

Dewey,  
Diehm,  
Di Lemmo,  
Dilsheimer,

Kooser,  
Krause, T. S.,  
Krause, W.,  
Krugh,

Robertson.  
Rothenberger,  
Ruddy,

Zook,  
Spangler,  
Speaker.

YAYS—0.

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

RECONSIDERATION OF VOTE ON HOUSE BILL NO. 1132.

Mr. WILLERT offered the following motion:

Moved by Mr. WILLERT, seconded by Mr. WONER, that House Bill No. 1132, file folio 3161, entitled

An Act reorganizing the Department of State Police creating therein a Bureau of Fire Protection providing for a State Police force and defining the powers and duties of the same including the enforcement of laws relating to game fish forestry and water supply and certain other laws and including the collection of information useful for the detection of crime and the apprehension of criminals providing for the equipment maintenance and transportation of such police barracks and substations therefor and medical attention for men injured and funeral expenses to men killed in line of duty and prescribing penalties

which was defeated on final passage Monday evening, April 28, 1919, be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?"

It was agreed to.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?"

Mr. WHITEMAN. Mr. Speaker, are remarks in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. They are.

Mr. WHITEMAN. I heartily favor, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the passing of this bill. If you will bear with me for just a moment, I want to give to you just one of the many reasons which I might present.

This afternoon, from my home town, there was borne in a white casket, across the hills to a lonely cemetery in the valley, the broken and bruised and mutilated body of a young school teacher, a girl nineteen years of age, as fragile as a china cup, a girl so innocent, so retired, so modest that the blood was wont to flush to her face even when merely and casually addressed by a stranger. Last Monday afternoon this young teacher, this girl nineteen years of age, disappeared as she was on her way home from a lonely school house in a neighboring township. As it afterwards developed, she was abducted in broad daylight; her wrists were bound together by a leather thong; her head was bruised by a blow from a big club; she was carried into an abandoned log house; she was mistreated in the course of a desperate struggle in an unspeakable way; she then was carried to an abandoned shanty, an out house, and thrown in head first; and when her body still quivered with the breath of life a bullet was sent crashing into her brain; and thus they found her last Saturday, with a leather thong still about her wrist, her hair down and a bullet hole in the back of her head.

Gentlemen of this House, we people of Westmoreland County are looking to the State Police to apprehend and find who did this deed, this deed which was committed in a lonely part of a township not provided either with police or detectives. We, of Westmoreland County, this very night are placing our chief dependence upon the State Constabulary, the State Constabulary whose record is filled with the successful solution of many crimes, the State Constabulary, gentlemen of this House, whose personnel includes men experienced in the tracking of criminals, and men who, when once they take the trail, never give up until they have run the quarry to earth. Gentlemen of this House, I say to you that if this bill carried an appropriation of five million dollars, still I would be with it this night if only for the single fact that we, the people of Westmoreland County, have available the State Constabulary in helping to run down the perpetrator of the foul deed which I have recited to you.

Mr. DITHRICH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: I would like to say, chiefly to the new members in the House, that two years ago, when a similar bill was under consideration, I voted against it. I was impressed by the literature that was sent out by labor organizations—no, not by labor organizations but by a few bad leaders of labor organizations—and as I represented a district which is very largely industrial I felt that the sentiment of the voters of my district was opposed to that bill and I voted against it. When I went home and interviewed those men, singly and in groups, I found that they were not opposed to it; they were in favor of it.

We are confronted tonight with the same question. Furthermore, we passed here in this House a bill abolishing the Fire Marshal's office. This bill creates a Bureau of Fire Protection within the State Police. It also takes over the duties of the fish and game wardens. The increase is absolutely necessary, and I appeal to you men, do not be impressed by these last minute attacks on this bill. I believe that the sentiments of the people of the State, the vast majority of the people of the State, are strongly in favor of the bill. I feel that the sentiments of the voters in my district are in favor of it; but even if I had any doubt of it, in the face of the things that have occurred in the last few days, I would still vote for it because I say to you that the true representative is not the cringing, fawning tool that allows himself to be brow-beaten by some biased people but the man who stands for what he believes is right; not the man who is guided by every change of sentiment, every puff of wind or notion; but the man who makes up his mind what is right and stands fairly and squarely for it and votes accordingly.

Now gentlemen, it is very clear that the vast majority of our people recognize the great work of our State Constabulary which has a national reputation. Other States in the Union are forming State Constabularies and they are all being modeled on the plan of ours. I say that the eyes of the people of the State are upon the House of Representatives tonight. In the face of the outrages which have just been attempted, and very fortunately frustrated, the people of this State demand that you increase the force and give to the Governor and the other law officers of this State sufficient power to cope with the people who are the perpetrators. In my mind, it is clear that the issue tonight is in favor of upholding law and order and protecting life and property, and who is opposed to that? and you will be compelled to give your vote in favor of this measure tonight when you answer that issue aright.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is indeed not a surprise to me, that once a bill has been defeated, you again attempt to pass it. This bill was overwhelmingly defeated a week ago this evening, and I say to you, that labor stands against this bill this evening just as it stood against it a week ago. Statements were made on the floor of this House by the sponsor of the bill, that the district he represented, which was the largest organized district in this State, was not opposed to this bill. Fifteen local unions in that district met last Saturday evening and came out in opposition to the bill. If we are going to use the arguments of broken heads here to-night, we also would have a long story to tell. History will tell you that many of the wage-earners themselves have suffered broken heads in the past. We are not here to-night speaking against law and order, as some would like to interpret it, for labor organizations,—the American Federation of Labor,—have always stood for law and order, and I dare anyone in this House to contradict me. Let me tell you, men, that the question before you to-night is not what good they are or how bad they are. Since 1905, as I said before, you have continually tried to increase the State Police. In 1911 you tried, and it was defeated 117 to 70. You were not satisfied that session and had it come up again, and it was defeated by 113 to 65. Again in 1913 you tried to increase the State constabulary, and it was defeated that year by 95 to 89. On the second battle, it was a tie vote, 86 against 86. In 1915, again this question came before you. At that time it got 61 votes, with 125 against it. They were not satisfied that time with the defeat, and it came back again, receiving 51 for and 77 against. In 1917 the same proposition came before you. Of course, then we were

in war, and the State Militia had been called to the front. Every argument presented upon the floor in favor of this bill was clothed in the Stars and Stripes.

Now the arguments are, if rumors are correct, that you are trying to place the blame on labor, and trying to class every labor organization as Bolsheviks, and I want to say to you, the labor organizations are going to resent these statements that are being circulated through this House. I want to say to you that I have been as good a law-abiding citizen as any man. I have opposed the I. W. W. and anarchistic organizations; just as much as any one of the State police has ever opposed them. The organizations that we represent have always been against these people. My friends, I do not see the necessity of increasing the State police at this time. As I said here a week ago, we are not going to have any disorder now, because, as brother Jordan says, they have taken away our beer, and that used to get the blame for it a few years ago. All our jails will be empty, the same as in all of the other prohibition states, my friends. I want to say to you that in the increase of this State constabulary you take from the game wardens and the fish wardens and the fire marshals their power, and you place that in the hands of men who are not citizens of Pennsylvania, men who only have to pass a physical examination. I want to say to you, that the game wardens and the fish wardens and the fire marshals that are now serving, demand as much protection as any other class of citizens, and I do not believe in taking away the jobs of these men and placing them in the hands of men that do not have to be citizens of Pennsylvania. My friends, it is useless to talk at length upon this bill. You men have had sufficient time to consider it. Whatever has happened, has happened in the last week. We do not know what the orders are, but I want to say to you, that the rank and file at home do not ask you to receive orders at the eleventh hour to bring about the passage of this bill. They want you to consider it just the same as you did last Monday night. I would ask you again to defeat this bill this evening.

Mr. JAMES A. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Allegheny (Mr. Dithrich), has referred to this bill as having a resemblance to the bill which was passed by the General Assembly two years ago. It has this resemblance: They both apply to the state constabulary. There is this difference, however, that the present bill does not change it much. The bill of 1917 merely raised the salaries of the superintendent, assistant superintendents and some of the other officials. This bill, however, gentlemen, performs a very, to me, small need. It increases the four troops of the constabulary now existing in this State to five troops. Under the law as it now stands, there shall be one captain, one lieutenant, one first-sergeant, four second-sergeants, eight corporals and sixty-seven men to a troop, making a total of eighty-three men in each troop. There were four troops, making a total of three hundred and twenty-eight men. Under the present bill there is one captain, one lieutenant, one first-sergeant, five second-sergeants, ten corporals and sixty-five men to a troop, making a total of eighty-three men to each troop. There are five troops, amounting in all to four hundred and fifteen men. So this bill increases the number of men in the entire State to eighty-seven. It also increases the salaries of the men, and I do not think there is any man in this House who is not willing to say that these men are deserving of an increase of salary, and in fact, gentlemen, the best proof that I have of the correctness of my statement lies in the statement of the gentleman from Lackawanna (Mr. Fowler). When he spoke on April 28th, he said this: "I say the fellow that is in the saddle ought to have got the increase." Now he opposed the Act in 1917 because it applied to that absolute patriot and leader, Captain Groome, who had an offer, as you remember, from New York to go there and receive a greater salary in erecting State troops of this character in New York. But he stayed in Pennsylvania, and he took this work up and stood by it until we went to war with the Teutonic people, and then he went across and was over there until very recently, as the head of the Military Police of the American Army. Now he is back in this country, and he expects to return to his duty. But the argument the gentleman from Lackawanna (Mr. Fowler) used in opposing the bill last session, and which he submits now, is that the men should have received the increase.

The gentleman from Lackawanna (Mr. Fowler) has referred to the fact that labor has been patriotic. There is no doubt about that, and the man who says labor has not been patriotic is a fool, and not only that but he slanders the cause of union labor in this country, and particularly in this State. What the gentleman from Lackawanna (Mr. Fowler) said on the twentieth of April with reference to labor is true, absolutely true. Union labor has been with the government from start to finish during the war, and it is not with union labor, not by any means, that we find fault; for it has stood in favor of law and order. But, gentlemen, even as labor has given its young men to the support of the government, even as its young men entered into the lists and went abroad to fight for our Nation, and some of them to their eternal resting place on the other shore, so may it be said that the State Constabulary, many of them, entered the army and fought for their country. So that the principle that applies to labor may also apply to them, and in proportion to their size the sacrifice was equal. But those boys are now coming home, and while they were here they did mighty efficient work. It is the record of the State Constabulary that they obtain seventy per cent. convictions in every case they go into, and I do not believe any man would dare say to this House that a constabulary officer has ever been known to commit perjury. Those men are too proud of their body, and too proud of their record, to stand for anything like perjury. Furthermore they refuse to make a charge until they are sure they can prove it. That is the type of men that constitutes the State Constabulary. It is not politics nor mere influence. In fact, the surest way to see a man turned down is to have the political leaders make an appeal for him; for they are chosen for their worth, and most of them are veterans of the Spanish-American War, and discharged soldiers of the United States regular service. Several of them are back in their old positions and giving the same character of service and displaying the same worth they did on the other side. But most of all, the reason for the bill does not lie with union labor. Union labor is opposed to Bolshevism, and not a man who is in favor of union labor will stand for it. But there have crept into the labor unions men who will not and cannot and won't submit to the control of their leaders, fly-by-nights, if you please. But labor will not stand for that which is unpatriotic. These men cause the trouble and then sneak out. It is this which brings disgrace to the body with which they are connected. They are a crowd that do not belong to the union. They come in from other States. They fly in the face of providence and disseminate the doctrine of hate, rapine and murder. The State Constabulary is needed to protect the State against such men. I noted in the speech of the gentleman from Lackawanna (Mr. Fowler) last week that he made reference to the Sedition Bill and the bill which provides for this extra group of police. My friend from Lackawanna is crossing a bridge before he comes to it, because there is no provision in the Sedition Bill or in any other bill such as he refers to, and there is no telling what may become of either of the bills. Therefore this bill should be considered on its merits or demerits.

The State Constabulary has brought fame to our State, and the greatest compliment that can be paid has been that it has been passed upon by other states, the compliment of imitation. It has been imitated in other states, and it will not be long before every state in the Union that can afford it will have a State Constabulary. The bill is full of merit. All it does is to raise the State Constabulary in Pennsylvania eighty-seven men; and I want to say to you that we will guarantee the safety of our wives, the safety of our children and the safety of the people if this bill is passed. I am sure that union labor, real union labor, will have no complaint against any member of the State Constabulary of Pennsylvania, as it will not do otherwise than keep, maintain and support the laws of Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHN T. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: This bill has been given some serious consideration by the members of this House. When it was brought before the attention of the House just the other evening it was defeated. Many have gone back to their homes, many have looked into its merits, many have considered it from every angle; and I feel confident tonight as I stand before you that this bill will receive an almost unanimous vote.

Why do I make that assertion? I may give three reasons. First, because of what has taken place throughout the length and breadth of this Commonwealth since we last sat here in this chamber. I want to say, gentlemen, that I am a friend of labor. I have talked to many men who are faithful to the organizations which they represent. Particularly have I talked with individuals in my own particular county. Last Thursday when, not organized labor, nor the United Mine Workers of America, nor the men who stand for organized labor in all its meaning and force, but men who disregard law and order and society and the happiness and prosperity of our womanhood and manhood in this Commonwealth, went forth, or endeavored to go forth, and parade in the various sections of Indiana County to show the people of Indiana County that they are willing to take the law in their own hands, and to demonstrate throughout the length and breadth of our county that no law nor any force could keep them from thus parading and demonstrating and promulgating their ideas before the people. I want to say here tonight that if it had not been for the State Constabulary that were on the scene and on the job, I believe there would have been bloodshed in our county. But those men nipped it in the bud; those men were on the job; they did not mistreat a single individual who was a law-abiding citizen; they were kind and courteous to all who are true Americans. I want to ask the gentlemen of the House tonight what they think of these pictures and these books that were found on the persons of two of the individuals? These are the pictures that were taken from the persons of the individuals who desired to parade. I say to you, gentlemen, that there ought to be sufficient American ideas and ideals manifested through this House tonight to send broadcast throughout the length and breadth of this great Commonwealth, that this House of Representatives stand as unit against that kind of un-American idea and ideals and un-American principles in our nation. I want to say further that I believe, as my colleague, Mr. Whiteman from Westmoreland, has said, that our part of the State has indeed been aroused and I want to say further that I believe it is true that the efforts of this State Constabulary have been in our part of the State able to suppress a vast amount of crimes, that it is shameful to mention in a civilized country, and while these ideas are prevalent, being manifested through the minds and views of such individuals as have sent forth this literature, and I want to say that it is time that this great Commonwealth is safeguarding our homes, our wives, our children and our daughters, from the offenses that are being perpetrated in our Commonwealth today. I believe it is the patriotic duty of every member of this House tonight to go on record for the increase of eighty-seven more men on this force of individuals who will protect and who will uphold the dignity and safeguard all those in this great Commonwealth against those who desire to overthrow it and enter into the sacred realms of our homes and destroy our young womanhood and threaten to bring disorder upon this Commonwealth.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to interrogate the gentleman from Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Philadelphia (Mr. Walker) permit himself to be interrogated?

Mr. JAMES A. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, yes, sir.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask him what the bill in 1917 asked for?

Mr. JAMES A. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the bill in 1917 only asked for increased salaries of the superintendent and assistant superintendent and some others.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, the act of 1917 was an act increasing the salaries of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent and a number of the State Police, a number of officers and enlisted men, being 112 men on the list in that session. I will state further, in answer to Mr. Walker, that at no time have I opposed the increase of salary to the rank and file of the force and to-night I take the same stand that I took in 1917; and what I said in 1917 was, as I believed at that time, that the Superintendent of State Police should not receive as much salary for superintending 320 men as a Brigadier General in the United States Army. A brigadier general of the United

States Army was at that time paid a salary of \$6,000 a year, and I say, even today, that it is ridiculous to have an increase of the salary of the Superintendent of the State Police of this State from \$3,000 to \$6,000. In answer to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. John T. Davis), it is all right to come into this House and say there would have been bloodshed in Indiana on that occasion but if the information is correct I think that investigation should be made in Indiana County, and if they broke into that meeting, that that is a matter that should be investigated. I said in regard to Indiana County then and I say now, that I brought to the attention of the House that case and I took it before the Governor in regard to Indiana, and I made the same statement two years ago, that the tactics in use at that time in Indiana were dangerous and that there would be trouble later on in Indiana, and that trouble is this: That organized labor has been kicked out of Indiana every time it has made an attempt to go in there up to two years ago. I want to call your attention to the fact that Joseph Yannis, the vice president of the United Mine Workers of America and International President White, of the Mine Workers' Organization, and myself, were on a train at the same time going over to Pittsburgh, and Mr. Yannis went into Indiana there to see his boy, and the minute he arrived in there he was packed into the company store and thereafter kicked out of town, and he was not a Bolshevik. I want to say that labor will go on and investigate some of the conditions that are prevailing in Indiana County. There are some men who may have been radical, and some men may have made mistakes, as men make in this House, just as well as in Indiana. Gentlemen, I want to say to you, as I said in 1917, which is just what I then said, and I say it again in this session, that I have not opposed any salary to be paid to men who are in the rank and file, who are in the saddle, and I believe that if they are worth anything, they are worth a decent living wage and that they should be paid a higher salary, and if they are not paid that, they should be. We can have a better class of men by paying better wages, but my objection to the bill now as in 1917 is that it is not necessary to increase the salaries of the police force at this time. If you only treat organized labor in Indiana and in other counties fairly, there is nothing further required. I went into the city of Johnstown some time ago, and I was to speak there at a mass meeting. Objections had been sent out by one of the organized companies there that the representatives of the American Federation of Labor organizations should be put out of town and the mayor refused to recognize it. I have a father who was a superintendent for that same company and after I made that speech in the city of Johnstown, he was discharged. I say to you men, in answer to the gentleman from Philadelphia, that it is true that the sedition bill was a dovetail bill to the State Constabulary, and also the Eyre bill, No. 381, which creates a State Detective Agency and pits organized men, against one another. Why did I make that statement in regard to those bills the following day in this House of Representatives, because the representatives of labor were well represented themselves in this House and they convinced the Attorney General that that bill was a bad bill, and according to that, the Attorney General Schaffer made a remark to that effect and struck out one of the teeth in that bill and said to labor that he believed himself that it was a bad bill. I want to say to you men that the American Federation of Labor has at all times stood for law and order. I battled the I. W. W., when Joe Ettor was out there at that time in that locality, and the State Police could not control them under the leadership of Joe Ettor. At that time there was none of the organizers of the Federation of Labor of the United Mine Workers that refused to come over and volunteer their services to break up the I. W. W. workers. We are not preaching against them as individuals because if I was to go into that history I could tell you a good many tales.

Let us get down to the real issue and vote this down. The game warden of today is just as much entitled to hold his job, the fish warden is just as much entitled to hold his job, and the State Fire Marshal is just as much entitled to hold his job as you men have a right to take it away from him. I say you have not the right. You are discriminating against one class of people to hand it over to another class of people for a sinister purpose, perhaps.

Mr. RAMSEY. Mr. Speaker, in the first speech of the gentleman from Lackawanna (Mr. Fowler) he made this very truthful statement: "It is useless to talk at length on this bill." I hesitate, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, to occupy more time on this question except to call your attention to this fact: Two years ago, when this General Assembly considered the increase of the State police, many of the members then petitioned those in charge of the measure to double the size of the State Police. And why did they petition those in charge? Because it was demonstrated two years ago that there were not enough State Police in Pennsylvania. The Governor of this Commonwealth was then a Senator. He knew of the demands that were made upon the Commonwealth for protection such as our friend from Westmoreland has brought here tonight, he knew the increasing necessity for a police force under the control of the Governor of this Commonwealth. For the two years since then he has known it, and now he comes before the General Assembly, as the Executive of this Commonwealth, just as your mayor of a city would go before council, just as the burgess of a borough would go before council, when he felt the police force of that municipality was not sufficient to cope with the situation; and the Chief Executive comes here and asks you to increase this police force eighty some men, a small number when you consider the area which these men have to cover. Why, my friends, if they were of no more use in this State than to track down automobile thieves, we should give them that increase. (Applause). There is one of their functions.

Am I a friend of labor? I think I am, because I am a laboring man; and I want to say that on last Thursday night, when in the city of Chester—which I have the honor to represent—we felt there were to be serious outbreaks, the labor organizations tendered their services to our sheriff, and on that day there were more men working in the plants of our city than on any other day for months before. But that alone, my friends, don't convince me that the Governor of this Commonwealth should not have a few more State policemen. Why, if we were not emerging from war; if we were not in the midst of crimes of every character; still, my friends, there would be a need in the State of Pennsylvania, not as an enemy of organized labor, not that, but as the protectors of the citizens from crimes which organized labor has nothing at all to do with. These crimes that are happening now demand immediate attention, and I say to you men that if it were not last night, in the city of Chester, a bomb had not been hurled from a passing automobile, supposedly at a Polish church, if that had not occurred, still there is a demand in this State for extra policemen. These men are the police of Pennsylvania, and your Governor, after twenty-two years of service in the Senate of Pennsylvania, after he has watched these men in action, after he has known what a Commonwealth officer needs in Pennsylvania, after he has heard the appeals from all over Pennsylvania asking that he would give them more State Police to protect their avenues and their highways and their homes, he comes here to you, my friends, and he says, "Give me these paltry few more State Police," and you are going to answer, "I will." (Applause).

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House: Is there any need for this legislation? I am frank to say that so far as a very large majority of the people of this State are concerned; there is not, but, unfortunately, we have among us a very small majority who make it absolutely imperative that there should be. Yesterday morning I picked up an issue of a Philadelphia paper, and I read a glaring headline which said,—and the article was written by the worthy Samuel Gompers—"Russia is a torch of warning to the United States." Did I need to ask myself what Samuel Gompers meant? Do you need to ask yourselves tonight what Samuel Gompers meant when you come to this Assembly Hall and you can only get in at one entrance and the other two are barred to you? Do you need to ask yourselves what anyone means when he refers to the abnormal condition of society prevailing in this Commonwealth today? I sat on the floor of this House last Tuesday afternoon and I listened to a hearing, and I heard the Representatives of organized labor say, "We will assist you to put down these law-breakers;" and I want to say to organized labor that I appreciate that; every citizen of

this Commonwealth will appreciate their assistance, and I believe they meant it; and every citizen of this Commonwealth will appreciate the assistance of every other citizen of this Commonwealth; but, gentlemen, neither you, nor I, nor organized labor are charged with the responsibility of maintaining law and order in this Commonwealth.

That responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the Governor of this Commonwealth, and he comes to us and says, "There are calls from this quarter and calls from that neighborhood, and we do not have a sufficient number of men to send there." Eighty-seven additional men to patrol sixty-seven counties of this Commonwealth. Of course you are going to have them, gentlemen. I trust that the vote on this bill will be almost unanimous.

Mr. JOHN T. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the chance to take just a moment to make an explanation in defense of our county, Indiana. I want to say that I received this from the lips of our own burgess in the town of Indiana. Some three or four weeks ago there was a committee that visited him and asked for the privilege of parading on last Thursday. He granted that privilege, thinking that they represented the United Mine Workers, which privilege has never been denied them when they came and desired to parade. He had occasion to talk with a representative of that particular organization, and that representative said that it was not the United Mine Workers that desired to parade, and that they had absolutely nothing to do with it. Then an investigation was started and it was found that it was an organization that disregarded law and order, therefore, they were instructed not to parade; and that day, in all defiance of that instruction, they gathered in many parts of the county and endeavored to pull off their parade. It was absolutely necessary to have the State Constabulary there in our county, to keep down a riot that would undoubtedly have happened if the constabulary had not been present. I was desirous of giving this information to the House.

Mr. HELT. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief in what I say to you. I was sorry to hear several speakers intimate that labor did not understand its stand against legislation of this kind. I want you to understand that labor, in these days, knows what it has passed through in the past in getting what they are enjoying today. Do not forget that, and organized labor knows the possibilities of such legislation as this. I heard it stated last week and heard it again here tonight that labor possibly does not comprehend the intent of this bill. Is it not a possibility that the gentlemen who are sponsoring this bill or those who are behind the bill miscomprehend the need of this legislation? If half the effort was put forth and half the time were put forth in an effort to bring this State to a point where it would be a State worth while living in and if half the effort were put forth in behalf of labor, then you would not hear of these riots in Westmoreland and Chester. I heard a gentleman state that they would be glad to have the assistance of labor in suppressing riots. I will guarantee you that any locality in the State of Pennsylvania that will give labor half a chance to suppress riots of the Bolsheviks and the I. W. W. that we will do it for you, we will do it clean and honest and above board.

Mr. WHITEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add one word. The father of the girl whose terrible fate I recounted to you, is a man of small means, a working man, a man who could not afford to employ a private detective. Men, how can we vote against an organization whose men know neither rest nor sleep nor danger when there is a fiend to be run to work?

The SPEAKER. Before the Chair orders a roll call by the clerk, he would ask the members to answer to their names in a clear, audible and distinct tone. He would also ask the members to remain quiet, and would enjoin upon the visitors that they remain quiet while the roll is being called.

On the question recurring,  
Shall the bill pass finally?

Agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution, the yeas and nays were taken and were as follows, viz:

YEAS—131.

Alexander,	Curry, R.,	Harvey,	Powell,
Armstrong,	Davis, J. T.,	Heffernan,	Quigley,
Aron,	Davis, W.,	Hess,	Ramsey,
Baldi,	Dawson,	Heyburn,	Reber, C. A.,
Barnhart,	Day,	Hickernell,	Reber, H. F.,
Bechtold,	Dewey,	Hoffman,	Ruddy,
Beckley,	Diehm,	Hollingsworth,	Scott,
Benchoff,	Di Lemmo,	Hough,	Shaffer,
Bennett,	Dilsheimer,	Jennings,	Shunk,
Bigler,	Dithrich,	Jones,	Simpson,
Blanck,	Drinkhouse,	Jordan,	Sinclair,
Bolard,	Dunn,	Kinsman,	Smith, E. R.,
Bower,	Ehrhardt,	Kooser,	Smith, F. L.,
Bowman,	Evans, J. T.,	Krause, W.,	Sowers,
Brady,	Finney,	Levis,	Sprwls,
Brooks,	Fitzgibbon,	MacCallum,	Stark,
Bucher,	Flynn,	Magill,	Statler,
Bungard,	Foster,	Mallery,	Sterling,
Campbell,	Fox, A. R. E.,	McKay,	Stott,
Catlin,	Fox, I. M.,	McVicar,	Ush,
Clutton,	Franklin,	Mehring,	Vickerman,
Coldsmith,	Gans,	Miller, A. D.,	Walker, G. T.,
Collier,	Glass,	Miller, D. I.,	Walker, J. A.,
Colville,	Golder,	Miller, D. D.,	Wallace, R. L.,
Comerer,	Goodnough,	Millin,	Wallace, W. T.,
Conner,	Graham,	Milner,	West,
Cook,	Griest,	Morgan,	Whiteman,
Cox,	Haines,	Neary,	Willert,
Crawford,	Haldeman,	North,	Woner,
Crockett,	Hamilton, J.,	Patterson,	Wood,
Crum,	Hamilton, W. J.,	Pidgeon,	Woodruff,
Curran,	Harer,	Pike,	Spangler,
Curry, A. E.,			Speaker.

NAYS—62.

Allum,	Horne,	Michel,	Snowden,
Baldrige,	Hutchison,	Miller, A. D.,	Snyder,
Bell,	Kantner,	Murphy,	Soffel,
Benninger,	Kennedy,	Norton,	Stadtlander,
Brendle,	Krause, T. S.,	Palmer,	Steedle,
Brislin,	Krugh,	Perry,	Sullivan,
Clements,	Lanius,	Phillips,	Todd,
Corbin,	Lauler,	Ringler,	Trach,
Davis, D. F.,	Mangan,	Rinn,	Wagner,
Donneley,	Marcus,	Robertson,	Wettach,
Evans, S. J.,	Marshall,	Rothenberger,	Williams,
Fowler,	Martin,	Sarig,	Willson,
Geary,	McCaig,	Schaeffer,	Wynne,
Griffith,	McCurdy,	Schilling,	Zanders,
Hampson,	McIntyre,	Shellenberger,	Zook,
Helt,	McKim,		

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative.  
 Ordered, That the Clerk present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

SENATE MESSAGE.

RESOLUTION CONCURRED IN BY SENATE.

The Clerk of the Senate being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the resolution from the House of Representatives as follows:

In the House of Representatives, May 5, 1919.  
 Resolved (if the Senate concur), That House Bill No. 362, entitled "An Act to amend clause twelve, section thirty-nine of an act approved the twenty-ninth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-four (Pamphlet Laws seventy-four), entitled 'An Act to provide for the incorporation and regulation of certain corporations,' be recalled from the Governor for the purpose of amendment.

SENATE MESSAGE.

RESOLUTION CONCURRED IN BY SENATE.

The Clerk of the Senate being introduced, informed that the Senate has concurred in the resolution from the House of Representatives as follows:

In the House of Representatives, May 5, 1919.  
 Resolved (if the Senate concur), That House Bill No. 792, file folio 1729, entitled "An Act to revise, amend and consolidate the law relating to fish in certain boundary lakes, bays and peninsular waters," be recalled from the Governor for the purpose of amendment.

SENATE MESSAGE.

FAVORING FEDERAL AID FOR HIGHWAYS.

The Clerk of the Senate being introduced, presented an extract from the Journal of the Senate, which was read as follows:

In the Senate, May 5, 1919.  
 Whereas, In the proper economic development of the resources of the various States of the Union, it is essential that a

connected system of main arteries of traffic between the States be evolved which will assist in the marketing and distribution of their products and commodities; and

Whereas, In order to develop such an interstate system, the Federal Government should establish a national highway system and make the necessary appropriations to carry the same into effect; and

Whereas, In the construction of a system of main arteries an opportunity will be offered to provide employment, during the period of adjustment of this nation, for unemployed labor and the heroes returning from France; now, therefore, be it

Resolved (If the House concurs), That the members of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby petition the Congress of the United States to establish a national system of highways and to cooperate with the State of the Union in carrying out plans for the development of such a system, together with the provisions of the present Federal Aid Act, or any amendment or amendments thereto;

Resolved, That the present appropriation for Federal Aid to the States be continued and increased, and the States urged to undertake comprehensive highway improvements to keep pace with the transportation needs of the nation.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Commonwealth forward a copy of this Resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and that a copy thereof be sent to each member of said bodies from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Ordered, That the Clerk present the same to the House of Representatives for its concurrence.

On the question,

Will the House concur in the resolution of the Senate?  
 It was concurred in.

Ordered, That the Clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER.

There is too much noise in the rear of the House. The visitors will have to remain quiet, otherwise they will be asked to leave the Hall.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNOR.

The Secretary to the Governor being introduced, presented a communication in writing from His Excellency the Governor, which was read as follows:

APPROVAL OF HOUSE BILLS NOS. 167, 222, 230 AND 234.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,  
 Executive Chamber, Harrisburg, May 2, 1919.  
 To the Honorable, the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

Gentlemen: I have the honor to inform you that I have this day approved and signed House Bill No. 167, entitled: "An Act to amend part of section one of an act approved the ninth day of April one thousand nine hundred and fifteen (Pamphlet Laws fifty-four) entitled "An Act to establish and regulate the fees to be charged and collected by sheriffs in counties of this Commonwealth having a population of not less than three hundred thousand nor more than one million five hundred thousand inhabitants as computed by the last preceding United States census the time and manner in which said fees shall be paid the publication and posting of said fees the delivery of an itemized receipt for official fees and legal costs received and repealing all laws general special or local or any parts thereof that are or may be inconsistent therewith" extending the provisions of said act to counties having a population of not less than two hundred thousand and not more than one million five hundred thousand inhabitants;"

Also House Bill No. 222, entitled

An Act to amend clause (a) section two of an act approved the seventh day of June one thousand nine hundred and seventeen (Pamphlet Laws three hundred and eighty-eight) entitled "An Act relating to the jurisdiction powers and procedure of the orphans' court and the court of common pleas as to sales mortgages conveyances on ground-rent leases extinguishment of ground-rents partitions exchange squaring and adjusting of lines between adjoining owners consolidation and combination of mining lands and the leasing thereof the joining by owners of undivided interests in making and taking conveyances in order to change the route or location of any right of way or passage over adjoining or other lands and the subdivision of premises so as to command the highest price or greatest rents and for such purpose the laying out or dedication of roads streets and alleys or the vacation of such as have not been accepted by the public authorities where the court shall be of opinion that such decree will be to the interest and advantage of all those interested and where the legal title is held by minors lunatics habitual drunkards or weak-minded persons, a married person whose spouse is a lunatic or has abandoned him or her for one year or has been absent and unheard of for seven years b, corporations having no capacity to convey or by an unincorporated association by any religious beneficial or charitable society or association incorporated or unincorporated and the title is subject to forfeiture if real estate is held in excess of the amount prescribed by its charter or by law by a corporation or individual or individuals and is subject to a trust of any description whatever by any person as to whom a presumption of death may have arisen or any in-