to show how far the conference committee has adopted what was originally the Senate provision or how far it has adopted something which was the House provision.

Mr. TILLMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Illinois that the usual course has been to number the amendments to any bill which the Senate has sent to the House of Representatives and to point out just what changes or substitutions have been made. If that were done in respect to this bill, we could very easily keep track of it.

Mr. CULOM. By the House.

Mr. LODGE. It is impossible to number the amendments, as the Senator from South Carolina suggests, as there was but one amendment, to strike out all after the House title, and the House conferees could do under that circumstance was to report back the amendment with amendments. There was no other way of doing it. We followed that method, which is the only one open to us. To number the Senate bill and there is no way of getting at the changes except by laying the Senate bill alongside the conference report and comparing them line by line.

Mr. BACON. Could that comparison, after it was made, be put in writing, so that it could be printed and brought to us?

Mr. LODGE. It is here on your desk. You can not do anything except to put the two bills together.

Mr. BACON. I am speaking of the comparison being put in writing. Take section 3 of the bill; if that is identical, it would be perfectly correct to say by marginal note "no change." Take section 4; if that has been stricken out and another substituted, it would be perfectly competent to put the stricken lines through Senate section No. 4, and to put adjacent thereto the House section No. 4. That is not the way the bill in its entirety as it left the Senate stricken through, and we have the bill in its entirety as it came back from the House put in italics, but there is nothing by which we can contrast one section with another.

Mr. LODGE. The great mass of the two bills is the same, and the great mass of the amendments are perfectly trivial amendments, chiefly verbal. The important amendments can be compared by any Senator by laying the Senate bill alongside the conference report. If we printed what the Senator from Georgia asks for, it would be simply printing the Senate bill alongside of the conference report. He would have to make the comparison just the same when they were printed together.

Mr. BACON. It would not be the same if each section which was not amended was so stated, and if each section which was amended should be expressed as amended and the amendment printed in full by the side of it, so that we could see what it is.

Mr. LODGE. There are a great mass of amendments. I am not sure that I understand just what kind of a reprint the Senator from Georgia wants; but if I do understand, it would be a very great labor to reprint all those small amendments; to take the Senate bill, compare it with the House bill, strike out each line that is not the same, mark each change, small and large, and then add the amendments made in the conference report, which are the only important ones.

Mr. BACON. Let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question. Amendments of both after practical results. The Senator says the amendments are of two classes: that there are some material amendments and some trivial ones, but there are very few material amendments and many trivial ones. Suppose the House, instead of sending us back an entire substitute which expressed all its changes, had taken up the Senate bill and had expressed each as a separate amendment, would it not have been perfectly practicable for the Senate to have printed its bill with the amendments as thus expressed by the House; and if so, is it not now practically?

Mr. LODGE. The Senate bill would have come back with the House amendments, but the House did not amend it in that way.

Mr. BACON. The Senator does not let me finish my question.

Mr. LODGE. I beg pardon. I thought the Senator had finished.

Mr. BACON. Is it not now equally practicable to take the Senate bill and show as to each provision in what way it has been amended by the House substitute? Then we could compare it with the Senate bill.

Mr. CULOM. Let me make an inquiry, to find out, if I can, what would satisfy the Senator. I hold in my hand a Senate bill with the amendments agreed to by the House incorporated in it. Subsequent to the conference we had, as the Senator from Massachusetts and I have both stated, to consider the substitute instead of the Senate bill as it would be amended if the substitute were all in. If that would be satisfactory to the Senator, I can prepare a Senate bill with every provision of the House bill as it passed the House in it. Would that satisfy him?