which," because without those words it does not make sense. The bill was drafted in the Land Office, but in printing it the Committee on Public Lands probably did not read it very carefully, and they left out a pronoun which is absolutely required to make sense. Yet we can not offer an amendment to perfect it, notwithstanding that the Committee on Public Lands, any day when Congress has been or is to be in session, did have and would have the privilege of calling this bill up for consideration as a matter of high privilege, having it considered in the Committee of the Whole, where there was a chance to perfect it by offering amendments, but the committee is evidently afraid to expose the bill to critical analysis. Hence it directs its Member in charge of the bill to move to suspend the rules and pass it without knowledge, without amendment, without real consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any time I may have left.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentlemen on the other side to use some of their time.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS]. How much time did I use?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman used three minutes.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think I will use the time allotted. The gentleman from Illinois, with his ingenious mind, calls the attention of the House to the supposition that the Public Lands Committee can march in and take possession of the House with this or with any other bill that they have reported.

I think it is scarcely necessary to say that the Committee on Public Lands would not carry on any such proceeding as that, even if the rules would technically say we had the right.

The Public Lands Committee has many matters before it, some of little consequence and some important, but it does not feel it has the right to come in here and take advantage of some technical rule, and it has not done it in the past under this or any other administration. Neither has the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERGUSSON] been selfish, grasping, or penurious with his bill.

The gentleman from New Mexico has gone down in defeat while working for the people of his State. He has been working in season and out to get up this bill. No man could have been more diligent. No man deserves more credit for his zealous and untiring efforts. It is not necessary for me to state that when a man comes into this House with a bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar he approaches a perilous course. The Speaker has generously agreed to recognize the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERGUSSON] to-day to call up this bill under suspension, and very properly so, as I believe.

As the public land dwindles away, and the good land is taken up, and the rocky and the hilly dry land is left, Congress is occasionally asked to modify the homestead laws. You can not go out on a sand dune or a bald knob without a stake or a blade of grass on it, and a family can not exist on 160 acres of such land.

I want the gentleman from Illinois to search into the innermost recesses of his heart and see if he can not put some of his patriotism into this bill as he did into the bill of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] a moment ago. The gentleman from Illinois has great influence in this House; he is the leader of a great party here, and he probably will be a candidate for leader in a greater capacity, and I hope he will; but I urge the gentleman from Illinois and his colleagues who sit about him, and I urge the colleagues of my friend FERGUSSON on this side of the House, not to turn their back on a law that will absolutely settle and populate the West. I ask, then, to pass a bill to-day that is workable, that is practical, and that will help the West.

Let me call the attention of the House to what Congress is being asked to do in another bill that has already passed the Senate, and it is being seriously urged in my committee. They ask to let land be taken up without any residence at all on the ground that they can not get water. Two States in previous Congresses have already been granted that right. I stood in the Public Lands Committee during the Congresses and opposed that proceeding. I am opposed to it now. I am in favor of letting the arid sections of the Rocky Mountain States, where it requires land for pasturage, perchance a little valley, on which to raise the various forage crops—fedrietta, alfalfa, Soudan grass, and others—be actually settled and not prove a failure.

They can not live and they can not stay on 160 acres of this dry, arid land. They can not live and they can not stay on 320 acres of this sort of land. But if you will give them an area large enough so that they can have, perchance, 10 dairy cows or 5 dairy cows, or perchance they can find a little valley with a little well water with which they can irrigate, or a little valley that will raise something without irrigation, and enable them to produce a little forage which they can put into a silo I think the West can be settled.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] called attention to the fact that although his State had been admitted into the Union 50 years they had only 80,000 population. Why, my own county in the State of Oklahoma has almost as much population as that. Think of it! Eighty thousand people in an entire State. No one can stay on the land under the present law. No arable or irrigable land or mineral land is to be settled under this bill; no land in any section of the country where they have rainfall enough to raise enough to live on can be homesteaded under this bill. But this bill will cause what? It will cause the Secretary of the Interior, the Geological Survey, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, to pick out a lot of high, dry, nonagricultural grazing land, and it will give 640 acres to a man and his family to live upon. Does anyone longer desire a State that has been admitted into the Union 50 years to be held down to a population of 80,000? This is a good bill. The West needs it. It will help produce more foodstuffs and enable people to get food more cheaply. It should have been passed long ago. I am proud to see it up for consideration. I want it to pass. It deserves to pass. The West will appreciate it. I ask the House to pass it.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I can not agree with the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands that this bill relates only to lands on which nothing can be grown. If that were the fact, it would be meaningless and of no value to consider it in this House at all. But because I believe you are going to enlarge the homestead entries on lands that residents in any State might see fit to locate upon, and to grant to those who have already exercised their homestead rights additional land upon which to locate, is the reason I am against this bill.

I do not think the time has arrived for the inauguration of a policy on the part of the National Government to enlarge homesteads generally from 160 to 640 acres. In 10 years' time we have seen that idea develop from the well-known Kinkaid Act, which applied only to arid lands, until now it is proposed to be extended to lands that are capable of agriculture.

Because land is suitable for grazing it does not follow that it is not suitable for agriculture. If you will read this bill closely throughout, you will find that every endeavor is being made to add to the domain of those who have homesteaded the addition of 480 acres. If the homestead entryman has 160 acres, he can go and locate an additional 480 acres within 10 miles of the original tract. If there is no such compact tract within 10 miles of the original tract, he can go foraging around and take to that extent in little strips. He might appropriate under the provisions of this bill all the various scattered tracts of land that might contain watercourses. The gentlemen on the other side shake their heads, but as I read this bill it may be subject to such entry. You do not limit them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I yield. I wish to be notified, Mr. Speaker, when five minutes have elapsed.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Is the gentleman personally familiar with the land that is described here?

Mr. STAFFORD. I tried to get some information about it. There is nothing here that says "arid" lands. It says lands described as suitable for stock raising. Now, stock-raising lands are grazing lands, and grazing lands may be suitable for agriculture.

Mr. HAYDEN. He can go only 10 miles.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then section 11 of the bill has some provisions relating to coal entries. What connection have stock-raising lands with coal entries? You are legalizing coal entries by this bill.

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

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a reenactment of other laws heretofore passed, providing for the surface entry, merely, of land containing coal and minerals.

Mr. STAFFORD. This provision goes further than that. It does not merely reserve to the Government the coal and mineral lands thereon, but specially grants the right to enter, and approves of those entries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. Read the language and you will see that it will bear that construction. I am one of those coming from the Middle West, where we have large numbers of people who want to go upon the public domain. All the available public land has not been exhausted—

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. Is the gentleman speaking now of section 10?

Mr. STAFFORD. Section 11.

Mr. FERRIS. Did the gentleman observe that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERGUSSON], on the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], added an amendment which made it clear that when a homestead was taken it had to be of the character designated in this bill—a stock-raising homestead?

Mr. STAFFORD. I remember that amendment was suggested.

Mr. FERRIS. It was embodied in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is too important a bill to be considered without the privilege of amendment. You are crowding this through here, taking away the rights of the great majority of the people to locate on the public lands that are now available and permitting all who have heretofore homesteaded to enter upon an additional 480 acres without paying anything for the additional land. I protest against that policy.

Mr. FERRIS. We are not taking away anything.

Mr. STAFFORD. You are taking away the privilege that my people now have to homestead this land, and conferring a second homestead entry of 480 acres of grazing land adjacent to their present homesteads. This is for the benefit of the entrymen in the Western States, and not for the benefit of the people in the rest of the country.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman kindly tell me how a man can enter public land without going West?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

Mr. KENT. Mr. Speaker, a statement was made here by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. LAFFERTY] that I, as a member of the Public Lands Committee, am obliged to resent. He stated that our committee had adopted the policy of recognizing only two bills for national parks, the bill of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the bill of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], both members of the Public Lands Committee. The gentleman from Oregon, in connection with that statement, said that he had gone before a subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee to recommend a certain bill for the State of Oregon, and by that subcommittee he was told that that bill would not be considered and that no other bills than these two would be considered. The gentleman from Oregon has since informed me personally that that event happened in a previous Congress, when the bill of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] was not under consideration. I make this statement here and now because I feel it is due to the Public Lands Committee to have it known that they are not playing favorites. They have tried to do their duty by the membership of the House, to take up all questions concerning the public domain, irrespective of whether the bills were brought in by members of the committee or by others. I make this statement to repel false aspersions of recalcitrance to our duty or of favoritism.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not hear the statement of the gentleman from Oregon and do not know what he said. Did the gentleman from Oregon say he was seriously pressing some bill now that the committee had slighted?

Mr. KENT. I understood his statement would lead to the belief that a bill he was pressing was put aside in the interest of these two bills.

Mr. FERRIS. That was some park bill?

Mr. KENT. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. The gentleman from Oregon has not been pressing any bill recently to the chairman of this committee, has he?

Mr. LAFFERTY. If the gentleman from California refers to me, I never heard of these two bills until to-day.

Mr. FERRIS. I did not know what the incident was, and all I desire to say is that I do not recall any Member of the Oregon delegation or the Washington delegation recently pressing any park bill. If they have done so, I have forgotten it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico has 11 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin has 7 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. STAFFORD. And I yield two minutes additional to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, when I presented the 320-acre homestead bill to the House some years ago I said that the next evolution in homestead law would be in the nature of a grazing homestead bill. A short time after that I introduced a grazing homestead bill. Now we have before us such a bill, called a stock-raising homestead bill. I am in favor of the legislation suggested in this bill. I very much regret, however, that the bill was not brought up in the way that it could have been brought up, and in which the House has heretofore considered the same kind of legislation, so that we could have an opportunity to debate it and amend it. I regret that that was not done, because I do not like the form of the legislation. While I am in favor of a grazing or stock-raising homestead bill, whatever you may call it, I do not like the provisions of this bill. I do not like the provisions of the bill with the complete mineral reservation, which is not clear, and I am sure would not be satisfactory. There are other provisions of the bill that, in my opinion, could be wisely amended; but if it is a question of passing the bill or not passing the bill, I am in favor of legislation of this character, and therefore shall vote for the bill with all of its failings and imperfections. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I am sure if its provisions are understood there will not be a vote against it. The bill authorizes any person qualified to make entry under the homestead laws of the United States to make a stock-raising homestead entry for not exceeding 640 acres of land that shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as "stock-raising lands."

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Secretary to designate or classify lands subject to entry under the bill, which limits the entry to the surface and provides that the land must be chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops, not containing merchantable timber and not susceptible of irrigation, and that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family.

Section 3 prescribes that the lands entered must be in compact form and that title can be secured by compliance with the terms of the homestead laws, except that instead of cultivation the entryman shall be required to make permanent improvements upon the land before final proof is submitted, tending to increase the value of the same for stock-raising purposes, of the value of not less than \$1.25 per acre, and that at least one-half of such improvements shall be placed upon the land within three years after the date of entry.

Section 4 provides that an entryman who has an existing entry of 160 acres or less shall have the right to file upon contiguous lands designated for entry under the provisions of this act to the extent of an area equaling 640 acres, including his original entry.

Section 5 provides that one who has submitted final proof or received patent for lands of the character subject to entry under the terms of this bill, who owns and resides upon the land so acquired, may make additional entry for contiguous lands which, together with the area theretofore acquired, shall not exceed 640 acres.

Section 6 provides that where there are not contiguous lands in area sufficient to complete an entry of 640 acres the entryman or patentee shall have the right to enter, within a radius of 10 miles from his entry, lands in reasonably compact form designated for entry under the provisions of this bill that shall, together with the first entry, not exceed 640 acres.

Section 7 authorizes a person who has made an entry or submitted proof to relinquish or reconvey to the United States his land and make an entry in the same land district of 640 acres under the terms of this bill.

Section 8 provides that the commutation provisions of the homestead laws shall not apply to entries made under this act.

Section 9 gives entrymen or patentees entitled to an additional entry a 30 days' preference right to make an additional entry and also provides for how it shall be determined who is entitled to a tract where there are two claimants.

Section 10 provides that any person who has acquired title under the homestead laws and who is the owner and occupant of the land so acquired may purchase not exceeding 320 acres of stock-raising land at \$1.25 per acre.

Section 11 reserves the mineral in lands entered and patented under the terms of this act and provides how the mineral deposits may be disposed of.

Section 12 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make rules and regulations for carrying the terms of the law into effect.

The original homestead law under which the public lands in the humid sections of the United States have been entered and acquired permit an entryman to file upon 160 acres as the maximum area that can be entered, the original theory of the law being that by reason of favorable climatic conditions and the productiveness of the soil 160 acres is sufficient to enable a settler with a family to live comfortably. I mention this because that is the correct theory upon which laws for the disposition of the public domain ought to be constructed. It is this theory that justifies the enactment of the pending bill, and I think I can demonstrate it. Some years ago Congress recognized that the homestead unit of 160 acres ought not to be adopted in all instances; in the irrigation act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to fix the amount of land that can be entered, the maximum being 160 acres, and he may limit the amount that can be entered to only 40 acres. This limitation is because with the aid of water in arid localities lands may be irrigated and cultivated in the most intensive manner and several crops can be produced during the year.

In the Fifty-seventh Congress there was enacted what is known as the Kinkaid law (act of Apr. 28, 1904, 33 Stat., 547), which is limited in its application to a portion of western Nebraska. This act permits the entry of not exceeding 640 acres. The Kinkaid Act clearly recognizes the necessity of providing that a settler should have a greater area of grazing or arid land, especially nonirrigable, than a settler locating in a humid section on land susceptible of successful grain raising without irrigation. The Kinkaid law was predicated upon the suggestion of the President in his message to Congress at the opening of the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress, in which he said:

Moreover, the approaching exhaustion of the public ranges has of late led to much discussion as to the best manner of using these public lands in the West which are suitable chiefly or only for grazing. The sound and steady development of the West depends upon the building up of homes therein. Much of our prosperity as a nation has been due to the operation of the homestead law. On the other hand, we should recognize the fact that in the grazing region the man who corresponds to the homesteader may be unable to settle permanently if only allowed to use the same amount of pasture land that his brother, the homesteader, is allowed to use of arable land. One hundred and sixty acres of fairly rich and well-watered soil, or a much smaller amount of irrigated land, may keep a family in plenty, whereas no one could get a living from 160 acres of dry pasture land capable of supporting at the outside only one head of cattle to every 10 acres.

Recognizing that in the intermountain States there are areas not susceptible to raising crops under the ordinary methods of farming, but which will, through the adoption of conserving the moisture by certain cultivation known as dry farming, produce profitable crops, Congress enacted what are known as the enlarged homestead laws of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat., 639), and June 17, 1910 (36 Stat., 531), under which acts not exceeding 320 acres may be entered as a homestead. It will be seen by the laws just cited that Congress has repeatedly recognized what I have already stated, that the original homestead laws are not applicable to portions of the public domain and that new laws are necessary to apply to portions of the country where none of the existing laws are applicable, and give the settler who may go upon such lands a fair chance to succeed.

The Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in his report to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee on the pending bill, commenting upon the success of the Kinkaid Act and the other enlarged homestead laws that I have referred to, said:

The settlement, home-making, and agricultural development which followed the enactment of these laws is well known and need not be here described.

With relation to the necessity for legislation, as proposed by this bill, the Assistant Secretary said:

There remain, however, as indicated, vast areas of the public lands to which none of the foregoing laws seem well adapted, and I am of opinion that the time has arrived when a new form of homestead law should be enacted peculiarly adapted thereto. The lands I have in mind, because of their arid or semiarid character, or because of their location on mountain tops or sides, will not produce agricultural crops for sale or exportation in sufficient quantities to justify acquirement thereof and residence thereon under the existing laws. They do, however, possess some value for grazing purposes and often include tracts of

greater or less extent upon which might be grown forage crops, such as Kafir corn, milo maize, fodder, or other rough feed, of little value for sale and transportation, but valuable for winter feed or for the fattening of range stock. I believe that with this class of lands a homestead of 640 acres of land would enable bona fide homeseekers to establish and maintain homes for the purpose of stock raising and for such farming operations as will enable him to raise their own supply of rough feed for the stock pastured upon the remaining lands entered or acquired.

After the subject had been fully and carefully considered by the Public Lands Committee and after exhaustive hearings had been held, the committee approved the present bill precisely as it is presented here, and it was submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for a report, and the Assistant Secretary, in a letter to the chairman of the committee, under date of April 24, 1914, said:

As stated in my letter to you of January 30, 1914, I am heartily in favor of legislation which will permit and encourage the settlement and development of public lands to which the present homestead laws are not adapted, but which, under a somewhat more liberal measure, would be settled upon, improved, and developed for the purpose of stock raising.

He suggested a couple of amendments to the bill, and their adoption is included in the pending motion to suspend the rules.

I want to read a statement made by Mr. I. S. Bartlett, of Cheyenne, Wyo., that appears in the hearings upon this bill, as to the necessity for this legislation and the benefits that would result from it. Mr. Bartlett said:

A grazing homestead bill giving 640 acres, or even 2 sections, to each settler would soon add 200 per cent to the live-stock production of the public-land States and solve the beef problem for the next half century. Not only that, it would break down the high prices of beef, pork, and mutton, as well as dairy products.

Better than all, it would settle up the vast area of waste lands in the Nation with a hardy, intelligent, and progressive American citizenship.

Think for a moment what our desert or grass ranges will produce, situated, as they are, in an environment of mountains and plains and flooded with sunshine.

Here are some purely range products: Cattle, sheep, horses, hogs, goats, hides, wool, butter, cheese, milk and dairy products, poultry, and eggs. All these can be produced in our native grass regions without any plowing or land cultivation.

The irrigated and dry farms in the same section will supplement all the needed fattening and forage crops, and both the farming and stock-raising interests will be mutually and correspondingly benefited.

The range homestead proposition can be easily worked out. Instead of the requirements of plowing up the land and crop cultivation, the law should require expenditure for sinking wells, building of sheds and corrals, the possession of a certain number of animals, etc. The residence requirements should be the same as in other homestead acts.

In nearly every section of the grass ranges water can be found at depths varying from 20 to 500 feet. In many cases artesian water and flowing wells are obtained, giving a sufficient supply of water for irrigating many acres and raising fine crops. With the passage of a grazing homestead bill the so-called desert lands would be penetrated with wells and the whole landscape dotted with windmills and improvements in the form of houses, barns, corrals, and fences.

In a very few years a wonderful transformation scene would be enacted in the vast cattle ranges of the West, now practically uninhabited by settlers. That this is no dream has already been demonstrated by the results of the Kinkaid 640-acre homestead act, which applied to the desert wastes of western Nebraska. That entire section is now settled up with a high class of prosperous and successful farmers. Five million acres of arid lands have been reclaimed there, and the wave of incoming settlers has overflowed into Wyoming in the search for dry-farming lands.

Even under the late repressive land administration the Commissioner of the General Land Office advocated the 640-acre homestead for the semiarid West, and in so doing stated that "the largest part of the unappropriated public domain would never pass to private ownership under smaller allotments."

Local bills are good enough so far as they go, but the whole subject should be treated from a national point of view and a bill passed applicable to all the States having public lands.

It is interesting to note what Maj. J. W. Powell, Director of the United States Geological Survey, said in 1879 with relation to the necessity for legislation permitting the entry of more than 160 acres of grazing land. Here is his statement:

THE FARM UNIT FOR PASTURAGE LANDS.

The grass is so scanty that the herdsman must have a large area for the support of his stock. In general, a quarter section of land alone is of no value to him. The pasturage it affords is entirely inadequate to the wants of a herd that the poorest man needs for his support (p. 21).

Four square miles may be considered as the minimum amount necessary for a pasturage farm, and a still greater amount is necessary for the larger part of the lands; that is, pasturage farms, to be of any practical value, must be of at least 2,560 acres, and in many districts they must be much larger (p. 22).

Hon. Charles D. Walcott, who for many years was the Director of the United States Geological Survey, in a communication to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the Kinkaid bill, among other things said:

The central idea of this bill is that of enlarging the area of homestead entry to suit the conditions of the semiarid West. There is general recognition of the fact that the present land laws, designed for the humid region, are not applicable to the arid region.

The arbitrary limit stated by the present land laws of 160 acres for a homestead does not suit existing conditions in the arid region. If the water supply is ample, 160 acres is usually far too much, and would support two, three, or four families; on the other hand, throughout 90 to 95 per cent of the vast extent of remaining public land 160 acres is so small as to be useless for a homestead.

No general rule as to what shall constitute a homestead can be laid down. In order to determine this matter local knowledge must be had and exercised in the same manner as it is under the reclamation projects. The question is one largely of altitude, climate, and water supply, rather than extent of land.

There can be no hard and fast rule as to the limits to be set for such land, but knowledge of the water supply and judgment may be used if the arid lands are to be divided into tracts capable of supporting a family. Under the operation of the laws at present in force there is no possibility of equity in the matter. Men take their chances of getting enough land one way or another. If they fail, they sell or relinquish their rights to their neighbors until an adjustment is finally attained, at great cost and hardship, and without attaining the best results for the Commonwealth, since in the general laxity of affairs the lands are not put to the best use, and many of them gradually pass into the hands of corporations instead of being utilized for the support of independent families.

I might go on discussing at much length the necessity for legislation for the disposition of lands of the character intended to be affected by this bill so as to induce settlers to go upon them and acquire homes and under conditions that would enable them to succeed and live comfortably, but being convinced that enough has been said to justify the passage of the bill, and having explained its different provisions in detail, I will conclude with a hope that the motion to suspend the rules will prevail and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I also yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, no more important measure has been before Congress for consideration for many years. I do not believe that in all the history of the country a single piece of national legislation was ever passed that has resulted in greater good to the entire people than the homestead law of 1862. This bill, after very full consideration and very full hearings and with all the light up to date on this great homestead question, has been drafted, and the purpose of it is to adapt the fundamental principles of the homestead law to the conditions surrounding the remaining public lands.

Of course, the exact test as to what ought to be the size of the homestead which the Government offers to citizens who will go out upon and open up a new country and make it fit for civilization is the area that will enable an industrious man to support a family. That was the rule adopted as to the 160-acre homestead law, and it worked well in the Missouri and the Mississippi Valleys, but we have gone way beyond the point where 160 acres in area of our remaining public lands without irrigation, can support a family. The area here, 640 acres, has been fixed as the result of experience. This particular bill has been drafted by the Interior Department itself, and I differ from my friend from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] in his view as to whether it has been well prepared. It would have been proper if the bill, considering its importance, could have been considered for general amendment, and still I believe that the bill in its present form is about as good as could be drafted, with all the intelligence and information we have on this great subject up to the present time.

We undertook many years ago—10 years ago, indeed—to pass a section homestead law for the remaining public lands in western South Dakota. We passed it through this House, but it failed in the Senate because we were near the adjournment of Congress at that time. Impelled in part by the fact that that movement had life and agitation in Congress, two great railways built across that country and settlers poured into that semiarid area and took 160-acre homesteads; but the result has been, from practical experience, that many of those who went there have now gone away, while those who remain occupy practically 640 acres each and are making a living upon it. Consult the census and you will find that in Iowa, for instance, with rich lands and ample rainfall, about 160 acres are now the unit of farm area—one hundred and fifty-six and a fraction.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that in certain portions of the West 640 acres are not sufficient?

Mr. MARTIN. That is true. There are portions of the West where that is not sufficient, and it is the duty of the Secretary of the Interior under this bill to leave out those general areas from classification and to put in classification only those portions of grazing lands where 640 acres can be reasonably expected to support a family. In South Dakota the average farm unit is three hundred and thirty-five and a fraction acres; in North Dakota, 382; in Montana, 516; and in Wyoming, 777. We have never had a land monopoly in this country, and we never will have so long as Congress remains wise enough to provide farm homestead units upon which men can make a living. It is only when we are negligent in that respect that the lands are liable to fall into monopoly.

A large number of homesteads have been made in the semi-arid West in the past few years. To the extent that they have become permanent, it is well known that the settlers are not supporting themselves on 160 acres of land. They are depending upon large areas of open range for their stock, and without this could not exist under present conditions. The native grass of the range country is being rapidly destroyed under the careless and wasteful methods of the open range. These vast areas of public lands are not subject to taxation and make no contribution to local self-government.

A good stock country is a wealthy country when properly stocked and used for the purposes for which it is best adapted. A section of these lands, properly protected and utilized, in the ownership of an industrious citizen may support a family. To limit the settler to 160 acres is to invite disaster.

It is the duty of the Government to offer the homesteader sufficient land that his battle on the frontier may not be a losing one. This legislation will take us a long step in the right direction. It will provide comfortable homes for thousands of our worthy citizens, who in turn will build up local communities and add millions of value to the combined wealth of the Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID].

[Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] for one minute.

[Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

[Mr. RAKER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. FERGUSON. I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, commonly known as the Fergusson 640-acre homestead bill, is the product of months of hard work by the Committee on the Public Lands. Exhaustive hearings were held, and the committee was favored by the testimony of men thoroughly familiar with every phase of the live-stock and dry-farming industries of the West. Three different drafts of this measure were considered by the committee, and the bill before you represents the collective judgment of its members as to what ought to be done in order to promote the settlement of large areas of the public domain.

Like most bills that come before this House, this proposed act is a compromise. I have not been a Member of this body very long, but I have served here a sufficient time to learn that we can not expect to have legislation passed that is entirely satisfactory to our constituents. This is particularly true of the Congressmen from the public-land States, because we must submit our measures for decision to the membership of the House, a majority of whom never saw an acre of the public domain and have no conception of the difficulties under which the homesteader is compelled to labor.

I betray no secrets when I say that there was a serious disagreement in the Committee on the Public Lands when this proposition was first considered. The bill as originally drawn made available for entry as "grazing homesteads" all lands designated by the Secretary of the Interior "the surface of which is, in his opinion, chiefly valuable for grazing, which do not contain merchantable timber, and which are not susceptible of irrigation from any known source of water supply." Immediate objection was made to this provision by a number of the members of the committee, upon the ground that it would permit speculation in large areas of land by entrymen who were not seeking in good faith to obtain homes, but who would make entries in order to force the stockmen to pay them to move away or to purchase the land after title was obtained from the Government.

Members of the committee who favored this language insisted that a similar provision in the 320-acre homestead law had worked well in actual practice, and that it was no concern of the United States as to what use was made of the land after a patent is issued. They were quite certain that the Department of the Interior could prevent the acceptance of proof made by entrymen who were not acting in good faith.

A compromise was finally agreed upon which requires the Secretary of the Interior to classify the land that is suitable for entry under this act. In addition to the text that I have just read, the Secretary must designate lands that "are of such character that 640 acres are reasonably required for the

support of a family," and a proviso was added which reads as follows:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Interior shall not designate for entry under this act land of which, owing to its general character or general conditions, in his opinion, 640 acres clearly will not support a family.

This proviso is an innovation in our homestead laws. Heretofore the settler could go upon the most arid, barren, and worthless tract of land imaginable and, if he succeeded in making satisfactory proof of residence and cultivation, title to the area entered would pass to him. The entryman took all the risk and did his own classifying. But under this provision it is made incumbent on the Secretary of the Interior to say that the average settler has a fair chance to make a living on 640 acres of land of such character that it is "chiefly valuable for grazing and raising forage crops."

This new idea was adopted by the committee after much discussion in the belief that it would not only tend to prevent speculation by entrymen who would not act in good faith, but with the further purpose of preventing the location of settlers by land agents in places where they are foredoomed to failure. The committee believed that an attempt by the settler to support his family by grazing live stock and growing forage crops on 640 acres in the semiarid West is, at best, an enterprise of considerable hazard, and for this reason the prospective entryman is entitled to the benefit of the best judgment of the Department of the Interior respecting the probability of his success on the land he desires to enter. Undoubtedly the department will, among other things, give consideration to the annual and seasonal rainfall, the length of the growing season, and the quality of the native grasses in determining the areas to which this act shall apply. The settler in a new country has enough of hardships to contend with, under any circumstances, and he certainly ought to be furnished with every particle of helpful information that the Government has at its command.

I desire to state, Mr. Speaker, that I have heretofore mailed a large number of copies of this bill to my constituents, and that much mention of it has been made in the newspapers of my State. I have received a great many letters from citizens of Arizona urging its passage. Most of the letters, however, are from the counties of Cochise and Santa Cruz in southern Arizona, and from Apache, Navajo, Coconino, and Yavapai Counties in the northern part of the State. I doubt whether the Department of the Interior will find any considerable area of land in the other counties of Arizona where this bill can be made applicable. I am satisfied, however, that its enactment into law will materially promote an increase in the population of the counties that I have mentioned by inducing new settlers to make homes on the public lands located therein.

This bill merits favorable action by the House. It is but a continuation of our present homestead policy, with such changes as experience has demonstrated to be necessary in view of the character and condition of the remainder of the public lands in the West. It will make homes for our citizens; it will create property values that can be taxed to support the State and county governments; it will promote the prosperity and the general welfare of the entire West. This is the only homestead legislation that is obtainable at this time, and I sincerely trust that this measure will become a law during the present session of Congress.

Mr. FERGUSSON. Has the gentleman only one more speech?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. I yield the balance of my time to my colleague [Mr. LENROOT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I was not in charge of the bill nor was I interested in it any more than I was in any other bill coming from the Committee on the Public Lands, of which I am a member. I want frankly to say it had not occurred to me that this bill was a privileged bill, and if it were not for the fact that it would be impossible, through the inability of the Democratic Party to expedite business and its general incompetency [laughter on the Republican side], to secure consideration of this bill in the regular way during this session, although it is privileged, I would not favor this motion at this time. But we all know that, although privileged as it is, appropriation bills will take all the time of the remaining portion of the session.

Now, with reference to the criticism made on this bill by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. He very severely criticized that provision of the bill which requires the Secretary of the Interior in making designations to designate such land as he shall find that 640 acres are reasonably required for the support of a family, and on the other hand prohibits him from

designating land where he believes 640 acres will not support a family. Now, technically, the criticism of the gentleman from Illinois may be correct, but, after all, it is only a direction to the Secretary of the Interior as to what character of land shall be designated by him; and it was the intention, as is clearly seen from a reading of the bill itself, that he must not designate land where 160 acres will support a family or 320 acres will support a family, but where 640 acres are reasonably required to support a family, and in order to prevent inducements being held out to would-be settlers from all over the country that here are 640-acre homesteads in abundance, in order that the entire public domain, much of which is absolutely worthless, will not be held out to them by land agents in the West, we make a limitation upon the other hand also prohibiting the Secretary from including in that designation land where the settler will not have a reasonable chance to make a home and support a family. That is the purpose of the proviso, of the two limitations, one that he shall designate 640 acres that will reasonably support a family, and the other that he shall not designate any land where it certainly will not support a family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all those who have spoken on the bill may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the bill may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, may I make a similar request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object to all of them. If we pass the bill under the suspension of the rules, let us have the RECORD show that we did it without consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and, in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the Chair understand the gentleman makes the point of order on the vote?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; the vote has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned, to meet to-morrow, Tuesday, January 19, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1. Letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting list of documents and files of papers of no use in the transaction of the current business of the department and of no permanent or historic interest (H. Doc. No. 1499); to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting data relative to leasing and renting unoccupied and unproductive property of the United States under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury (H. Doc. No. 1500); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting report as to rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the United States Government in the city of Washington (H. Doc. No. 1501); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for administration and protection of the Yellowstone National Park, caring for buffalo, etc., for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 1502); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copy of findings of fact and conclusions in

the case of Frances J. Tuyle, remarried widow of Henry F. Jacobs, deceased (H. Doc. No. 1503); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copy of findings of fact and conclusions in the case of E. B. McHenry, receiver of the Bank of West Tennessee (H. Doc. No. 1504); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. STOUT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3897) to authorize the Great Northern Railway Co. to revise the location of its right of way, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1292), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5525) to authorize the President to appoint Maj. William O. Owen, United States Army, retired, a colonel on the active list of the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1291), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

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. 12841) granting a pension to Blanche Wood; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 20410) granting a pension to Jennie S. Bunch; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid 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. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 21007) giving contestants preference right to purchase abandoned entries pursuant to successful contest proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURNETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 21008) to further regulate the entrance of Chinese aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 21009) to make Van Buren, Me., a port through which merchandise may be imported for transportation without appraisement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 21010) granting an increase of pension to George Gardiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 21011) granting an increase of pension to James P. Strickler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 21012) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Vosburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 21013) granting an increase of pension to Frances M. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 21014) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Macdonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 21015) granting a pension to Edward Rowe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 21016) granting a pension to Mary A. Coffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 21017) granting an increase of pension to Schuyler C. Cline; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 21018) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bushnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 21019) granting an increase of pension to Major S. Bowman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 21020) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lenz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 21021) granting a pension to Mary Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 21022) granting a pension to Francis M. Stoddard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21023) granting a pension to Sarah J. Effelberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 21024) granting a pension to Maggie Barron; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 21025) granting a pension to Sarah E. Sargent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 21026) granting an increase of pension to Justin B. Lynch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 21027) granting an increase of pension to Joseph P. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 21028) granting an increase of pension to Marcella Matlock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TUTTLE: A bill (H. R. 21029) granting an increase of pension to William Husk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: A bill (H. R. 21030) for the relief of the Hilton Building & Loan Association; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21031) for the relief of the Commonwealth Building & Loan Association; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOLLMER: A bill (H. R. 21032) granting a pension to Mary Burke; 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 (by request): Petition of citizens of St. Charles and Catholic Union State League of Missouri, protesting against sale of munitions of war by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Pueblo German and Austrian Widows and Orphans' War Sufferers' Society, protesting against shipment of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Eichelberger Co., J. E. Dilling, R. S. Isenberg & Sons, C. N. Johnson, and J. P. Rearick, all of Martinsburg, Pa., for the passage of House bill 5308, a bill providing for the taxation of mail-order houses for local purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petitions of citizens of Elkhart, Silver Lake, Warsaw, Etna Green, Pierceton, Argos, Inwood, Tippecanoe, Atwood, Bourbon, Claypool, Mentone, and Plymouth, all in the State of Indiana, in favor of bill to compel mail-order merchants to pay taxes in communities where they sell merchandise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petitions of August Ruedebusch and 366 other citizens of the city of Mayville, Wis., and Andrew Schmidbauer and 34 other citizens of the town of Leroy, Dodge County, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of House joint resolution 377, to levy an embargo upon and prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, etc., from this country to any of the European countries now at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of citizens of Danbury, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, against House joint resolution 372, to establish a national security commission; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of citizens of Danbury, Conn., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Mary Coffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring observance of strict neutrality by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Wilmington Friends' meeting, of 1,000 or more members, favoring passage of House bill 16098, protecting the Quaker name against advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of the Winton Gas Engine & Manufacturing Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against passage of House bill 18666, relative to Government ownership of merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Branch, National Association of Civil Service Employees, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139); to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of Good of the Order Association, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, favoring the passage of the immigration bill, H. R. 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of North St. Louis (Mo.) Business Men's Association, favoring 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition protesting against Smith-Burnett immigration bill by Polish National Alliance, Pulaski Branch, No. 178, Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of William F. Schmidt, of Farmington; citizens of West Point; and J. A. Reid and others, of Morning Sun, Iowa, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Protest of Klemens Markowski, Southington, Conn., in re Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, letter of President C. L. Beach, the Connecticut Agricultural College, Storrs, Conn., in re agricultural appropriation bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, letters of J. F. Callbreath, secretary the American Mining Congress, Washington, D. C., and William North Rice, superintendent of Geological and Natural History Survey of Connecticut, Middletown, Conn., in re House bill 15869, to establish mining experiment stations; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, letter of William I. Barber, secretary of Hartford Business Men's Association, Hartford, Conn., in re House joint resolution No. 372, to establish a national safety commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Memorial of Catholic Union of Illinois, First German Baptist Church of Oak Park, German-Irish Central Legislative Committee, and German-Irish Demonstration, all of Illinois, favoring American neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, favoring passage of the Root bill (S. 3672) relative to improvement of the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Norwich, Conn., and vicinity, favoring the passage of House joint resolution 377, relative to export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 372, relative to appointment of national security commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of Germania Aid Society, of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Good of the Order Association, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the Dillingham-Burnett immigration bill (H. R. 6060); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of Pennsylvania Arbitration and Peace Society, urging strict maintenance of neutrality law by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petitions of Kullman, Salz & Co., Benicia, Cal., protesting against the Underwood Tariff Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Chicago Substitute Letter Carriers' Association, favoring the passage of H. R. 11522, providing a minimum wage for Federal civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. PHELAN: Memorial of Polish National Alliance, Group 1114, of Lawrence, and St. Michael's Polish Benefit Society, Branch 630, of West Lynn, Mass., protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Hardin, Ill., citizens, protesting against certain publications through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Boardstown, Ill., Knights of Columbus, favoring restoration of order in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 300 citizens of Boardstown, Ill., favoring embargo on war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Polish Knights of Holy Virgin, of Meriden, and St. Stanislaw, B. Z. N. P., of Meriden, Conn., against Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REILLY of Wisconsin: Petitions from residents of the sixth congressional district of Wisconsin, protesting against the exportation of arms and ammunition from this country to any of the warring European nations and asking the passage of legislation preventing such exportation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, letters of sundry citizens of the sixth congressional district of Wisconsin, asking support of House joint resolution 377, or legislation that will prevent the exportation of arms and ammunition from this country to any of the warring European nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUBEY: Petition of citizens of Crawford County, Mo., favoring passage of House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: Petition of Board of Commerce of Erie, Pa., favoring Senate bill 3672, to make certain improvements in Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of John Stege and others, of Perham; Peter Frendenberg and others, of Parkers Prairie; J. A. Fridgen and others, of Vining; and citizens of Rothsay, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. Joseph Eitel and others, of Perham, Minn., favoring House joint resolution 377, to forbid export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Jennie S. Bunch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of Pueblo German and Austrian widows and orphans, war sufferers, Pueblo, Colo., favoring bill to prohibit the export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of 776 American citizens, favoring passage of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting export of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of Polish Society of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 19, 1915.

(Legislative day of Friday, January 15, 1915.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, there are only about half a dozen Senators present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

| | | | |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|----------|
| Brady | Gallinger | Overman | Swanson |
| Brandegee | Gronna | Page | Thomas |
| Bristow | Hitchcock | Perkins | Thornton |
| Bryan | Jones | Ransdell | Tillman |
| Burleigh | Kenyon | Robinson | Townsend |
| Burton | Kern | Shafroth | Vardaman |
| Chamberlain | La Follette | Sheppard | Walsh |
| Clapp | Lane | Simmons | White |
| Crawford | Lippitt | Smith, Ariz. | Works |
| Culbertson | Martin, Va. | Smith, Mich. | |
| Cummins | Martine, N. J. | Smoot | |
| Fletcher | Myers | Stone | |

Mr. GRONNA. My colleague [Mr. McCUMBER] is unavoidably absent from the city.

Mr. THORNTON. I was requested to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] on account of illness in his family. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CAMDEN, Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. ROOT,