

up to the 1st of April, in carload lots, roll paper, f. o. b. at the mill. That did not touch the greatest part of the iniquities that they had been practicing; but let that go. They agreed to that, and agreed further—these five men, running five of those big companies—after the 1st day of April to submit to the very things as to which you are contending, and all the balance of you, how outrageous it would be; and those men themselves consented that this matter should be thereafter settled at the price stated by the Federal Trade Commission.

They have been given six months. They only met here yesterday—a matter to which the Senator from New Hampshire called my attention, and which I investigated last night. They were not ready. Six months was not nearly enough time. In spite of their statements prior to this that the products going into the manufacture of paper have not seriously increased in price, they now want until the 4th of February to ascertain what their property is worth.

If that is not fraud, what is it? They are making every day accounts to their own people, and they are writing off every year 15 per cent depreciation on the wear and tear of their machinery, and yet, while they have had six months, they want three months more, until the 4th of next February, to make a showing as to what their property is worth and what it costs them to make paper. You know and I know and every other man knows that those great business concerns know to the fraction of an ounce what a ton of paper costs them. They know.

If that were all there were in it, there might be nothing left in the bill; but under these agreements that they have made any one of them can still make a trade with a publisher for the small cut paper going to the country press at any prices they please. They ought to be allowed 10 per cent for handling it; the mill ought to be allowed a fair profit for making it; and that is the whole purpose of this resolution, and the whole purpose of the Trade Commission and every man on it, and the whole purpose of these thousands, yes, thousands of editors of some of the biggest papers in the country, answering completely the Senator's argument as to censorship of the press. They have asked for this action in paper after paper. I have here on my desk two different publications that are absolutely filled with the names of the papers and the localities where the men live asking for relief from this aggression; and yet, my Lord! we stand here asking what paper has to do with the war! We lose sight of the inadvisability, in an emergency like this, of allowing the crippling of this great arm of the Government that is suffering in its support, but is none the less devoted to it, the great country press of this country that has assisted so materially in floating our liberty bonds. We stand by, for fear of interfering with legitimate business, and let this sort of a combination keep up, and keep up eternally!

Better a thousand times a censorship of the Government against every paper that did not say exactly what it pleased, as infamous as that would be, a thousand times better than to let a combination of self-seeking gentlemen get together and say, "We will rob every poor editor, every poor paper, and increase the price in spite of the great tax they are already paying in their postage. We will increase the price to these people and fill our own pockets still fuller."

Mr. President, unless some other Senator desires to speak, I would just as soon move that the Senate adjourn at this time.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator would better make that motion. Quite a number of Senators on this side of the Chamber intend to speak on the resolution, but they are not prepared to do so to-day. I think this is a good time to adjourn.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have no objection, unless there is some reason to have an executive session.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; there is not.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I know of no reason for an executive session. There has been some suggestion for the Senate not to sit to-morrow; but in explanation of a motion to adjourn until to-morrow I will say that, among other things, the conference report on the farm-loan bank bill will be taken up to-morrow, and more particularly I want to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] desires to submit some remarks to the Senate to-morrow. I take it that he will have something to say about his recent trip to the battle front in France, though he did not tell me the subject to which he expected to address himself; but he did say that if it would be agreeable he would like to address the Senate to-morrow.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think that could easily be accomplished before the expiration of the morning hour, and I would willingly join in the request that the Senator should have that right. I would not if I could stand in the way of the delivery of his speech.

Mr. MARTIN. I will say that I do not know that the Senator from Iowa would want to interfere with any other business. He just happened to mention to me the fact that he wished to

address the Senate to-morrow, if it would be agreeable to the Senate to hear him.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I was only going to make this suggestion: We have been in the habit recently, when a bill came here, of being told that it must be put through instantly, almost the very day it has been reported; and we have yielded to that because it was said that it was a crisis in our affairs. Now, this bill need not be hurried. If the Senator gets his bill through in three or four days he will be doing remarkably well. I had a bill here, relating to something that concerned me much more deeply than this concerns the Senator, and I did not get it through for three months.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Senator remembers well when he was one of the few that helped me try to get a bill through for over 20 years.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; I did, and we succeeded after a while.

What I was about to remark was that I think the Senator would better let the consideration of this measure go along deliberately. There are several Senators who desire to speak. Some of them are not prepared to speak to-day, and they may not be to-morrow, but I feel sure that the Senator will get a vote on this bill in a few days. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator. The only fear I have about it is that matters of greater importance, in the view of the Senate, will probably be intruded, and the bill will go over for weeks and weeks at a time.

Mr. GALLINGER. There is nothing in sight.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Whatever I have asked about the consideration of the bill, I confess has been largely personal. I would not permit that to prevent the proper consideration of the bill and whatever debate on it Senators really want to make; but I am extremely anxious, largely on personal grounds, to see that it is not displaced as the unfinished business.

Mr. GALLINGER. We will try not to allow that to happen.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If that is not done, I am perfectly willing that it shall go over until to-morrow as the unfinished business.

Mr. MARTIN. It will, under the rules, take that course if the Senate adjourns. Therefore I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 10, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 9, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for the clear and cogent messages delivered by the Premier of Great Britain and the President of the United States as to the demands of the entente powers, their position, and desires for a world-wide peace, based on clear and God-like principles, for all the world. And we pray that these just and equitable principles may find a response in every true heart and become the basis of a world-wide conference among the leaders of all nations; that the terrible war may cease, and liberty, truth, justice, and righteousness be established in all the world, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3009. An act granting the consent of Congress to the P. M. C. Coal Co. to construct and maintain a bridge across Tug River, connecting Pike County, Ky., and Mingo County, W. Va.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3081. An act to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis within the States of Illinois and Missouri; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2812. An act to encourage and promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, and sodium on the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1917, the Senate passed the amendment to the Federal Constitution providing for nation-wide prohibition by a vote of 65 to 20. In the House, on December 17, 1917, the House passed the resolution by a vote of 282 to 128. The legislature of my State yesterday convened at 12 o'clock, and in the lower house of that body, by a vote of 93 to 3, it ratified the constitutional prohibition amendment. [Applause.] The senate of that State on yesterday by a vote of 28 to 5 took like action. [Applause.] Thus Mississippi is the first State to ratify the constitutional prohibition amendment, and it is hoped that the action of that body, in a State that has seen the beneficent influence of prohibition for many years, will be followed by other States of the Union. [Applause.]

SERVICE FLAG IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives secure from the Members of the House of Representatives the record of the number of sons or brothers of Members in the military or naval service of the United States, and that he is instructed to procure a suitable service flag representing this number, or such number as may later join the colors, to be hung in the Hall of the House of Representatives, and that credit on the flag shall also be given for the four Members of the Sixty-fifth Congress who have joined the colors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GORDON. I object, Mr. Speaker. I did not hear the resolution read. I will object to its consideration.

Mr. TREADWAY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution be read again for the benefit of the gentleman.

Mr. GORDON. All right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the resolution be read again. Is there objection to that?

There was no objection.

The resolution was again read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. LENROOT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts on what theory brothers of Members are included?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thought that there were Members of the House probably not old enough to have sons in the service, but who are greatly interested in the fact that they have younger brothers or older brothers who have joined the colors.

Mr. LENROOT. Generally, where service flags are used by members of families, brothers are not included.

Mr. TREADWAY. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the use of the service flag is pretty general. Organizations use them, and they are used to designate members of a family or members of a church. It has been very general, and I think properly so. It strikes me that the relationship of brothers and sons is sufficiently close to recognize them in a flag of this character.

Mr. LENROOT. My understanding was that service flags only included the members of the immediate family, and it seems to me that if brothers are to be included the force and significance of the service flag would largely be lost.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; unless the brothers were members of the family or the same household. I really think it would lessen the effect of it if it includes brothers in the form in which it is stated.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by some of the Members I ask unanimous consent that the word "brothers" may be stricken out.

Mr. CANNON. What are you going to do—if the gentleman will yield—about those Representatives who have no sons or brothers?

Mr. MADDEN. They may have sons-in-law.

Mr. CANNON. Some have no sons-in-law.

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

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. What is the plan of the War Department or of the Navy Department as to the use of the service flag?

Mr. TREADWAY. My only knowledge on that score is that gained from the service flag at the entrance of the War Department, showing the number of employees of the department that are now with the colors—a very large flag, as the gentleman probably knows.

Mr. GARD. Has there been any general rule adopted with regard to the service flag?

Mr. TREADWAY. Not to my knowledge, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a matter upon which some of us have had no thought before. It occurs to me that the gentleman ought to consider very carefully just who should be represented. I really have some question as to whether a service flag hung in the Hall of the House of Representatives should contain stars indicating other than Members of the House of Representatives and probably employees of the House of Representatives who have gone, and that it ought not to go to the extent of including members of families. Those are represented in the homes of Members by the service flags there. I suggest that to the gentleman's consideration. With the spirit and purpose which the gentleman has in mind, of course, I am sure we are all in harmony, but I venture to suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw the resolution for the present.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am willing to leave it temporarily.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Leave it temporarily, and let us discuss that a little and see just what form it should take.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be allowed to lie on the table temporarily, to be brought up later.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. MOON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] objects.

Mr. TREADWAY. What is the nature of the objection?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts requested that his resolution lie on the table temporarily, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] objected. The gentleman from Massachusetts can withdraw his resolution without asking anybody's consent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is entirely agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think it ought to be considered by the committee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to suggest to my colleague from Massachusetts that, as I understand it, there is now no officially recognized service flag. There happens to be pending before this House, as I understand it, a resolution or bill, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS], to have Congress provide a design for a service flag, and I would suggest that, rather than have the resolution referred to the Military Affairs Committee, my colleague from Massachusetts withdraw it until action is had upon the resolution of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to call the attention of the House for just a moment to the situation with reference to this service flag. The service flag that is in general use throughout the Nation has been patented by an Army officer, Capt. R. L. Queisser, of Cleveland, Ohio, who is charging for the use of this flag a royalty of 5 and 10 per cent of the wholesale price. This Army officer has pretended to assign this patent to what is known as the Service Flag Co., of Cleveland, Ohio. The stationery of that company has but one name on it, and that is the name of the president, who, by the way, is the officer who patented the flag. It is merely a pretended assignment for the reason that the patentee and the company are one and the same person. I think there should be something in our connection with this war so altogether worthy that the profiteer should be made to keep his hands off of it. [Applause.] The mothers of America are hanging this flag in their windows as a sort of holy sacrament, as an expression of the pride that they feel in contributing a son to the service of the Republic. That anyone, especially an Army officer, should exact from them a royalty is nothing short of contemptible. I have pending before the Judiciary Committee a resolution calling for the adoption of a service flag which shall be known as the national service flag, upon which no patent shall be granted. I would not like to see this House indicate its pride in the Members who have gone to the service by hanging any flag upon these walls upon which we have to pay a royalty before we may use it. [Applause.] I would like to see this resolution withdrawn until the Judiciary Committee can report in proper form some legislation, either by resolution

or such amendment as may suit its pleasure, looking to the adoption of some design as a national service flag which the homes of America may use without charge, because I am tired of seeing the devotion and the patriotism of the parents of this Nation coined into money for the benefit of the profiteer. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has offered a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes, to give some information that may be of value to the House concerning the patent upon this flag.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the question. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] moves that this resolution be referred to the Military Affairs Committee. How much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin ask for?

Mr. STAFFORD. Three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, last November my attention was called to the fact that this captain in the Army to whom the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] refers, and who has been given considerable prominence in this House by a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] to provide \$50,000 for the purchase of this service design to be displayed in the homes of families whose sons have enlisted under the colors, had begun proceedings against manufacturers of these generally used service flags. I received the information from a patent attorney who was representing some of these manufacturers who had manufactured flags without authority from the inventor of the design. He advised me that the head of the division of designs in the Patent Office had made a finding adverse to the granting of the patent for the design, but that in his absence on a vacation some subordinate or other official had authorized the patent. This patent attorney is contesting the position of this Army officer who is claiming 5 per cent royalty on all flags manufactured before the issuance of the design patent, and 10 per cent royalty, 5 per cent for himself and 5 per cent for the Red Cross, on all flags manufactured thereafter. It is a question that is going to be contested, because many manufacturers are being besieged with claims by this person who has obtained this design patent really with the disapproval of the head of the Design Division that had it in charge.

True, he has a patent; but I approve the position taken by the gentleman from Nebraska that we should not go ahead and grant authorization by congressional action of a design which the claimed originator is using for collecting money from innocent users.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee to refer the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the motion so as to refer it to the Committee on the Judiciary, that already has the other resolution.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I hardly think it should go to the Committee in the Judiciary. The matter that the gentleman from Nebraska has before him is the general proposition, and this is a special one relative solely to this organization. As far as I am concerned, I should be perfectly willing to have it await in the Committee on Military Affairs until action is taken in the Judiciary Committee on the gentleman's previous resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. My point of order is that permission has not been secured to consider the resolution, and therefore the motion to refer it is not in order.

Mr. TREADWAY. The question was put by the Speaker as to whether there was objection, and there was none.

Mr. GARD. Would not it solve all the difficulty if the gentleman from Massachusetts would withdraw the resolution?

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, we have already taken too much time on a matter that I thought would not take any time, and I withdraw the resolution for the present.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution extending until January 1, 1919, the effective date of section 10 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority of the Committee on Woman Suffrage may file minority views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to file minority views on the woman suffrage resolution. In what time?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Instantly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to file minority views on the woman suffrage resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PAIRS.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a statement by one of the pair clerks of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to print in the Record a statement from one of the pair clerks of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take occasion to state that the House has absolutely nothing to do with pairs. It has gone as far as to allow them to be made a matter of record, but it is a private transaction. A good many Members think that the House has something to do with it, but it has not. If anybody wishes to know all about pairs, let him get Benton's "Thirty Years in the United States Senate" and see what he had to say about it when it was first begun.

The statement is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES UNITED STATES.

Washington, D. C., January 8, 1918.

MESSRS. THOMAS L. BLANTON, M. C., and T. A. CHANDLER, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIRS: On day before yesterday you requested me, as pair clerk of the House of Representatives, to make you a statement in writing as to the facts concerning the pair made between you and Hon. JAMES C. WILSON, giving the reason why the pair was not observed and did not appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

About two weeks before the vote was taken on the constitutional amendment for national prohibition, Hon. THOMAS BLANTON, Member of Congress from the sixteenth Texas district, came to me and stated that he had a pair upon the votes to be taken upon the constitutional questions of national prohibition and woman suffrage. Mr. BLANTON stating that he was for both these propositions and that Mr. WILSON would be against both, and that they would secure some other Member who would vote as Mr. BLANTON would in the matter. (Pairs upon these constitutional questions are in the same proportion as the vote, and as it requires a two-thirds majority for legislation of this character, it would take two Members for either of these amendments to protect one Member voting against.) On the next day Mr. BLANTON came to me with Mr. T. A. CHANDLER, Member of Congress from Oklahoma, and handed to me a pair which was out of the ordinary for the reason that it was a typewritten agreement, with the names of Messrs. BLANTON and CHANDLER voting for the prohibition amendment and Mr. WILSON voting against the prohibition amendment inserted in the pair and duly signed by each of them, and I told them, as pair clerk, that the pair would go into the Record.

Two or three days before the vote was taken on the prohibition amendment Mr. WILSON came to me and said he had expected to leave the city, but that as he had not he desired to have the pair changed to some one else who would vote as he would in order that he might vote.

Now, pairs are simply agreements between Members of Congress, the idea being that one vote will offset the other, and should one or all Members concerned in a pair or an agreement made between Members be absent, these agreements and pairs are observed. After such an agreement is made it is never altered by the pair clerks, except by the consent or permission of those concerned.

Therefore, when Mr. WILSON requested the pair clerks to release him we had nothing to do with it, as the matter was between Messrs. BLANTON of Texas, CHANDLER of Oklahoma, and Mr. WILSON of Texas. I told Mr. WILSON that if he would communicate with Messrs. BLANTON and CHANDLER, and they would agree to do so, of course it would be all right; otherwise I would put the pair up for the Record.

In the meantime Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, the Democratic floor leader, handed me a telegram from Mr. BLANTON, which is as follows:

"Am making three speeches a day in my district, embracing 58 counties, in effort to wipe out all disloyalty and force absolute support behind Government. If Wilson of Texas will support prohibition amendment, then change my pair to benefit cause, or if necessary I will return immediately."

Mr. WILSON came back to see me and said so far as Mr. BLANTON was concerned he was willing to release him (Mr. WILSON) from the pair. Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, who represents the minority in the matter of pairs, who was present, asked Mr. WILSON how he expected to protect Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. WILSON said that he had no agreement with Mr. CHANDLER, and then we cited Mr. WILSON to the signed agreement, with all names filled in, and which is as follows:

"Mr. Speaker: We, the undersigned, have paired on the resolutions for the national prohibition amendment and the national woman suffrage amendment, THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas, and T. A. CHANDLER, of Oklahoma, each voting both for national prohibition and national woman suffrage and JAMES C. WILSON, of Texas, voting against both of these said resolutions, and we request that this agreement be printed in the Record.

(Signed)

"THOMAS L. BLANTON, of Texas.

"T. A. CHANDLER, of Ohio.

"JAMES C. WILSON." (Name later erased.)

Mr. WILSON then said that he intended to vote anyway. I went to Mr. FERRIS, of Oklahoma, and although it was late we made an effort to communicate with Mr. CHANDLER as to whether he wanted to hold

Mr. WILSON to the pair, as it was my plain duty as pair clerk to have the pair as made announced for printing in the Record. Mr. WILSON came to the pair clerk's desk again, and with him was Mr. MORGAN, of Oklahoma, who stated that he was not willing to state whether or not Mr. CHANDLER would be willing to release Mr. WILSON from the pair, after the matter had been explained to him. Mr. WILSON then left and returned after a few minutes and said that he was going to vote and asked to see the signed pair, which he took and said as he intended to vote, would not have his name on it, and then erased his name from the agreement, which he had, according to his own statement, signed.

Mr. BLANTON's telegram released Mr. WILSON from the pair, provided he intended to vote for the prohibition amendment, and on the final vote he voted against the amendment, so that he had no release from Mr. BLANTON and did not claim to have any from Mr. CHANDLER. We, the pair clerks, could not put the pair into the Record because Mr. WILSON had erased his name and there was nothing to hold him to the agreement, as he had announced his intention of voting.

This is how the matter happened, and no one regrets as much as do the pair clerks that you both were left unprotected on the vote, as we knew when you left the city it was with the understanding that you would be taken care of.

With highest personal regard, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

W. E. SMALL, JR.,

Pair Clerk, House of Representatives.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a speech made by my colleague from New York [Mr. HICKS] on his observations on the battle front in Europe.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS] on his observations on the battle front in Europe. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] is ill, and I ask unanimous consent that he be excused for 10 days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks for the leave of absence for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PORTER] for 10 days. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take occasion to state that in such cases as this if the Member will give the Clerk a slip making the request they can all be attended to at once without waste of time. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the Clerk will call the first committee.

FUEL STORAGE YARD IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The Clerk proceeded to call the committees, and when the Committee on Mines and Mining was reached.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House joint resolution 23, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to make an investigation and report upon the advisability of establishing and maintaining Government fuel yard or yards in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 23.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be prepared by the Director of the Bureau of Mines plans and specifications, together with report showing the approximate cost of the establishment of a fuel-storage yard or yards and necessary handling and distributing equipment in the District of Columbia, for the storage of fuel for the use of and for delivery to all executive departments and independent establishments in the District of Columbia and vicinity, which plans and specifications and estimates of cost, together with a report upon the advisability of establishing, maintaining, and operating such a yard or yards and equipment, and the feasibility of consolidating all matters relating to the purchase and supply of fuel for the use of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia and vicinity, shall be submitted to Congress on the first Monday in December, 1917, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is for the purpose of directing the Bureau of Mines and Mining to prepare plans and select a location for the establishment of a Government fuel yard in the District of Columbia to supply the executive departments and independent establishments within the District of Columbia, and those within the vicinity of the District of Columbia. I do not recall how many there are but the workhouse at Occoquan is outside and the fuel is supplied to it by the Government.

Last summer one department of the Government secured its own coal, buying some 15,000 tons, securing a truck for the purpose of delivering it, and secured its coal for 76 cents less a ton than it could have been bought from the dealers or by bids. There is used, or was previous to the war, about 225,000 tons per year, so at this rate in normal times the saving in the cost of coal for the District of Columbia for Government use would amount to quite a considerable sum of money and would also insure a supply to be purchased at a time when coal could be easily secured.

The Government now gets its coal by bids. The yards of the District do not have sufficient capacity for storing coal, and they

do not have the equipment that is necessary for handling it; and it is believed by the Committee on Mines and Mining that the passage of such a resolution looking to the establishment of a yard for the purpose of supplying the Government would be not only an economical transaction but would result in securing an adequate supply for the Government.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. In what manner has the coal been purchased for the Government heretofore?

Mr. FOSTER. By bids from local dealers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWELL. Retailers?

Mr. FOSTER. Wholesalers and retailers. I think the coal which supplies the Capitol is purchased direct from the mines.

Mr. DOWELL. Has it not been possible to purchase all of it at the mines?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; but it has not always been done.

Mr. DOWELL. It has all been purchased from the retail dealers.

Mr. FOSTER. As I say, so far as I know except for the Capitol.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield to me five minutes?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Permit me to say that this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Mines and Mining after hearing statements from those who knew something about it, and we believe that the establishment of this yard would be of great value.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice that the report of the committee says that a saving of 76 cents a ton has been made by one department of the Government because it has been able to handle and deliver its own coal supply. How many hundred thousand tons of coal do the departments use?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not give the gentleman the information since all these new places have been opened up, but previous to the war it was about 225,000 tons.

Mr. MADDEN. So that would be about \$2 a ton for the year, if we spend \$400,000 for a yard. If the Government can save 76 cents a ton on coal at the yards, I would like to know why it does not undertake to save some for the people who pay the cost of running the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Illinois, and this year has demonstrated beyond doubt that in the District of Columbia, or in any other place throughout the United States, a yard which would sell to the people in the immediate vicinity at reasonable prices, without permitting them to get into the hands of speculators, would be a blessing.

Mr. MADDEN. But the trouble is that the price that is fixed by the Government for coal to be sold to private consumers is about 95 per cent more than the cost of producing the coal. Instead of trying to save to the private individual, who pays the cost of maintaining the Government, the Government itself has fixed a price beyond all reason, and the coal miners and the coal operators are making more money than they have ever made before and more than they ought to be permitted to make. It costs about \$1.01 a ton to mine coal in the bituminous coal fields of Illinois, put on the cars, and yet the operators are allowed to sell this coal for over \$2 a ton, which is a profit of 100 per cent.

Mr. GORDON. To sell it where?

Mr. MADDEN. At the mine, and at prices away above that. That is the minimum. There is no industry in the United States that ought to be permitted to get rich at the expense of the overburdened taxpayers in a time like this, and that is what the coal people are doing right now.

Mr. FOSTER. I agree with the gentleman, they ought not to be permitted to charge exorbitant prices, but they ought to be compelled to produce coal at a proper price, and this is one way to help start this thing. I hope my colleague will vote for such an arrangement. If the Government can not control the price, there is but one other thing to be done, and that is to take the coal mines of the country and operate them in the interest of the people of the country.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman agree with the statement of his colleague, Mr. MADDEN, that coal can be mined in Illinois for \$1.01 a ton?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe that.

Mr. MADDEN. The cost sheets of the mine show that.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman has not examined them lately, I am sure.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to ascertain, if I may, if it is the purpose to present legislation on this question to regulate and control the price of coal purchased by the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this provides that the Government shall purchase its own coal for use in the District.

Mr. DOWELL. Is there to be a provision to compel a department to purchase under this resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. There will be succeeding legislation. If they report the advisability of establishing a coal yard, then legislation will be necessary which would then, I suppose, provide that it should be done.

Mr. DOWELL. But, as I understand it, they are now purchasing at retail, each department paying the price it pleases and doing what it pleases. This will not correct that as I understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it will.

Mr. DOWELL. This resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DOWELL. It will be necessary to have further legislation?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. DOWELL. I am asking if it is the purpose to introduce further legislation to follow this resolution up, to fix the price?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. DOWELL. Is this price to be fixed on the same basis as the price generally to the public, or is it to be for what it is actually produced?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not answer the gentleman on that point.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GARD. The District of Columbia is a purely governmental reservation, intended for the purposes of the Government. Is it the idea of this committee that there would also be included in this resolution a report as to the advisability or propriety of purchasing coal for those who are residents of this governmental reservation?

Mr. FOSTER. This resolution itself does not provide for that.

Mr. GARD. I understand it does not; but is it in the mind of the committee that the resolution should be so extended as to include that?

Mr. FOSTER. I can say to the gentleman that in my own private opinion—and I am not speaking for the committee—I would welcome the time when opportunity may be afforded to sell to the people of the District of Columbia in an emergency such as we have had this winter.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I presume the object of the resolution is to take care of the coal that is needed by the Government, to establish a place and a means by which the Government can obtain its coal supply? Is not this resolution as it is drawn broader than that? Does it not occur to the gentleman from an inspection of the resolution that it has in mind a report as to plans for a general distribution of coal?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What does the language "independent establishments" mean?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a well-defined term. "Independent establishments" means such establishments of the Government as the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Federal Trade Commission—all of those establishments not under any executive department of the Government.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I am merely submitting my judgment of the matter, but I think it ought to be limited.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my colleague is wrong about that. I think that is well understood.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman have any objection to inserting before the word "establishments" the word "governmental," so as to correct any ambiguity that exists in the present phraseology? It would then read "independent governmental establishments." And that would remove all doubt as to the purpose of this depot.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not any objection to that if it makes it any plainer, but I do not think it needs it. It is very well defined.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield me, say, 10 minutes?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] 10 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Allow me to present a parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this parliamentary inquiry—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. So as to obtain a ruling from the Chair, if the gentleman from Illinois will also yield for that purpose. This is Calendar Wednesday. The rule under which we are proceeding provides that not more than two hours of general debate shall be permitted on any measure called up on Calendar Wednesday, and all debate must be confined to the subject matter of the bill. Heretofore, Mr. Speaker, on Calendar Wednesday, when bills on the House Calendar have been considered, it was the practice—though it has been questioned, but never presented to the Chair for a ruling—that there should be two hours of general debate, one hour in favor and, presumably, one hour opposed. In my acquaintance with the House I do not know of any general debate, as such, except on a bill which is on the Union Calendar, where the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, or a bill on the Private Calendar, where the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House. When this amendment was first proposed, the purpose of it was to curtail unlimited general debate on bills considered on Calendar Wednesday which were on the Union Calendar, so that the whole time of the proceedings could not be frittered away in general debate. Its very purpose was to try to expedite the consideration of the bills which were considered on Calendar Wednesday.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, though I do not profess to have gone into the details as much as I should have, that on a bill on the House Calendar there can not be any general debate; that the ordinary rules of the House should apply, namely, that the gentleman who has charge of the bill has an hour at his disposal, during which time he can move the previous question, and I wish to call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that whenever bills on the House Calendar have heretofore been considered on Calendar Wednesday, that the practice has been to grant an hour's time of debate in favor and an hour's time of debate in opposition before the gentleman having control of the bill would move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. What point of order does the gentleman make?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not making a point of order. I am making a parliamentary inquiry, whether in the consideration of this bill there is to be two hours of so-called general debate or whether under the rules of the House the gentleman from Illinois will control the time, so he can move the previous question at any time? Of course, Mr. Speaker, if the Speaker is not prepared to make a ruling that may be adhered to for all time on Calendar Wednesday, I do not wish to press the point, because I believe the gentleman from Illinois will yield time sufficient for the consideration of the bill. However, I thought it advisable to present this matter for the consideration of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would rather defer the matter until next Calendar Wednesday, because he can hunt it up and make a ruling that will stick.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used 12 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution, in my judgment, should not pass. We are in war time. As a war measure we have fuel inspectors, food inspectors, and very properly. As a war measure we have seized the railroads and all other means of transportation on land and on sea. Some time or other the war will end, and I do not believe that a joint resolution of this kind should pass looking toward the legislation that is proposed when the report is received. In the law as it is now it is the duty in normal times for the respective departments to advertise and give all the world in the production of coal a chance to bid and give bond and security for the fulfillment of the contract. So far as I know and believe this law in normal times has been sufficient to get the best service for the least money. This is looking to the establishment of a coal yard. If you have a coal yard and the necessary machinery and purchase the necessary plant and establish it for the purpose of buying coal in the amount of 250,000 tons when the total production of coal in the United States is—how much?

Mr. FOSTER. Last year 675,000,000 tons.

Mr. CANNON. Six hundred and seventy-five million tons. I think we had better proceed as we are now proceeding. It is true that with an exceptional season, under peculiar conditions that I can not now take time to discuss, with railroad transportation exceeding what it ever has been, with a larger gross and a

smaller net, we have a great slump in railway securities and a great destruction in the credit of railways so that the President has, in my judgment, properly as a war power, taken possession of the railroads and other means of transportation. There is an agitation. Why, gentlemen rush into print? We want to lay a foundation now, not to take care of the war, but we want to legislate for a time of peace. I think we had better let this war end and then, free from excitement, let us proceed to enact such legislation as is necessary.

Ah, do you know what a Government coal yard would cost? God knows; I do not know. I expect a quarter of a million. You have got to have your engines, you have got to have all your appointments; and my observation has been that the Government in the payment of its employees does not conduct a particularly economical service.

I want to say—although my friend knows that I am against the resolution, and he has kindly yielded me 10 minutes—he seems to be, from an intimation had, of the opinion that this thing might expand, and that the coal mines, if I understand him properly, in the United States could be permanently seized and that we might, at least in the District of Columbia and presumably elsewhere, proceed to operate mines and furnish 110,000,000 people with coal.

Maybe I am old-fashioned. I expect I am. But competition is the life of trade, and I pray God that in my time, at least, the Government will not, under the pretense or under the excitement of a war period lay the foundation, great or small, to care for the business of the country by the regulation of prices, and so forth, by governmental authority.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could always agree with my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] on public questions. Generally I do agree with him. But I see no real objection to the passage of this resolution in its present form. It contemplates an inquiry, and only an inquiry, as to what might be done for the Government only in the District of Columbia. Therefore it can hardly be said to be a Government ownership proposition in the general sense to which the gentleman from Illinois refers. It seems to me it might be a good thing to pass a resolution like this in the present war crisis. It is the war crisis that brought about the high price of coal and the confusion resulting in the taking over of the railroads by the President of the United States, a proposition upon which very few Members of this House would have agreed a year or two ago. But the crisis is here, and it is due to war conditions. And not only is the Government at a disadvantage, but the people of the District of Columbia are suffering. Indeed, if we pass a resolution of this kind and it should result in the erection of a coal-storage yard, it might be made sufficiently large and of such capacity that in another such crisis not only the Government might be served, but the people in distress over coal prices and coal scarcity due to war emergencies might also be served. It might be a good thing even to have the Secretary of the Interior inquire as to a coal bin of the capacity of 500,000 tons, if 250,000 tons is the amount necessary for the actual needs of the Government, and thus give the people who are without coal and freezing in their homes a chance to come in on equal terms with the Government. It would be the humane thing when the ordinary supply methods fail.

An inquiry like this may do some good.

There is ample proof to show at the present time that neither the Government nor the people have taken advantage of their opportunity to obtain coal in due season. They have utilized one method of transportation only. They have used the rails until they have stopped the cars and blocked the tracks, and yet other means of communication, like from Cumberland yonder to the District of Columbia, have gone to waste because of the prejudice against waterways and canals—a helpful and competitive or relief method of transportation.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. MEEKER. Can the gentleman give us a sort of a percentage or average of reduction in the cost of foods and fuels to the consumers since our bill passed?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There has been no reduction in the cost of consumption anywhere. The cost of consumption has steadily gone up, but it has gone up very largely by reason of the fact that the common carriers of the country have had their cars used as storage warehouses instead of distributing agencies which might operate for the relief of the people. And at great construction works now cars that ought to be used for carrying foodstuffs to the people are standing upon the tracks

idle, paying demurrage on cargoes of lumber and heavy freight that ought to have been discharged days and weeks ago.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman from Missouri asked you to state what reduction, if any, had resulted in prices by reason of the fuel and food control. Can the gentleman state in what manner prices were held down, and what increase there might have been if we had not had that control?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is aware of the fact that prices have not come down. If the gentleman wants concrete details, I will tell him. We are paying 85 cents a dozen at our house now, in the District of Columbia, for eggs.

Mr. SNYDER. Ninety cents a dozen.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And they are going to a dollar.

Mr. WINGO. If you had not had fuel and food control, prices might have gone a great deal higher. Of course, food control does not cause the hens to lay any more rapidly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Nor make the grass grow.

But before my time expires I want to say this, that our present stringency in the coal market in the District of Columbia is due to the fact, as it is in other large cities, that in times of plenty, when we had ample means of transportation, we did not avail ourselves of the supply or of the auxiliary means of transportation. So that when the freeze came and the crisis is on, stress naturally follows.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] if I can have more time?

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry, but I have promised to yield all of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Illinois, Mr. DENISON.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am unalterably opposed to this resolution for more than one reason. In the first place, it is an entering wedge to Government ownership, to which I have always been opposed.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] speaks about the high cost of living and says that eggs are 90 cents a dozen. Do not worry, my friend. The funny man down at the theater the other night said that a chicken was a valuable bird; you could eat it before or after it was hatched. [Laughter.] Do not worry about the price going up, because they are cold-storage eggs anyway.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is certainly consolation to the consumer, anyway.

Mr. FORDNEY. Well, it may develop into a chicken. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is plenty of time yet.

Mr. FORDNEY. The report of the committee says on page 2 that the Treasury Department last year sent to Congress an estimate of \$400,000 to equip those Government coal yards. Everybody knows that conditions are critical all over the country, in shipping especially. We do not give enough consideration to the causes of this condition. In the first place, the Congress of the United States is responsible for legislation that has crippled the railroads of the country. The Interstate Commerce Commission fixes the maximum rates the railroads can charge for hauling freight, and the politicians of Congress have fixed the minimum wage scale on railroads, and the two are so close together that it does not yield a reasonable profit to the railroads to supply the money necessary to purchase equipment, railroad cars, and motive power, and, consequently, with the greatly increased volume of business in this country caused by this war, there are not enough railroad cars and railroad engines in the country to carry the freight to its destination and to provide suitable terminals to take care of that freight.

And let me call your attention to this fact, gentlemen, that prior to the war our exports never exceeded two and one-half billion dollars in value in any one year, and yet in the year 1917 our exports reached the enormous sum of \$6,000,000,000. Prior to the war our imports never exceeded \$1,825,000,000 in any one year, but in 1917 they reached the enormous sum of \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. How do you get that figure as to imports? You do not get it from the amount of duties paid, do you?

Mr. FORDNEY. You get it from the volume of business reported by the Department of Commerce, my friend, showing the value of imports.

Mr. SLOAN. What does it show about the revenues arising from those enormous imports?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not wish to advert to that, but the ad valorem rate on our imports last year was 7 per cent—pretty close to free trade. And yet to-day our President recommends universal free trade to the whole world. The Kaiser may speak for the German people, or for himself, but the President does not speak for me when he says the people of the United States are in favor of free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am in favor of that label, "Made in America," not that "Made in Germany." [Applause.]

My friends, we are bordering near to Government ownership. I doubt seriously if the railroads of this country will ever return to private ownership again, and if not, it is a mighty serious question for the people of the United States.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The Government owns the different buildings and the different furnished rooms where the coal is consumed in the different departments in the District?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. What objection can the gentleman have to the Government owning a central storage plant and the machinery to handle it?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am not in favor of any kind of Government ownership, because the Government can not do at double the price the things that firms and individuals can do. The Government can go out and buy coal anywhere in the United States, and there is no law or regulation preventing it. Why, then, should we legislate on this matter?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is in favor of the Government owning the Panama Canal, is he not?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is a different proposition altogether.

Mr. COX. Yet the Government built it.

Mr. FORDNEY. That is a different proposition altogether, I will say to my friend.

Now, let me answer the gentleman. I made this statement on this floor before. For the year 1913 I have the cost of carrying freight on the railroads in all the principal countries of the world. You can obtain it. Let me call your attention to this fact, and see whether there is any recommendation in it for Government ownership. In the year 1913 the Government of Germany owned 95 per cent of all the railroads in Germany—the only country in the world owning that large percentage of the railroads.

The wage scale in Germany for that year was \$7.76 a week on her railroads, and the freight cost was 1.42 cents per ton per mile. The wage scale on the railroads in the United States was \$15.56 per week, or double the wage scale in Germany, and the freight carried was seventy-two one-hundredths of a cent per ton per mile. Our wage scale double that of Germany and our freight cost one-half that of Germany. Do you get any recommendation in favor of Government ownership in that, my friend? If so, tell me what it is.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Do you recognize that the cost of carriage is very much less where the average haul is two or three times as far?

Mr. FORDNEY. I recognize, my friend, that the population per square mile in Germany is five times that of the United States, and consequently their freight ought to be cheaper than ours. I know we have a longer haul in this country than they have in Germany. The center of population in the United States is just west of Indianapolis. The long haul is from the Pacific coast. The center of population of Germany is around a very thickly populated territory.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question along that line?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; but I have but a limited time.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman realize that the average cost per ton per mile in Germany is made up of high-class freight, and that in Germany the cheap freight goes by water?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; I do not recognize anything of the kind. I recognize that it is made up in Germany just as it is made up here, and not differently at all. I have not got time to discuss that question fully, but I can show it to you, my friend, if necessary.

Mr. HARDY. But that is the fact, nevertheless.

Mr. FORDNEY. There are difficulties to overcome. I am not criticizing the administration. I have stood loyally by this administration since the war began and I am going to con-

tinue to do so, and the administration will be entitled to any credit coming out of this war and should have any criticism that belongs to them. I know of a port on the Atlantic coast where to-day there are 800 carloads of hay piled up, and they will not unload it off the cars, because they are waiting for a ship to send that hay abroad, and there is no ship in sight. I know of a special delivery of anchors that were given the right of way as class A freight. Those anchors reached a shipyard on the Atlantic coast, and the keel for the ship on which those anchors are to be used has not yet been laid. Yet those cars must be utilized for shipping anchors, while you and I go cold for the want of coal and of cars in which to ship it. Now, that may be good management. I do not know who is to blame or whether anybody is to blame. I am not finding fault with that; but that is the condition, and that is why there is a shortage of coal cars. Last night I talked with a coal operator from West Virginia, who has at his mine 40,000 tons of coal in stock and can not get a car to ship a ton of it North or East or West, and he is here appealing to this board to get cars to ship his coal. Where are they? You and I who travel over the roads see upon the side tracks of the country thousands of cars which are loaded waiting for some opportunity to unload.

Who is to blame? I do not know. I do not blame anybody. It is a condition that is here, and a serious one, and since the Government has taken over the railroads, a very short time ago, I do not see any change. I hope it is for the better, and let us all hope and do all we can to better these conditions. But I do not believe you better the condition of the people of this country when you resort to Government ownership. In our recent tax bill we aimed to put the taxes upon the incomes of the country, the rich people of the country. I want to know whether or not you believe that is going to work out just as that law was intended? The other day, my good friends, I sent to a meat market in my home town for some steak and paid 60 cents a pound for choice cuts of beefsteak. Who pays for that beef? The consumer. Who pays \$7 or \$8 for a pair of shoes that you and I used to buy for \$4 or \$5? The consumer, every time. The manufacturer and the producer must add to their overhead cost and will do so, because every dollar of tax that you put upon an article produced in a factory will be added to the price of the article. You can not tax the rich men of this country without putting a proportionate burden upon the consumer. Every time you add to the cost of production you add to the cost to the consumer. You can not get away from that; and Government ownership, that costs more to do the thing than the individual or the set of individuals can do it for, will add to the burden upon the poor people of this country. Think that over. You can not get away from it my good friends, and the more carefully you study that question the more thoroughly you will be convinced that those conditions are as I have stated. I am opposed to Government ownership of anything—it makes no difference what—except some things that the individual can not do. Therefore, my friends, I hope this resolution will fail. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield me some time? I should like to have about 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. DENISON. How much time is there for general debate?

The SPEAKER. Two hours from the time it began. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has 23 minutes left of his hour. The gentleman asks to have his time extended 30 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that at the expiration of the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] or any other gentleman on this side in opposition would be entitled to recognition for one hour?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] represents the opposition or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand from the statement of the Speaker a little while ago that the parliamentary question raised will be deferred, and that during the consideration of this resolution we will proceed under the one-hour rule. I have yielded time to those opposed to the bill as well as to those favoring it. With that understanding I have yielded more time to those opposed to the bill than to those for it. Now I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended 30 minutes beyond the hour.

Mr. ROBBINS. It is two hours, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. No; an hour.

Mr. CANNON. And then there is another hour.

Mr. ROBBINS. Who has the other hour?

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not ask to have your time extended one hour, and then yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I will yield to my colleague the right to control some of the time.

The SPEAKER. To begin with, each side has an hour. That much is clear. The Speaker is not going to render any opinion on technical points until he has a chance to study them. Now the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks that his time be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I made that request thinking that the Speaker was not going to decide that question now.

The SPEAKER. I am not going to decide it, except this far, that after the gentleman from Illinois gets through with his hour the opposition will have an hour.

Mr. FOSTER. I have already yielded 20 minutes' time to the opposition, and if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] controls the time in opposition, I hope he will yield some time to those who favor the bill, and I think he will.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Why not have a gentleman's agreement that whoever is recognized in opposition will yield 20 minutes to my colleague [Mr. FOSTER]?

Mr. FOSTER. That is fair, and I withdraw my request for an extension of time.

Mr. DENISON. I am not opposed to the bill. I am in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The rule is explicit in one thing: That on Calendar Wednesday the general debate is limited to two hours, and that one hour of it shall be controlled by the people in favor of the bill and the other hour by those opposed. That much is clear.

Mr. DENISON. It is my intention to yield time to those who request it, whether they are for the bill or against it.

The SPEAKER. Does any gentleman want to control the hour in opposition to this bill?

Mr. CANNON. I will ask to control it, but I may or may not use it. If I do control it I will yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has been customary for the ranking member of the committee to control the time, even though he was not in favor of the bill, and to yield to those opposing it.

Mr. DENISON. I will yield to anyone who is against the proposition.

Mr. CANNON. Then that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. DENISON. I will yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman from Illinois has 43 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I listened a moment ago to the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORENEY], in which he gave what he said was a fair comparison between the freight rates on Government-owned railroads in Europe and the rates on privately-owned railroads in this country. And when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] interrupted him with questions suggesting that freight rates in Europe on Government-owned roads cover the transportation of more kinds of freight than do freight rates on our corporation-owned roads and cover the transportation also of some articles which are never carried as freight in this country, I heard the gentleman from Michigan deny specifically and absolutely what the gentleman from Texas intimated, and then follow that denial with the statement that freight rates are much lower here than on the Government-owned roads in Germany. Now, I am not going to speak in favor of Government ownership of railroads, but have taken the floor at this time merely to show that the gentleman from Michigan was, as I think, much mistaken in that denial and statement—a statement which is only a repetition of what he has heretofore said on the same subject in debates here.

I have in my hand a book written by Carl Vrooman, published by the Oxford University Press, London, and so forth, the preface bearing date "Oxford, July, 1910." The title of the volume is "American Railway Problems in the Light of European Experience, or Government Regulation versus Government Operation of Railways." Let us see what are here set forth as the facts about rates under Government ownership:

"Undoubtedly, the question which interests the general public most is that of rates. This is not the most important question connected with the railway problem, but it is the one which

touches the public most immediately. Any comparison of railway rates between different countries, however, must necessarily be more or less unscientific, owing to the varying conditions under which their lines are run and the different rate schedules which are employed.

"But while no entirely satisfactory comparison of the rates of one country with those of another has been or can be made, at the same time comparisons can be instituted which will prove of very great practical value as making clear certain highly important facts. The most difficult attempt of this sort upon which one can embark is that of making a comparison between the rates of American railways and those of European countries. Take, for example, the case of Prussia. It is extremely difficult to make any comparison between the rates on her State roads and those on our corporation roads, because, first, the general scale of wages is distinctly higher in America than in Germany; secondly, the length of haul for freight in this country is 242 miles, whereas in Prussia it is only 71½ miles, causing the terminal expenses to constitute a much larger per cent of the expense of transportation in Prussia than they do with us; thirdly, most of the heavy and bulky freight materials, such as ores, minerals, fertilizers, timber, etc., in Prussia are carried by water, while with us they are generally carried by rail. Moreover, the cream of the American freight, that part which pays the highest rate, is carried at exorbitant rates by our express companies, whereas in Germany it is counted as freight and helps to raise the general average of the price for carrying a ton of freight a mile; fourthly, in America large quantities of freight are carried for the companies themselves, for which no charge is made, whereas in Germany every ton so carried is actually paid for; fifthly, the German roads carry an immense quantity of mail, including parcels, for which they get no pay, while the American roads receive very high pay for every ounce of mail carried by them.

"Messrs. Hoff and Schwabach, the Prussian commissioners sent to this country a few years ago to study and report on the American railway system, made a careful effort to take into account all of these diverse factors in their comparison instituted between our rates and those of the Prussian State lines. The conclusion which they arrived at, after making allowances for all the factors which have tended to reduce the average price for carrying a ton of freight a mile in this country, was that under similar conditions the average rate in America would be 1.44 cents per ton per mile, while on the Prussian State railways it would be only 0.95 of a cent. In the course of their interesting and valuable discussion of this subject, they say:

"American freight rates are divided into very many grades; they consequently reach and sometimes fall below the level of the German standard rates for long distances; that is to say, for the distances which with us do not come into question for the bulk of the traffic. However, as with us the bulk of the freight movement takes place within distances which, according to American ideas, must be called short, the natural consequence of geographical and economic conditions, it is permissible to say that the goods transported in standard classes, which amount with us to about 35 per cent of the total freight, enjoy in Prussia-Hesse and nearly throughout Germany a lower freight rate than the goods forwarded in America according to the standard classes in force in that country. (The average distance of transportation of all freight amounts with us to 115 kilometers (or 71.5 miles), in America to 390 kilometers (or 242.33 miles)."

"If the freight rates for articles in bulk are to be compared with any pretense to correctness it stands to reason that it is necessary to come down to the distances over which goods are actually transported in Germany, and then the aspect is not unfavorable to our conditions after all.

"The Hon. Charles A. Prouty, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, some time ago made an interesting comparison of rates from his home town, Newport, Vt., to Boston, with rates for the same distance in Iowa (where, owing to the activity of their State railway commission, rates are low for this country), and with rates for a similar haul in Prussia, where the rates are lower still.

[Rates in cents per 100 pounds.]

	Newport, Vt., to Boston.	Iowa rate for same distance.	German rate.
Potatoes.....	19	12½	9.6
Hay.....	17	11	10½
Butter.....	46	26	36
Sugar.....	19	17.1	10.9
Lumber.....	10½	9½	6.4
Fertilizers.....	17	9½	8

"Commissioner Prouty further says:

"Last summer a company in which I was interested had occasion to transport considerable quantities of copper wire from Phillipsdale, R. I., to Bradford, Vt., and of dynamo and transformers from Pittsfield, Mass., to the same destination. We paid in less than carloads from

Phillipsdale 32 cents per hundred pounds and from Pittsfield 45 cents per hundred pounds. The corresponding rates in Prussia are 11.08 and 15 cents.

"In the most recent and perhaps most authoritative comparison of Prussian and American railway rates that has yet appeared, Prof. Henry C. Adams, statistician of the Interstate Commerce Commission, after giving a number of exhaustive tables of rates in both countries, says:

"Quite a number of distinct impressions are derived from a study of the above tables. In the first place, it is observed that the Prussian rates are much more regular and uniform than American rates, thus showing that they are not exposed to the influence of temporary changes of commercial conditions or to the passing demands of shippers or localities. The degree of uniformity disclosed indicates that commercial conditions in Prussia are supposed to adjust themselves to railway tariffs rather than railway tariffs to industrial conditions, except it be that the industrial conditions which call for a departure from the rule of uniformity are of a permanent character. Which of these two policies is preferable, and whether stability of railway tariffs, or what railway advocates in this country call elasticity of railway tariffs, is preferable, is again a question of judgment, and for this reason is excluded from further consideration. A second impression left by a study of the above tables is that for a distance not exceeding the average haul on Prussian railways the Prussian rates are lower than the American rates, but that for long hauls the American rates are lower than the Prussian rates.

"A less complex and fairer comparison could be made between the rates of the Prussian State roads and those of the corporation roads of some other European country, such as England or France. In fact, in 1902 such a comparison of the freight rates of Prussia and Great Britain was made by a British 'select committee.' The conclusion arrived at by the committee was that the 'cost of transportation on the German railways, as concerns the Levant and East African tariffs, is only one-third to one-fifth as high for a large number of commodities as the British rate.'"

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

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. My colleague undoubtedly knows that under the German system they produce a large profit, which goes into the treasury?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. ESCH. If that profit were distributed over the rates, it would result in a still greater reduction.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is very true, and I am glad to have that interruption by my colleague. I knew the fact he stated, but I had forgotten to mention it. Under similar conditions and a fair comparison based on those conditions the freight rates on the Government-owned railroads in Germany have been cheaper than have freight rates in this country.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. While the rates are lower, is it not a fact that the wages paid for labor in this country are a great deal higher?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In the first paragraph which I read from this book, the author says that wages are lower in Germany, but he says that freight rates also are lower there, whereas the gentleman from Michigan said that our wages are higher, but that our freight rates are very much less than they are in Germany. That was his statement, but according to these expert investigators that statement is not in accordance with the facts. I have read some of the literature—undoubtedly the same literature—on which the gentleman from Michigan bases his statement, but I took occasion a few years ago to investigate as to the accuracy of some of the articles written by the author of that literature.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman quotes as an author Carl Vrooman. Who is Carl Vrooman—is he an American or an Englishman?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He is an American.

Mr. CANNON. Is he the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes. This book was published in 1910, printed at the University Oxford Press in England.

Mr. CANNON. This was a political campaign document in the campaign of 1910. I do not know, but I think Mr. FORDNEY is as good an authority as Mr. Vrooman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me, Mr. Vrooman has given the findings of fact made by official Government representatives who came here from Europe and investigated this subject, and also statements from the report of a British select committee appointed to investigate this exact subject. These are not the ex parte statements of an American railroad employee. These are statements of fact from official reports of German and of British investigators, compiled by Mr. Vrooman, who is now in the employ of our Government in its Agricultural Department. I know of no reason to believe that when he wrote this book he was not entirely disinterested. Nor do I know of any reason to believe that he has not told the truth. As I have said, he bases his statement on official reports of German and of British investigators.

There are many more important things than rates to be considered before it is possible to make a wise decision on the great question of Government ownership. That question is not now before us and I am not discussing it nor advocating Government ownership of railways. But this is a time of all times for accuracy of information and truthfulness of statement; and what we ought always to strive to know before discussing problems of statesmanship are the facts upon which alone it is possible to base intelligent opinion. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a practical question, and not one that involves theory. The Government has provided for the establishment of a central heating, lighting, and power plant, and has appropriated \$1,669,000 for that purpose, of which appropriation very little has been used except to lay the foundations on the tract near the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. The location has railroad sidings and water frontage. That plant will furnish heat, light, and power to all of the Government buildings in the territory in the central part of the city, but the House well knows that that power plant will not be in existence for several years, and that even when it is in existence with its railroad sidings, which will enable it to get coal direct from the mines, there will be no governmental facility for supplying heat, light, and power to the private office buildings that are rented by the Government. For instance, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Department of Labor are housed in buildings that are all privately owned under contracts for a term of years. The Government merely rents the building as it stands and furnishes the heat, light, and power. Some means must be provided even when the central heat, light, and power plant is established to provide heat, light, and power for these privately owned buildings. The question is, Shall we continue under the present method? The present method provides for the purchase of coal at the mines, paying the railroad rate from the mines to the city and then providing for its distribution under separate contracts from the railroad sidings to the respective departments and office buildings. The Treasury Department enters into the contract for all the coal utilized by the Government in all of its activities. That price has varied in the last six months. When the President, through Executive order, first fixed the price of coal it was \$2.30 at the mines, and, as I recall, the price was increased subsequently by 50 cents. The Government to-day is paying \$2.80 or \$2.85 for bituminous coal at the mouth of the mine. It then pays something over a dollar for railroad transportation to Washington, and there are some 10 or 12 private parties who have contracted to haul the coal to the various departments. The charge for haulage varies according to the distance the department is from the railroad siding. The Agricultural Department, I think, pays \$1.05 a ton.

The Interior Department in the past year has been experimenting with the hauling of coal from the general railroad siding to that department, and the testimony of the chief clerk is that there has been a marked saving in the cost whereby they have saved sufficient to pay for the 5-ton trucks that are used in transporting coal to the Interior Department.

It is upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior that in this year's Book of Estimates there is included an estimate of \$200,000 for this very purpose. It is not an extravagant appropriation when you consider that the Government has appropriated \$1,670,000 for the erection of a central light, heat, and power plant. Of that \$200,000 it is purposed to expend only \$10,000 for the purchase of land, \$10,000 for roadways to yards, and \$70,000 for coal pockets, trestles, and equipment, and \$100,000 for the purchase of 25 trucks, at \$4,000 each.

This is a practical question. Shall we continue under the existing system or shall we extend the system which we have already adopted in providing a central heat, light, and power plant for the departments and one for the Capitol, both adjoining the railroads, whereby the Government can go into the market, purchase the quality of coal it desires at the mouth of the mine, pay the freight rate to these yards, and provide the means of conveyance from the central coal yard to the various Government establishments?

That is a practical question. It is not a question of Government ownership; it is merely a question of whether the Government shall provide the proper facilities for doing its own work, that and nothing more.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. In line 10, page 1 of the resolution, what is the comprehension of the term "independent establishments in the District of Columbia and vicinity"? How far does that go?

Mr. STAFFORD. As was stated before, it is rather ambiguous, but the gentleman from Illinois stated that he would have no objection to having an amendment to insert after the word "independent," the word "governmental." In the draft of the estimates, I may say to the gentleman, the ambiguity is removed by the following language:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to establish a fuel storage yard or yards, to procure by purchase or lease of necessary land, wharfs, railroad trestles, and sidings required for such yard or yards, and to procure the necessary storage, handling and distributing equipment, including motor trucks, for the storage of fuel for the use of and for delivery to all the executive departments and independent establishments and the District government in the District of Columbia and vicinity.

The following language, "and the District government in the District of Columbia," would eliminate the ambiguity as it exists in the present resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me say to my friend if you limit it to the District of Columbia you leave out some of the governmental establishments.

Mr. STAFFORD. I only suggested to insert the word "governmental" before "establishments."

Mr. FOSTER. The gentlemen, I think, in his service here knows very well what independent establishments mean; that is, establishments like the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, establishments of that kind which are not under the departments.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are good lawyers here like the colleague of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], who think that perhaps it is ambiguous, and why not remove the ambiguity by inserting the word "governmental," which will not restrict in the least the object of the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. It is so well established that I think the gentleman agrees with me there is no question about what it means.

Mr. FESS. Can not there be an independent establishment that is not governmental?

Mr. FOSTER. Not under the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, the only question before the House, as far as this resolution is concerned is whether we shall extend the facility whereby the Government can provide heat, light, and power, not only to the Government buildings until the central heat, light, and power plant is completed, but to the privately owned buildings which the Government is renting, which, as the House knows, houses 50 per cent of all the clerical force in the city. Here we have established recently 2,000,000 feet of floor space on the Mall on the site of the old Pennsylvania Railroad station. We have established a heat, light, and power plant there. Is the Government to be hampered by these peculiar conditions with traffic conditions so that it will have to pay the high rates for the haulage of coal from some points distant—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would ask for two minutes more.

Mr. DENISON. I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). Distant from the department, when the Government could have a central storage yard for fuel, tributary to some siding or tributary to water connection, saving perhaps many thousands of dollars. It is merely a question of economy. I think the resolution should be passed and that the policy should be adopted for a central storage fuel yard to supply coal to the various Government establishments. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Committee on Mines and Mining had no idea when we reported this resolution for a central fuel yard or joint purchasing agency for fuel for use of the Government departments that it would provoke a discussion of as many different questions not related to the subject matter of the resolution as have been discussed here to-day. The discussion has wandered far afield. We have discussed Government ownership, the price of eggs, the congestion of freight, freight rates in Germany, Carl Vrooman, and other things. Now, there is not any element of Government ownership in the resolution. There is no question of freight congestion only in an indirect way, that the plan that it is proposed to investigate would have a tendency to relieve such congestion. Now, all that the resolution does is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and Mining, to prepare a plan to show the cost of having a joint establishment—for what? For the Government going into the coal business for the general public? No; but a plan by which the coal that is bought for the different departments of the Government here in Washington, each one buying separately

now, bidding against each other, may be bought under one purchasing agent and placed in one yard, thereby saving not only in the price—because it is an elementary business proposition that the larger the volume of your purchase the cheaper you can get the stuff by purchase—but also reduce the different clerical expenses of having all these different departments looking after their particular coal bill. That is all there is to it. It does not involve any Government ownership of any kind under the sun. It is a proposition to provide a joint purchasing agent for the fuel for the different departments of the Government. That is all there is to it, and I can not for the life of me see where there can be any objection to it, and there is every reason at this time why we should have a plan of this kind. I, for one, would be willing to vote for a plan like that now, but it is thought best to have this resolution and let it be worked out and report a plan so that the details of it can be worked out with reference to the purchase and storage of the fuel supply of the different departments in the city of Washington. That is all there is to the resolution.

Now, a man is naturally inclined to enter into the other and different questions that have been discussed here. I was very much interested in the discussion of some of the questions by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. We all love the gentleman from Michigan; we all admire not only his splendid character but his remarkable abilities as a business man—one of the ablest men in the House. I was struck by one statement that he made that I never expected to hear the gentleman from Michigan make upon this floor, and that is that the ultimate consumer pays the tax. I knew it was true, and had believed it all these years, and had been contending that; but it was the first time I ever heard the gentleman from Michigan make that admission on the floor, and especially after the question of the tariff had been dragged into the discussion by one of his colleagues, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

There was something said about the fuel control. Now, of course, you can never determine just exactly of what benefit the fuel control has been; but this fact stands out, and I think that every man of any intelligence will agree to this, that the fuel-control bill has in a large measure checked the advance of prices that might have occurred in certain commodities. We know there has been a reduction in price of some of the staple commodities—for instance, flour, which is less than it was when the Food Administration took charge of it. I presume the Fuel Administration may have made mistakes, but I am convinced that there has been some good in spite of the mistakes that have been made.

A question came up concerning Carl Vrooman, with reference to his book as to railways in this country and other countries, it being stated that it was a political campaign document. I do not believe it was. Even if it were, it was a statement of facts and not the ex parte statement of Carl Vrooman. And even if it were, I take it that those who know him recognize him as a great American student and statesman, and on a question of this kind his opinion will command the respect of any man who is not blinded by partisan prejudice. He has rendered great public service and his writings are interesting. To my mind he is one of the ablest men we have in public life. And the statements in that book are borne out by facts from every source, regardless of partisanship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support this resolution and all measures which tend to modernize the methods of doing business with the Federal Government. We all recognize the fact that the Government, in the increasing number of divisions and activities in the departments, tends to a multiplication of red tape and to an increase of expense, purely by a failure to coordinate and correlate the different departments of the Government and to modernize their methods.

Now, before the Bureau of Mines was created the purchase of coal for the Government departments was on a most extravagant and unbusinesslike scale. They bought the coal by the ton, without regard to its heat units. It was purely a question of the price per ton by competition. Some coal is almost utterly worthless for heating purposes. Some coal is of very high value. It was not until after the Bureau of Mines was created that we had a method of determining on behalf of the Government what the big business man has determined for himself, to wit, the value of the coal according to the heat unit it contains. I have no doubt there are departments still in the Government that are buying coal according to the old plan, without referring the matter to the Bureau of Mines to determine the British thermal unit.

Mr. DENISON. I will state to the gentleman that the committee is going to report a bill that will control that.

Mr. GILLETT. Is it not a fact that all the coal for the departments is bought by the general supply committee?

Mr. BORLAND. I say that I think all the coal is bought by the general supply committee, and I think now it is submitted to the Bureau of Mines for a test; but it may be, and I would not be surprised to find if it were true, that there were some of these independent departments, the District government or elsewhere, that were still buying under the old plan.

Now, this resolution simply provides for an investigation on the part of the Bureau of Mines of the feasibility and cost of providing a Government coal yard for the departments in Washington. That is not a Government-ownership proposition at all, but if it were it would not frighten me on the subject. I have had some experience with this question of the Government furnishing supplies in connection with the Panama Canal. We maintained and were compelled to maintain down there a Government commissary, not only to supply the Government but 37,000 men in the working force of the canal. Otherwise there would have been profiteering, poor supplies, discontent, dissatisfaction, and a decrease in the earning power of the man who was working for the Government, and all of those attendant evils. That Government commissary at Panama fully justified itself, and I challenge any gentleman in this House who knows the facts to say that it did not fully justify its purpose. It was run economically, and men at work on the Panama Canal procured supplies at very reasonable prices. I noticed that in many cases they were paying less for beef on the Panama Canal than I was paying for it for my own household use in Washington or in Kansas City; and the same is true, or ought to be true, in regard to the Government supply of coal.

Now, the gentlemen speak about the congestion of cars. The very purpose of a Government yard is to purchase the Government supply of coal at a time when it can be delivered without congestion on the railroads. The great trouble now is that there is congestion and everybody is ordering supplies at the same time. The great heating plant of this Capitol is living from day to day, taking its coal direct from coal cars as they come into Washington. I think every car of coal that is used by the Government heating plant here must be hauled in the day or the week that it is used. That is one cause of the congestion. Suppose we had a supply on hand, as many great manufacturing concerns have throughout the Middle West—a supply of coal on hand to run the Government for a certain number of months, without the necessity of taking it direct from the coal cars.

My own private opinion of the cause of the shortage of coal at this time is that it is due to the fact that the food and fuel bill was filibustered against for two months last summer after it ought to have passed both Houses of Congress and at a time when the big consumers of coal, who formerly bought by annual contract, ought to have bought their supplies but were unable to do so. When the cold weather came on the big consumer and the small consumer were compelled at the same time to put in their orders, and the result has been that the small consumer, as usual, has not got the best of the situation.

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

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is aware of the fact that in many States, even after that bill became a law, it was a matter of one or two months, or perhaps three months, before any State administrator was appointed under it so that anything could be done to carry it into effect?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes. I have no doubt that we were fully two months late in putting that fuel bill into effect, and that is the cause of the present distress.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman evidently did not understand me.

Mr. BORLAND. I understand the gentleman's question. He says that after the bill was passed there was a further delay?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I am not excusing that. I say there was a delay before the bill was passed. The Government ought not to take its part in that active competition. It ought to supply itself at a time when coal can be mined and transported for the advantage of the consumers of coal without congesting the small consumers. I am in favor of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to oppose this resolution. I seem to be somewhat lonely in my efforts, but, nevertheless, I am sincere.

This resolution proposes two things, and, judging from its title, it proposes to establish a coal yard in the District of Columbia. You would not suspect, from looking at the title, that it proposes anything else. Yet on lines 4 and 5, on page 2, it does suggest that it proposes to make an inquiry into the matter of the purchase and supply of fuel in the District of Columbia.

Now, there are about 26 coal yards in the District of Columbia, as I am informed about this matter. The Government buys all its coal by public advertisement, after bids are submitted showing the quality of the coal required and the British thermal units it must contain. The coal is subjected to investigation and test at the Bureau of Standards before it is accepted or before the Government will accept bids for supplying it. The Government has all the mines of the United States tributary to the Government plants rated as to the quality of the coal produced and whether it is acceptable and comes up to the Government standard for the purpose required.

Mr. BORLAND. That has only been the rule since the creation of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. ROBBINS. It has been the rule for several years. It is a sufficient answer to say that it has been the rule for some time and for the last two years.

The trouble in the whole situation is not a lack of coal or a lack of labor but a lack of transportation facilities. In 1915 we produced 442,624,426 tons of bituminous coal. In 1916 we produced 502,518,545 tons, and up to the 31st of October, 1917, we produced 454,326,059 tons, or 40,833,075 tons above the amount produced at the same date in 1916. But the question is how to get that coal to market. We have not been able to market it, and the reason why we have not been able to market it is because the Government has interfered with the legitimate means of transportation by giving preferential orders and ordering continuous movement of coal. At one time there were 20,000 cars up at Lake Erie ports waiting to be loaded on the boats for transportation up the Lakes. Movements of that kind have so disorganized the transportation of coal in the United States that we have not been able to get the coal produced to market.

Now, what is the purpose of this resolution in proposing to establish a coal yard in the city of Washington? How is it going to save any expense to the Government or relieve the situation? It is simply asking us to put the Government into competition with 20 or 30 coal yards now in operation here that could and will furnish this coal on competitive bids to the various governmental departments, and it is proposed by this resolution to establish in the District of Columbia coal yards and to enter upon the business of dealing in coal on a wholesale basis.

That, however, is not the real purpose of it at all.

Another thing about this resolution that is wrong is that it does not take into account the fact that if it does propose to establish this coal yard, it also proposes to embark the Government upon an expenditure of a large sum of money. They have already investigated this subject, because we see on page 2 of the committee report the statement that the Treasury Department last year sent to Congress an estimate of \$400,000 for establishing a coal yard in the District of Columbia. That is the secret of this thing, and that is what is back of this resolution. There are some people in the city of Washington doubtless who have on hand a piece of property that they want to sell to the Government as a coal yard for \$400,000. They want to sell that property to the Government at a big price.

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

Mr. ROBBINS. Certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman know that the Government now owns property on which this coal yard can be established without buying it?

Mr. ROBBINS. I only know what this committee report states.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is charging that somebody wants to sell some property.

Mr. ROBBINS. Has the Government bought a property?

Mr. FOSTER. No. It owns the property now.

Mr. ROBBINS. Why, then, does the committee that has investigated this subject state that here is a proposition made last year to appropriate \$400,000 to establish this coal yard?

Mr. FOSTER. Surely.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is an exorbitant expenditure of money for a coal yard, now that we are at war and will need all our money to fight the Kaiser. A coal yard involves a railroad sid-

ing and some pockets that the Government would put up for the purpose of getting the coal dumped from the cars. It is suggested here that we have rail transportation and water transportation, and that we ought to take and use the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, which runs from here to Cumberland, that is now dry or probably frozen up and not navigable at this season, and in that case we would have to have a yard on the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, with equipment of cranes and lifts from the boats to pockets, and another one established somewhere else, along some railroad, entirely differently equipped and at a distance, so that we are not going to conserve the supply or reduce the price by establishing these various coal yards.

Mr. FOSTER. You ought not to involve others by undertaking to say what they are trying to do.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am only saying what this report says, that a proposition of \$400,000 was submitted last year by the Treasury Department.

Mr. FOSTER. The report states that the Treasury Department last year sent to Congress an estimate of \$400,000 for the establishment of a coal yard.

Mr. ROBBINS. I say that, too.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all?

Mr. ROBBINS. Therefore I say that if you are going to establish coal yards, as suggested in this report, you are going to spend \$400,000 for it.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman that it may take more than that.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is worse yet.

Mr. FOSTER. We can save that in one year.

Mr. ROBBINS. How will you save it?

Mr. FOSTER. On the price of coal as supplied to the District of Columbia and to the Government here.

Mr. ROBBINS. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I know something about the coal business. I was raised in a coal country, up in western Pennsylvania, and the congressional district which I have the honor to represent here produced over 20,000,000 tons of bituminous coal in 1916.

Mr. FOSTER. I know something about it, too, on the side of the people. I know something about the coal business from the side of the consumer of coal.

Mr. ROBBINS. I know it from the side of the consumer and from the side of the producer, both, because I live in a coal country, in western Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOSTER. I live in a coal country. The miners in my district are patriotic, too.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am patriotic, too, and so are the miners of my district; but even patriots can not produce coal when they can not get cars to ship it to market.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not charging the gentleman with any lack of patriotism.

Mr. ROBBINS. Of course you are not. Here is the situation: If the Government is to get this coal as cheap or cheaper than it gets it now it must get it by competitive bids, and it must submit its proposals to the largest number of coal producers. That is the only way in which it can get this coal more cheaply than now. Now, these bids are submitted f. o. b. the tipples in every instance. The Government and every other consumer pays the freight, and pays the same freight; hence if you are going to get this coal more cheaply you will only get it by competitive bidding, and your coal yard is not going to give any solution of that question, because the coal yard simply receives the coal from the coal cars at the dumps, and then you have got to transport the coal from those yards to the points of consumption or the various Government buildings, which are the various Government power plants, and that you do by trucks and wagons. Hence the proposition is one of the cost of trucking, not of coal yards or coal storage.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think it possible for the Government to save anything by purchasing coal in larger amounts?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; I do not.

Mr. DENISON. Instead of purchasing it in small amounts?

Mr. ROBBINS. No; the difference between one amount and another larger amount is not a factor in most instances, for this reason: If the Government is buying coal it is buying it by 10,000 or 20,000 ton lots, and a coal producer will not make any difference in his bid to supply a consumer in the city of Washington with 10,000 tons or 15,000 tons or 50,000 tons unless it is all to be delivered within a certain specific time. If the delivery is to extend over a season—5,000 tons a month or 1,000 tons a month—there is no difference in the bid, and you would not get it for a cent less per ton if you were to ask for 50,000 tons than for 10,000 tons, because it all goes in to take care of the general output of the mine, and the operator

simply gathers up contracts in the East or at the Lakes—taking western Pennsylvania as an example—for his entire tonnage for the year. He gets his price at the mines, and it does not matter how much each consumer takes; that is, outside of a few tons, which would be exceptional and not apply to the Government. Of course, one car of coal would be a different thing. There would be no saving on that. So I am opposed to this resolution, because I do not see how it would save the Government anything, and it will require the expenditure of a large sum of money and commit the Government to the expenditure of much larger sums in the future, at a time when we need all our money to arm, equip, and support our gallant soldiers, who are fighting this war for freedom and human rights. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, while this resolution on the face of it seems to be a very innocent one, because it provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall direct the Bureau of Mines to make an estimate on plans and specifications, of the approximate cost of establishing fuel yards, and all necessary handling of the same, yet if the Secretary of the Interior makes a report to this House and estimates that the building of a dock, and the purchase of trucks for transporting coal to the different departments will cost \$500,000, unquestionably this House will pass it. So why throw ourselves wide open for unnecessary appropriations at this time? This Congress has appropriated already at this session about \$1,500,000,000, and the estimates of the departments amount to about \$14,000,000,000. The taking over of the railroads by the Government will necessitate perhaps an appropriation of \$500,000,000, which we will pass within a few days. The urgent deficiency bill, which we will soon pass, will amount to about \$1,500,000,000. The sum total that we will appropriate will amount to perhaps, in round numbers, about \$18,000,000,000, or within two or three billions of what we appropriated at the last session, and it is not only possible but very probable that we will appropriate more money at this session than we did in the last.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. WHEELER. We have loaned to the allies now in the neighborhood of \$5,000,000,000, and the longer this war continues the more demands they will make upon us for money. And perhaps by next fall the amount will reach \$10,000,000,000 or \$12,000,000,000. It does seem to me that this Congress instead of trying to appropriate as much money as it can, or instead of laying itself wide open by the passage of bills which would call for immense appropriations, had better economize as much as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the pending resolution. I wish the committee had reported a broader resolution, and provided for a coal yard which would sell coal to all the citizens of the District of Columbia. I believe the sale of coal to citizens is a legitimate activity for any municipal government.

A very interesting experiment along those lines is now being conducted in the city of Denver. Denver is a city of perhaps 250,000 people, not as large as Washington, but in a general way in the same class. Denver was confronted by practically the situation in which the people of Washington now find themselves. The retail dealers put up the price of coal—endeavored to get all that the traffic would bear. That is the general policy among retail dealers over the country. Usually you will find that there is a combination between the retailers by which they maintain prices.

The mayor of the city of Denver decided to go into the coal business. He succeeded in securing contracts with three companies. Under these contracts he secures lump coal for \$1.25 a ton less than the price charged by other coal companies to retail dealers. So the mayor makes an initial saving of \$1.25 a ton.

In the matter of retailers' profits he has saved between 25 and 50 cents a ton. His net saving to the consumers of Denver on lump coal is about \$1.50 a ton at the present time, and he is delivering 800 tons a day.

Mr. ROSE. Is the mayor of Denver able to make such contracts now?

Mr. KEATING. I do not know. The mayor made these contracts last fall. He made the contracts with independent concerns, men who are not in the coal combination; in order to get their product on the market they were ready to make that deal with him. To-day the coal consumers in Denver who

patronize the retail dealers—for there is not enough coal obtained by the city to supply all the people—are paying \$1.50 a ton more for their coal than those consumers who are dealing with the city.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I noticed an item in the Des Moines paper that the mayor has been selling coal for 45 cents less a ton than the local dealers.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to see that Iowa is following in the footsteps of Colorado. Iowa is always wise in following Colorado's example, but Colorado is doing a little better than Iowa in this instance.

There is a newspaper in Denver—the Denver Post—that has gone into the coal business on the same basis as the mayor. It acquired the output of two coal companies, and it, too, is saving its customers about \$1.50 a ton.

So my friends, in my judgment, the establishment of this coal yard will undoubtedly result in a very large saving to the Government. If you were to extend it so as to give the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a municipal coal yard, they could save the people of Washington millions of dollars a year.

I hope the resolution will pass, and I hope that eventually the committee, in its wisdom, will bring in a resolution to give the people of Washington the benefits of municipal ownership in this important matter. [Applause.]

Mr. GARLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. GARLAND. What is the price to the consumer out there in Denver?

Mr. KEATING. In my home city—Pueblo, Colo.—it is \$7.25 a ton from the retail dealers. In Denver the city and the Post are selling for from \$4.65 to \$4.75 a ton. The retailers are charging from \$5.95 to \$6.45.

Mr. GARLAND. Was it not under such a monopoly that the price of coal was exceedingly high and they could easily take off \$1.25 and still have an extraordinary high price?

Mr. KEATING. I do not think Colorado suffers any more from the evils of monopoly than the great State of Pennsylvania, but it is true that Colorado coal companies are pretty well monopolized, and could easily sell lump coal for \$1.25 below the price fixed by the national fuel administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox]. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 16 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am for the resolution. It has been a hard problem for me to settle in my mind for many years in the past in favor or against Government ownership on many things. I must confess that down to this hour, after investigating the subject to some extent for 8 or 10 years, my mind is not yet clear just how far the Government ought to go in Government ownership on various lines.

I had occasion to go down to the Panama Canal in March, 1913, when the big organization was yet in existence. The man at the head of the Government commissary department was from my State, a man whom I knew personally and had known before he went there. I spent one day with him in the Government commissary. I was informed by him—and this was not off-hand information, it was information based on tangible facts—that through the Government commissary furnishing the employees food and clothing and supplies of various kinds they had actually reduced the cost from 25 to 33½ per cent from what we were paying in the States and 80 per cent of the food commodities selling there were raised in the States and shipped to Panama.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman think that Government ownership at Panama, a perfect organization and a success there, would be an argument for making it a success throughout the United States?

Mr. COX. I am not prepared to say that it would. But I am prepared to say that there were physical facts presented to me by Mr. Burke from his purchase and sales in that commissary.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The Government got the cost of commodities, including the overhead charges?

Mr. COX. They ran in connection with the commissary a laundry, and the laundry itself employed 1,600 persons. The commissary paid for itself all overhead charges, all of its employees, paid for the laundry, and the least amount of money, if I recollect correctly, that it turned into the Treasury of the

United States in one year was \$26,000. They had up into the small thousands of employees working in the commissary and in the laundry. That was a concrete illustration to me that Government ownership, under strict regulation, at least was not a failure.

I would like to see, as the gentleman from Colorado well expressed it, this resolution widened and broadened. In my opinion the people of this District are held up by the heels and absolutely skinned from the top of their heads to the soles of their feet by the retailers. I have no question on earth about that. Why, take the increase in rents here. An old building erected 30 years ago, which has not been repapered for 10 years—the price of electricity has not gone up, the price of gas has not increased, taxes and insurance have not increased, and yet the rent has increased from 25 to 33 per cent. Ask the owners why, and they say, "Oh, it is because of the war." Ask the employees, the janitors, who are firing the furnaces in these houses if their salaries have been increased as the result of the war. Oh, no. I know janitors to-day in the city of Washington firing furnaces in apartment houses where they have as many as 16 apartments who get \$10 a month and live in the basement of the apartment. And yet the rents of these apartments have increased from 25 to 33 per cent in the last two or three years.

And when I came to make up my mind upon the matter I had come to the conclusion that there is no way to break the strangle hold of monopoly except by Government ownership. I am willing at least to go to the extent of trying out Government ownership. I would like to see this resolution broadened, widened, and deepened to give a coal yard here to supply the people of the District of Columbia and cut out all of the intermediate profits of the middleman. Last summer we had for our consideration before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads a bill to establish transportation from the city to the country to carry parcel post; in other words, to put the city consumer and the country producer into direct and immediate touch as far as possible. That bill did not go very far; we did not have hold of it many days until the transportation lines, the railroads, and express companies began to raise their copper heads. I entertain no doubt in my own mind that is but the beginning, and I firmly believe that with that beginning, if that service be established leading from the city to the country, we will begin to reduce the cost of living. It is largely a question of profiteering. You go to the groceryman and ask him why there is an increase of this and that, and he will answer it is because of the war, although he may handle a commodity the war has never laid its hands on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word. Awhile ago there was some talk about the general supply committee of the Government and what it was doing with reference to the supply of coal. Mr. Jones, chairman of the subcommittee on fuel of the general supply committee, made the following statement in answer to a question by Mr. Moss, a former Member of this House:

Is it your opinion that the coal is purchased as cheaply as it can be purchased under existing conditions?

Mr. JONES. I think, Mr. Chairman, the Government could no doubt purchase coal a little cheaper if it had a coal yard of its own. I believe it not only could purchase coal cheaper, but the Government officials would feel safer, knowing that they had their coal supply on hand. During this past winter the department officials have been holding their breath, feeling that the supply of coal might run out and that they would not be able to get any more.

I want to call attention to one other thing. The Government operated a building down here beside the Knickerbocker Hotel, which is west of the War Department. The Government was burning anthracite coal and the Knickerbocker was using bituminous, the Government paying \$2.40 more for its coal than was the hotel, although the anthracite did not contain as many British thermal units as the bituminous. When the Government took over the hotel it changed the heating plant so as to burn anthracite at \$2.40 a ton more than had been formerly paid by the hotel, although getting less heat. I want to say further that the Government in the past has hauled anthracite coal from the Pennsylvania fields to New Mexico, they have hauled anthracite coal to Florida, and they have hauled it out to Fort Logan, Colo., when in Denver people have been using the soft coal to be had in the State of Colorado. That condition has been going on throughout the United States, and in one instance we found where the Government officials had macadamized a road with anthracite coal. There has been all sorts of wastefulness, the throwing away of money, and I think in this instance the Government ought to take some means to establish its own yard where it will be assured of a supply, and at reasonable prices. There is no sense in the Government

hauling anthracite coal, as it does, to the State of Wyoming when Wyoming has a good quality of coal. When the haul has been over a land-grant railroad, they have been buying the coal delivered at the post instead of buying it at the mine and having it delivered.

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

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I agree with the gentleman that the Government has done some very extraordinary things, but I do not want my friend to charge them with crimes they have not committed. I think among all of the peculiar and extravagant things that the Government departments have done, the hauling of anthracite to Wyoming is perhaps not one of them. I do not recall any anthracite having been hauled to my State, although, as an illustration, the gentleman's suggestion is very good, because some things almost as extravagant have been done.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I can show the gentleman where they have hauled coal from the Pennsylvania region to Cheyenne, Wyo.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman may have some information that I have not.

Mr. FOSTER. I am standing for the coal of Wyoming. They have good coal.

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly. We have no need for anthracite in Wyoming.

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman think that these examples of Government extravagance that he cites are good arguments for the Government ownership which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] has just advocated?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say to the gentleman that that is the mismanagement that we are trying to correct.

Mr. GILLETT. Is not that inevitable in a government like ours?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not, if it is managed by men who are intelligent.

Mr. GILLETT. Oh, if properly managed; but would it be?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman a question respecting the resolution. On page 2 of the resolution, on lines 3 and 4, there is the language "and the feasibility of consolidating all matters relating to the purchase and supply of fuel." Would not that include transportation lines to Washington bringing the coal?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. FESS. It would include the delivery from the yard to the Government establishments?

Mr. FOSTER. The tracks would run into the Government establishments.

Mr. FESS. How does the gentleman discriminate between simply the coal-yard purchase and the supply? That term is used so as to cover all matters that might be involved in establishing the yard and getting this coal.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the matter of transportation.

Mr. FESS. If you control all matters pertaining to it, why would it not include transportation?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the gentleman sees a bogey man.

Mr. FESS. I am a friend of the resolution; I am going to vote for the resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Then let me say that this is only a resolution to investigate, anyhow—

Mr. FESS. I know.

Mr. FOSTER. And it is not a final resolution that will establish a coal yard.

Mr. FESS. Why not say, "and the feasibility of establishing Government control, of the purchase and supply of fuel," and so forth?

Mr. FOSTER. The only thing is, there may be some other matters that they would like to report to Congress, and this is only a resolution to investigate, and I do not see any harm in it.

Mr. FESS. I am honest in my contention that the words "all matters" would include transportation.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman might make more definite language if this were the final resolution to establish a yard.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. I have not had an opportunity to study this resolution very carefully, but I wish to ask my colleague if one of the purposes of the resolution, in case it is passed, would be to build these sheds that the Government will be required to store the coal in—these particular sheds that the Government owns? Is that one of the purposes of it?

Mr. FOSTER. I expect they would do it; yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Unless it is so provided in the law does not my colleague fear, from other experiences we have had re-

lated by him of shipping coal, for instance, from Wyoming to the Atlantic seaboard and from there to some other places where it was altogether unnecessary, that unless there is some clause in the law compelling the storage of Government coal in the Government sheds that it might be possible that the men who had this law under their hands for administration might rent some of these high-priced buildings in Washington and store the coal there rather than in the Government sheds?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter that can be taken up. I think the gentleman also sees a bogey man, too.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman astonished me with his statement of governmental extravagance and incompetence, and I am a little afraid converted me on the other side, but I would like to ask one question in that connection; that is, whether this hauling of coal to western regions where there is already fine coal is still going on on the part of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman. I want to say this: That the Government need not be extravagant. The Government can coordinate its forces, it can stop duplication if it desires to do so, and it can save all this money that has been wasted in the past. Now, that is very easy if we get men hold of it who are business men and know something about it. There is no question but what that can be done. This is no argument for or against Government ownership. It is an argument in favor of supplying the Government itself with coal for all its activities in the District of Columbia.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, we are the greatest coal-producing nation on earth; in fact, we produce within our boundaries, if I recollect rightly, about half of the coal produced in all the world—possibly more. Our coal fields extend from one end of the country to the other. No people in the world are blessed with fuel resources as we are; and yet, in spite of all that, the coal industry, the fuel industry, is rarely in a condition satisfactory to anyone interested in or connected with it, either the producer or the consumer. In the summer the mines are largely idle; in the winter they are run at their utmost capacity. Always there is a shortage somewhere in the winter; always there is some actual suffering for lack of fuel, and that with the greatest coal supply on earth. The conditions we are passing through now differ only from normal conditions in that they are a little worse than usual. The demand is a little greater, the lack of cars is a little more acute, the shortage of fuel more widespread because of an unusually cold spell, but there is nothing strikingly peculiar in the present condition of affairs except that conditions are a little worse than ordinarily; the difference is in degree, not in kind. Some day in this country some genius will arise, let us hope, who will make it his work to bring about a better condition relative to the mining and distribution of coal. Such a man will have a work before him that will be tremendously far-reaching, the beneficial effects of which can scarcely be calculated.

Mr. DENISON. Will my friend, the gentleman, yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to make this suggestion: Mr. Giragossian claims that the Garabed would do away with the use of coal. It may be the gentleman thinks Mr. Giragossian may be the genius the gentleman was speaking about?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I wish Mr. Giragossian and his Garabed well. I only wish I had a little more faith in Mr. Giragossian and his invention. But assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Garabed may not develop as its inventor hopes, we will still have to depend upon coal. This—one of the greatest industries of the Nation—needs a readjustment and reformation more than any other great industry of which I know. We sometimes hear that the miners receive high wages, and at times they do; and yet it is a lamentable fact that even where the wages are highest, where men make the most when they are actually employed, the yearly wage is largely inadequate because of the fact that the employment is not steady.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. FOSTER. I have but one minute, and I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I yield the gentleman five minutes, if I have that much time to yield.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield a minute?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I do not.

The SPEAKER. What about the other gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not reached my discussion of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes, if I have that much time to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. In your hope of the attainment of proper regulations for the mining and distribution of coal and the distribution of fuel, it is evident, then, from your observation, that you do not attach any serious hope for the ultimate accomplishment of that much-cherished desire, by what is being done by Prof. Garfield?

Mr. MONDELL. I wish Prof. Garfield well, and I hope he will accomplish more good in the future than he has been able to accomplish in the past. [Laughter.] I believe he is making an earnest effort, and I wish him well in his work.

The solution of many of the difficulties surrounding the coal industry in America lies in storage. A great railway engineer was once asked, "What is the most important thing in building a railroad?" He said, "Drainage." "What is the next most important thing?" He said, "Drainage." "What is the all-important thing?" He replied, "Drainage." What is the most important thing in establishing a reasonably satisfactory condition in reference to the coal industry of this country? Storage. As far as coal is concerned, we mostly live from hand to mouth. We buy a ton of coal when the clouds are lowering, when the rain falls and the wind drives, and we expect it to be delivered within five minutes after we telephone our order. There never can be a satisfactory condition in the coal industry of the United States until the American people learn to store coal and to store it to an extent that will make possible the operation of the mines practically the year around. That will be beneficial in a thousand ways. First, it will prevent these winter shortages. It will give the operator a better opportunity to mine and sell his coal at a fair price and for a reasonable profit. It will give the coal miner a fair income, although his daily wage be not as high as under present conditions. It will bring the coal business to a normal, reasonably satisfactory condition.

Here is a proposition, in a small way, it is true, in one place, to start and to enlarge, as far as the Government bureaus here are concerned, the practice of storage. It is proposed that the Government, instead of buying a small amount of coal from time to time through many agencies, storing it in a great many places in small quantities, shall establish a yard or yards where coal purchased in the summer season, when the work of the mines is slack, and when the men need employment, when coal is comparatively cheap, may be stored. We shall then have a supply on hand in the days when there is a congestion of railway traffic, a shortage of cars; when the mines are pressed to their utmost in their production; when it is the most difficult to deliver and the price is highest. Even though the Government did not save a penny by this method of procedure it would be wise to inaugurate the policy proposed; but there will, in my opinion, be a very considerable saving in money.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I would like to inquire of the gentleman what is the practical reason why the mine operator does not store at the mines? Presumably some financial or other reason?

Mr. MONDELL. It is practically impossible to store in sufficiently great quantities at the mines to remedy the situation. The conditions about the mines are such as to make it difficult. The cost would in many cases be prohibitive. Some kinds of coal can not be safely or satisfactorily stored in the very great quantities that it would be necessary to store at the mines. In the main, storage must be by the individual and by the individual industry all over the country, and I know of no better work that a man can do for his country, I know of no effort that could be put forth that would bring better results, than that of advocating and securing the country over the storage of coal, as is proposed in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND].

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution ought to pass for the reason that it will give, if it is found practical to establish a yard here, information as to the real facts in the coal industry. And that will be satisfactory to those who are not supplying the Government. I do not think it is going to bring a great deal of benefit to the Government in the way of prices, but it is going to educate in the practicability of operating and mining and distribution of coal, just as you have

spent millions of dollars for other evidence that you had not at hand.

The last Congress appropriated \$11,000,000 for the establishment of an armor-plate plant, and when they finally get that established they will find it will be at a cost of about \$30,000,000, and that it costs them double the amount to make a ton of armor plate that they thought it would cost when they first purchased it; that is, if they keep books as to the cost. And we have gone along other avenues to discover facts. In this case we will take coal, for instance. I live in western Pennsylvania. All of western Pennsylvania and part of eastern Ohio is one great coal field, one stratum of coal under another, sometimes as many as three available strata. Every farmer who owns his land owns the coal under it. They are not operating. The trouble is to get the coal out. It is stored all right, but it is stored underneath the ground. They can not get the labor at the prices now being offered for the coal. The farmers would willingly take out coal in winter in order to supply the people if they could do so. And even though that supply is there we are suffering. But labor now at the mines is paid from \$5 a day—common labor, out around the mines—to \$15 a day in the mines. And even then they can not get the men to do it. That is the situation out there in western Pennsylvania. We are suffering from want of coal while living right in the midst of it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] has three minutes remaining.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes, and asks unanimous consent for two minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the business of mining coal is a very practical one. It requires executive ability and the capacity to labor with the hands and brains. Up to this year there has been no difficulty in the United States to any appreciable extent in supplying the demands of the country, the necessary fuel for the operation of the railroads, the manufacturing industries, and the domestic necessities of the country. Some time during the early summer last passed somebody conceived the idea that there could be an improvement upon the methods of producing and distributing coal. The result was that during the months of summer and fall, when every coal mine in the country should have been worked to the limit of its capacity, most of them were idle, waiting to see what the Government was going to permit them to do.

That is the answer to the present shortage of coal in every city and town of the country. In Pittsburg, Kans., surrounded by a great coal field, the miners were ready and anxious to work, but were not permitted to work for three months; those who were distributing coal were not permitted to distribute it. Operators were afraid to operate their mines and pay labor for fear they could not sell the coal at the prices it cost them to produce it.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In a moment. It took the Government and Prof. Garfield until along in November to arrive at the conclusion that the mines of the country must run to meet the demand for coal. That is the reason why people have suffered and died this winter for want of fuel.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Is it not also true that there was official discouragement of the purchase and storage of coal?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is one of the things the people were told by those in authority in the Government. "Do not lay in coal. Do not lay up a supply now. We are going to see to it that it will be cheaper when we get the management of it." Instead of getting it cheaper, the people have been obliged to pay more for it than ever before. Why, the people can not get it at any price. People have suffered and died in Washington, in New York, and every section of the country for lack of coal. They could not get the coal. They could have secured coal if the Government had not interfered with the operation of the coal mines early in the fall last year and prevented the production of coal at the time when it should have been produced to supply the necessities of the country.

That is the truth about it. What is the use of talking about coal and hardships and shortage? If you want to get at the reason for the appalling conditions that now exist, go back to last fall and find idle mines and idle miners and idle coal cars for months. There you will find the answer for the present suffering that exists throughout the country. There you

will find the reason for the present high price and the impossibility of getting it at any price.

I have been trying to get coal for three weeks. I will pay \$10 a ton, or \$15 a ton, or \$20 a ton, if I can get it, rather than have my family suffer. I can not get the coal; neither can you. Why? It has not been produced. Why? Because the mines were idle when they should have been operating. Why were they idle? Because Government officials said, "Do not buy your coal in July. We will get it for you cheaper next winter." [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOSTER: Page 2, lines 6 and 7, after the word "the," on line 6, strike out the words "first Monday in December, 1917," and insert "first day of April, 1918."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, there were two other amendments sent to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 1, line 10, after the word "independent," insert the word "governmental," so that the line will read "and for delivery to all executive departments and independent governmental establishments in the District of Columbia."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendments and resolution to its final passage.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer another amendment, on page 2.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we have given sufficient time to it already.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, there is an additional amendment there.

Mr. FOSTER. It has not been offered.

Mr. GARD. It has been offered and is in the hands of the Clerk.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. Is not this the stage for offering amendments?

The SPEAKER. Of course it is; but if the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] prevails, that is the end of the amendments.

Mr. FESS. I do not wish to make a point of no quorum, but I will have to do it if there is no opportunity given to offer amendments here.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I sent to the Clerk's desk two amendments, and now call for the reading of the second amendment. Is not now the time to read it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must rise in his seat and offer an amendment in order to get it before the House.

Mr. GARD. I transmitted the amendment to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but that is not the way. The way to get an amendment before the House is for some gentleman to rise in his place and offer it.

Mr. FESS. I offer an amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] made a motion for the previous question on the bill and amendments.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. Then the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] to offer the amendment he sent up here.

Mr. GARD. I offer the amendment previously sent up, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 2, line 4, after the word "purchase" strike out the words "and supply" and insert the words "storage and distribution."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Speaker's desk an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FESS: Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out the words "consolidating all matters relating to" and insert the words "establishing control of."

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

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this resolution. I am in favor of it. I think it is a wise piece of legislation. But those words that I am striking out are all inclusive. They do not exclude anything. They include everything. I insist that, reading it as it is written, we include transportation lines, bringing coal here to the city, and I am not sure that it would not extend to the operation of mines. It says "all matters relating to the purchase and supply," and if it includes distribution from the yard here to the Government buildings, it will under the same interpretation include the facilities for bringing it here. All the change I have made is that instead of "consolidating all matters relating to" I propose "establishing Government control of."

Then we will have control of the purchase and the supply. It is certainly not an amendment that is offensive to the resolution, but it simply proposes to clarify it so that the commission may have its limits within which to operate. As a friend of the resolution, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, just a moment. The gentleman from Ohio fails to understand the difference between this resolution which limits this to only inquiry and a report to Congress, and not a resolution to establish a coal yard at this time. It is simply an investigation to determine whether it shall be established, and his amendment limits the right of this Bureau of Mines to find out all the facts.

Mr. FESS. Will the chairman of the committee yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FESS. Does not the resolution go to the extent of taking in the distributing of the coal from the coal yard to the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course. It would be of no use to have coal in the yard and not be able to distribute it.

Mr. FESS. How can you get coal into the yard unless you bring it there?

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman wants now to limit the investigation as to the distribution.

Mr. FESS. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman wants them to be limited, so that they can do just a few things. This is simply a joint resolution calling for an investigation and report. I move the previous question on the amendment and the joint resolution to the final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois moves the previous question on the resolution and the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. FOSTER) there were—ayes 44, noes 20.

Accordingly the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Fess amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The ayes appear to have it, the ayes have it, and the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet seeking recognition. I want to make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a perfect right to raise the point of no quorum. Does he raise it?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes; I do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. HEFLIN. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Chair had already announced that the bill was passed.

Mr. ROBBINS. I was addressing the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman was in time. [After counting.] Eighty-nine gentlemen present, not a quorum. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is this a roll call on the passage? There has been no division.

The SPEAKER. Yes; this is a roll call on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But there has been no division.

The SPEAKER. The Chair put the question, and really announced that the bill was passed; but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] insisted that he was on his feet, and the Chair thinks he was. There is no question that this vote

will be on the passage of the joint resolution. Those in favor of the passage of the joint resolution will, when their names are called, answer yea, those opposed nay, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 39, answered "present" 1, not voting 109, as follows:

YEAS—278.

Alexander	Eagan	Keating	Ramsey
Almon	Eagle	Kebow	Ramseyer
Anderson	Elliott	Kelley, Mich.	Randall
Asbrook	Elston	Kennedy, R. I.	Reavis
Aswell	Emerson	Kettner	Riordan
Austin	Evans	Key, Ohio	Roberts
Ayres	Fairfield	Kiess, Pa.	Robinson
Bacharach	Farr	Kinkaid	Rodenberg
Baer	Ferris	Kitchin	Rogers
Bankhead	Fess	Knutson	Romjue
Beakes	Fields	Kraus	Rose
Bell	Fisher	La Follette	Rouse
Beshlin	Flood	Langley	Rowe
Black	Foss	Larsen	Rubey
Blackmon	Foster	Lee, Cal.	Rucker
Blanton	Francis	Lee, Ga.	Sabath
Borland	Frear	Leibach	Sanders, Ind.
Bowers	Freeman	Lenroot	Saunders, Va.
Brand	French	Linthicum	Schall
Britten	Fuller, Ill.	Little	Scott, Iowa
Bridbeck	Gallagher	Littlepage	Scott, Mich.
Browne	Gallivan	Lobeck	Sells
Browning	Gandy	London	Shackleford
Brumbaugh	Gard	Loneragan	Shallenberger
Buchanan	Garland	Longworth	Sherwood
Burnett	Garner	Lufkin	Siegel
Burr	Garrett, Tenn.	Lund	Sisson
Burrheads	Garrett, Tex.	McAndrews	Sloan
Byrnes, S. C.	Glynn	McArthur	Smith, Idaho
Byrns, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	McClintic	Smith, C. B.
Caldwell	Good	McCormick	Smith, T. F.
Campbell, Kans.	Goodall	McCulloch	Stafford
Campbell, Pa.	Gordon	McKenzie	Stegall
Candler, Miss.	Graham, Ill.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stedman
Cantrill	Gray, Ala.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Steenerson
Caraway	Green, Iowa	Magee	Stephens, Miss.
Carew	Greene, Mass.	Maher	Strong
Carter, Mass.	Greene, Vt.	Mansfield	Summers
Carter, Okla.	Gregg	Mapes	Swift
Chandler, N. Y.	Hadley	Martin	Switzer
Chandler, Okla.	Hamilton, Mich.	Mays	Tague
Church	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Minn.	Taylor, Ark.
Claason	Hamlin	Mendell	Thompson
Coady	Harly	Moon	Tillman
Collier	Harrison, Miss.	Moore, Ind.	Towner
Connally, Tex.	Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Treadway
Connelly, Kans.	Hastings	Moran	Vinson
Cooper, Wis.	Haugen	Mott	Voigt
Copley	Havlen	Mudd	Volstead
Cox	Heflin	Neely	Waldow
Crago	Helvering	Nicholls, S. C.	Walker
Cramton	Hensley	Nichols, Mich.	Walton
Currie, Mich.	Hicks	Nolan	Ward
Dale, N. Y.	Hillard	Oldfield	Watkins
Dale, Vt.	Hood	Oliver, Ala.	Watson, Va.
Dallinger	Houston	Oliver, N. Y.	Weaver
Darrow	Howard	Olney	Webb
Davis	Huddleston	Osborne	Welling
Denison	Hull, Iowa	O'Shaunessy	Welty
Dent	Hull, Tenn.	Overstreet	White, Ohio
Denton	Humphreys	Park	Williams
Dickinson	Igoe	Parker, N. Y.	Wilson, La.
Dillon	Jacoway	Peters	Wilson, Tex.
Dixon	James	Pou	Wingo
Dominick	Johnson Ky.	Pratt	Wise
Doolittle	Jones, Tex.	Purnell	Woodyard
Doughton	Jones, Va.	Quin	Young, N. Dak.
Dowell	Juhl	Rausdale	Young, Tex.
Drane	Kahn	Raney	
Dyer	Kearns	Raker	

NAYS—39.

Anthony	Hersey	Platt	Thomas
Cannon	Kennedy, Iowa	Robbins	Tison
Claypool	Leshner	Sanford	Walsh
Dies	McFadden	Shouse	Watson
Ellsworth	McKinley	Slayden	Watson, Pa.
Focht	McLemore	Slomp	Whaley
Gillett	Madden	Snell	Wheeler
Gould	Meeker	Snyder	Wood, Ind.
Gray, N. J.	Merritt	Sterling, Ill.	Woods, Iowa
Heaton	Paige	Temple	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Butler

NOT VOTING—109.

Barkley	Dewalt	Graham, Pa.	King
Barnhart	Dill	Griest	Kreider
Booher	Dooling	Hamill	LaGuardia
Capstick	Doremus	Haskell	Lazaro
Carlin	Drukker	Hawley	Lever
Cary	Dunn	Hayes	Lunn
Clark, Fla.	Dupré	Helntz	McKeown
Clark, Pa.	Edmonds	Helm	Mann
Cooper, Ohio	Esch	Holland	Mason
Cooper, W. Va.	Estopinal	Hollingsworth	Miller, Wash.
Costello	Fairchild, B. L.	Husted	Montague
Crisp	Fairchild, G. W.	Hutchinson	Moore, Pa.
Crosser	Flynn	Ireland	Nelson
Curry, Cal.	Fordney	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norton
Davidson	Fuller, Mass.	Johnson, Wash.	Overmyer
Decker	Glass	Kelly, Pa.	Padgett
Dempsey	Goodwin, Ark.	Kinchelee	Parker, N. J.

Phelan	Sanders, N. Y.	Stephens, Nebr.	Van Dyke
Polk	Scott, Pa.	Sterling, Pa.	Vare
Porter	Scully	Stevenson	Venable
Powers	Sears	Stiness	Vestal
Price	Sherley	Sullivan	White, Me.
Rankin	Sims	Sweet	Wilson, Ill.
Rayburn	Sinnott	Talbot	Winslow
Reed	Small	Taylor, Colo.	Zihlman
Rowland	Smith, Mich.	Templeton	
Russell	Snook	Timberlake	
Sanders, La.	Steele	Tiakham	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. SIMS with Mr. ZIHLMAN.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. CURRY of California.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. REED.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. LAZARO with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. HAWLEY.

Mr. SNOOK with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. LA GUARDIA.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. CRISP with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. McKEOWN with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. MASON.

Mr. DUPRE with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. LUNN with Mr. MILLER of Washington.

Mr. VENABLE with Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. HELM with Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. HEINTZ.

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. SWEET.

Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. CAPSTICK.

Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. NORTON.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. KINCHELOE with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.

Mr. PHELAN with Mr. SINNOTT.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. ESCH.

Mr. DILL with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. POLK with Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. CROSSER with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. HASKELL.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Miss RANKIN.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. CARY.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

A quorum having appeared, the doors were opened.

On motion of Mr. FOSTER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of Samuel T. King (H. R. 9902, 58th Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

My Dear Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM KETTNER.

The SPEAKER. Has the Committee on Mines and Mining any further bill?

Mr. FOSTER. We have not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the call of committees.

The Clerk proceeded with the call of committees. When the Committee on Labor was called,

NATIONAL INSURANCE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT, ETC.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up House joint resolution 189.

The SPEAKER. It seems that there is a special order in reference to these matters. It is as follows:

On motion of Mr. KITCHIN, by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That when bills now on the calendar which are in order on Calendar Wednesday shall have been disposed of the bill H. R. 269 shall be in order on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. KEATING. I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is interested in the bill referred to in that order, is quite willing to waive his rights at this time in order that the Committee on Labor may present this joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. That statement is correct, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution 189, to provide for a commission to inquire into the advisability of establishing national insurance against unemployment, invalidity, and sickness.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar and the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. Cox in the chair. The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

House joint resolution 189.

Resolved, etc., That a commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the Commission on Social Insurance, hereinafter referred to as the commission. The commission shall be composed of five persons, to be appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be employers of labor and two of whom shall be representatives of organized labor, the Secretary of Labor to be the fifth member of the commission and the chairman thereof. It shall be within the power of the Secretary of Labor to select a representative of the Department of Labor to act in his stead in any hearing or investigation in which the Secretary himself may be unable to participate, and said representative shall have full power to act in the name of the Secretary of Labor, but the position of the Secretary of Labor, as the fifth member and as chairman of the commission, shall in no wise be impaired, and in the report, findings, and recommendations of the commission his name and title shall be appended.

SEC. 2. That the members of this commission shall be paid actual traveling and other necessary expenses, and in addition the members of the commission, other than the Secretary of Labor, or his representative appointed by him pursuant to section 1, shall receive a compensation of \$15 per diem while actually engaged in the work of the said commission and while going to or returning from such work.

The commission is authorized, as a whole or by subcommittees of the commission duly appointed, to hold sittings and public hearings anywhere in the United States; to send for persons and papers; to administer oaths; to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses and to compel testimony; to employ such secretaries, experts, stenographers, and other assistants as shall be necessary to carry out the purposes for which said commission is created; and to rent such offices, to purchase such stationery and other supplies, and to have such printing and binding done as may be necessary to carry out the purposes for which the commission is created; and to authorize its members or its employees to travel in or outside of the United States on the business of the commission.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the commission to inquire into the causes of unemployment; to inquire into the subject of systems of insurance, voluntary or obligatory, contributory or noncontributory, now in vogue to meet unemployment, invalidity, and sickness, and to what extent the Government of the United States may aid by establishing a Federal insurance system for the benefit of the wage earners of the United States when in need by reason of involuntary unemployment, whether the unemployment be due to lack of work, to disability arising by reason of sickness, or to the impairment or destruction of earning capacity because of old age. If the commission shall recommend that a Federal insurance system or fund be established by the Government of the United States, it shall prepare and recommend the regulations that would be necessary for the successful administration of a national insurance system or fund, the amount of said fund, and the method of cooperation with existing insurance systems.

SEC. 4. That the commission shall submit, through the President, to Congress a report containing the testimony taken, its findings, and its recommendations on or before the first Monday of December of the year 1918.

SEC. 5. That the sum of \$50,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the use of the commission: *Provided*, That no portion of this money shall be paid except upon the order of said commission signed by the chairman thereof.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Committee would like to secure a vote on this resolution to-night. Under the rule we have two hours for general debate. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE], the ranking minority member on the committee, will, I presume, under the rule, control one half of the time and the other half will be controlled by this side of the House.

This resolution was reported in the last Congress, in practically its present form, by the Committee on Labor. It was a unanimous report, and was made after exhaustive and very interesting hearings. The committee for three or four days listened to gentlemen who may be regarded as experts upon

this subject. They represented every shade of political opinion. We had Republicans, Democrats, Socialists, and Progressives. We had actuaries, insurance commissioners, authors of books, and students of social questions. I think the volume containing those hearings is one that should find a place in the library of every student of public affairs. In this Congress the Committee on Labor, by a unanimous vote, made a second favorable report upon the resolution.

Briefly, the resolution provides for the appointment of a commission to investigate the entire subject of social insurance. The commission is to be named by the President of the United States. It is to consist of five members, two of whom are to be employers of labor, two to be representatives of labor, and the fifth to be the Secretary of Labor. The commission is to submit its findings to Congress.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I notice that the type of insurance is confined to unemployment, invalidity, and sickness. Does the word "invalidity" include death, or is death insurance excluded from this scheme? Is it the purpose of the commission to inquire into a system of State insurance for death?

Mr. KEATING. No; that would not come within the scope of the commission's work. The principal object would be insurance against old age, unemployment, and sickness. In Germany they have maternity insurance.

Mr. BORLAND. Invalidity, I suppose, would mean where a man was crippled?

Mr. KEATING. It is not the object to establish a system like the ordinary life insurance business.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has lagged behind other nations in the matter of social insurance. Germany has led in this as she led in rural credits. This country adopted the principal features of the German rural-credit system. That system had spread over Europe and other portions of the world before it was adopted by the United States. England, France, Germany, Austria, and practically every country on the other side of the Atlantic has some form of social insurance. The experts who appeared before our committee were agreed it was not possible to pick out any one of those European systems and apply it in whole to the United States. It was recognized that conditions in this country were so radically unlike conditions found in other countries that it was deemed necessary for us to fashion an American system. So it was considered best as a first step that we should appoint a commission which would devote itself to the study of all the systems now in existence and determine upon a system that was adapted to American needs, providing the commission found that any social insurance system was desirable in this country. The appropriation of \$50,000, considering the importance of the subject, is a modest one.

I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON].

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman takes his seat, will he yield for a question?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does this include anything about the Government establishing a system of old-age insurance?

Mr. KEATING. Oh, yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. That comes under the term "invalidity"?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; that would come under that term.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, this resolution which has been unanimously reported by two committees provides for the investigation of a subject which has engrossed the minds of statesmen for nearly 40 years. In the last Congress the resolution came up on suspension day under a rule which permitted only 40 minutes of discussion and which prevented a complete analysis of the merits of the resolution. It required a two-thirds vote. We fell 29 votes short. The hearing to which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] has referred covers 317 pages of testimony of expert opinion, of statistical data, of a bibliography of the subject, and furnishes indisputable evidence of the fact that a great deal of literature has accumulated on the subject; that a great deal of knowledge has already been gathered; that the problem which presents itself to-day is how to assort the information now existing on the subject, how to coordinate the efforts made by students of the subject, and how to adapt social legislation to American conditions. The commissioner of insurance from Illinois, Mr. Potts, in the course of his admirable address before the Committee on Labor, made the following interesting statement. He testified on April 6, 1916, and this is what he said:

When the European war is over and conservation and salvage of humanity is supplanted for human wreckage, then the nations of the world will take rank and be measured by a new standard. The rank and standard will be determined by the nation's attitude toward its

wage earners—its common people—its masses. All those traditional things which give a false rank and a false standard to nations must now give way to the establishment of a true national life and higher human betterment. National and industrial efficiency will correspond with the degree of efficiency of the people of each nation, and an efficient people can not exist in nations neglecting its wage earners—its common people, its masses—and social insurance is the one and only method of bringing to these people that efficiency that all successful and progressive nations must possess. If our Nation is to maintain a ranking position with the other nations, it must base its eligibility to its assumed rank by its actual ability to meet all other nations in national, commercial, and industrial contests, and to survive these tests its people must be as efficient as are contesting nations, and our Nation must begin at once to grant our people such opportunities and benefits as will permit them to bring self-standardization and the highest degree of efficiency.

The subject of social insurance covers unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, and health insurance. There will be a very serious disarrangement of industry with the termination of the present war, and the war is going to end some day. With the inevitable collapse of the industries now serving the needs of war, with the suspension of many a normal industry, the finding of a job will be quite a problem for many a man. Millions of men will return from the camps and from the battle fields to find their positions filled by women. There will be great difficulty in adjusting industry to the changed conditions, and then the evil of unemployment will present itself in its most acute form. The time to take up the preparation for that emergency and a comprehensive study of everything connected with it is now.

We should now accumulate the necessary knowledge, so whatever legislation we may be called on to enact will be based upon knowledge, systematized, sifted, analyzed, and brought up to date. There is a general impression that involuntary unemployment is an occasional or accidental thing. It is not so. Unemployment is inherent in the very system of production which characterizes modern industry. There are industries which from their very nature do not permit of constant employment, such as those which serve the caprices of fashion. It is impossible for a merchant or a manufacturer to predict in advance what demand there will be for a certain style of hat. To-day the women choose a hat that will look like a skull cap and to-morrow determine upon a hat that will look like a telescope. All seasonal industries give employment only part of the time.

The movements of labor incident to the removal of harvests means the shifting of men from place to place. Every new invention, every new machine, the application of a new method of division of labor causes a temporary shifting and disassociation of the man from his job. Every change in the tariff, the loss of a market, or the gain of a new one, a change in international relations causes a shifting of men and the separating of men from their jobs. Why, for that matter, competition among workers for wages can only exist on the basis of the presence of a large number of unemployed, ready to take for a lower wage and under worse conditions the places of those who are employed. So unemployment in its very nature is a part and parcel of the present system, which is no system, but chaos incarnate. It is not an accident, it is not an extraneous affair, but it is inherent and intrinsic, so far as the present system of industry is concerned. Thinking men should study the problem with the seriousness which it deserves. During the discussion of the little bill relating to the coal situation in the District of Columbia the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] brought out the point that the miners did not work during the summer; that the mines were idle and the miners were idle. If there had been a comprehensive method, if there had been a comprehensive system, if there had been somehow, somewhere, some one who could suggest to the Government what to do, we would have had the mines and miners working during the summer, so there would have been at all times a plentiful supply of coal and there would have been no unemployment in an industry whose product is always needed. In England they adopted some time ago an elastic system of providing public works, so as to increase the opportunity of the unemployed to find work in times of acute distress. Every industrial crisis means unemployment. Do you gentlemen know that the statistics of unemployment of 1910—statistics which were never assorted and published because they were so shocking—showed the presence of such a large number of unemployed that nobody dared publish the facts? Every industrial crisis brings with it hordes of unemployed, nor are these crises accidents. They have been recurring almost regularly every 10 or 15 years.

We had a crisis in 1819, in 1837, in 1857, in 1873, in 1893, in 1907, and 1912, because of the anarchy and chaos in the modern system of production. Goods are manufactured, not because the people need them at that particular moment, but with the object of sale at some time, the manufacturer taking the chance

of finding a market at some time and of course taking the chance of finding themselves without customers to purchase their goods.

A permanent solution should be found. The long-tried remedies of soup kitchens, vagrancy, and poor laws are out of date and will not do.

The fact that we are at war should not prevent us from taking up the task. See what Germany has done during the war. In the course of the hearing Mr. Stone brought out the fact that Prussia, following the outbreak of the war, appropriated one and a half million marks, or \$375,000, to be spent in combating unemployment through the construction of dikes, the draining of swamps, reforestation, road building, and so forth.

Notwithstanding the extraordinary expenditures called for by the war they found enough wisdom and enough statesmanship to take care of unemployment. If this contest we are now engaged in will not terminate soon, we will have a great deal of unemployment in industries that do not serve the purposes of the war and which are necessarily disarranged. Take the great ladies' garment industry of New York. That industry is to-day in distress because the average worker finds it hard, in view of the rise of cost of food, to spend the necessary amount of money for ladies' garments, and the industry is suffering. There will be a great deal of unemployment in other industries which do not supply absolute necessities.

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

Mr. LONDON. With pleasure.

Mr. GARD. Can the gentleman advise the committee relatively what proportion of involuntary unemployment there is at this time?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, what I am looking into is the future—

Mr. GARD. I understand.

Mr. LONDON. I am not so much concerned for the present moment. I assume there is less unemployment, less involuntary unemployment now than at any time in the history of the country.

Mr. GARD. Is there any?

Mr. LONDON. I assume in some branches of industry there necessarily must be. Take an industry which manufactures luxuries, for instance. Whenever there is a crisis or whenever there is a sudden change in industry the first industries to suffer are the industries that supply luxuries. You can not transfer men from an industry of peace to an industry of war without causing some unemployment. It is impossible for a man who is working in an industry requiring but slight physical effort to transfer himself at once and adapt himself at once to another kind of work which requires a great deal of physical exertion.

It all involves a great deal of suffering. I am looking to the future and I speak for the to-morrow, for the day that is to come, of the problems that will be upon us. I have not attempted to present an exhaustive analysis of the subject. All I am trying to do now is to point out the necessity for studying the problem.

The same thing is true about old-age pensions. The idea of an old man, of a man who has been rendering useful service to a community, finding himself at the age of 50 or 60 compelled to resort to charity is a negation of the most elementary principles of morality. You wonder why the German people to-day stand so loyally by a detestable form of government. You wonder why so many social democrats have tolerated a form of government that is dangerous to the German people and dangerous to the world, and they answer that the German Government, as wicked as it is, was clever enough to take care of the old, to take care of the weak, to attempt to take the thunder away from the Socialists in the eighties when they introduced social insurance, when they introduced old-age pensions and pensions for sickness and injury, so that vagrancy and the need for charity have been reduced to the minimum.

I submit that the things that a feudalistic government could do in order to bribe its people so that they might consent to a continuance of it can be done by a free people in order to help build a free, great, and big nation. The appointment of a commission which will approach the subject with sympathy and with a desire to know will help us to understand the problem and to find a solution.

Several States have attempted to create similar commissions. There is such a proposition before the Legislature of Massachusetts, but the problem is in its very nature national. It can not be solved by the subdivision of a county or of a State, or even by a State. Industry does not confine itself to geographical limits. Commerce does not know State lines. Commerce and industry are national and international. The problems of unemployment, of old-age pensions, of health insurance, can not be effectively solved by a subdivision of the American people. They are national problems and of national concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWNE] would use a little of his time.

Mr. BROWNE. No one has asked for any time on this side.

Mr. KEATING. So far as the Members on this side are concerned, I will ask that the bill be read.

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

Mr. BROWNE. As I understood the gentleman's proposition, it was to close general debate to-day and have the bill go over until next Calendar Wednesday and then have it open to amendment at that time. I therefore yielded up the time on general debate with that understanding.

Mr. KEATING. If that was the understanding, I move that the committee rise.

Mr. THOMAS. Are amendments in order now?

The CHAIRMAN. Not after the motion is made to rise.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Cox, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House joint resolution 189, to provide for a commission to inquire into the advisability of establishing national insurance against unemployment, invalidity, and sickness, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 10, 1918, 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. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate for clerical assistance required by the United States Public Health Service for that portion of the present fiscal year from February to June (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 773); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 774); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mary Ann Ford, daughter of William Boden, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 775); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Thomas J. Craycroft *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 776); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Narcissa E. Wade, sister of Berry M. Webb, deceased, *v. The United States* (H. Doc. No. 777); to the Committee on War Claims and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting a detailed statement of the number of documents received and the number distributed by the Department of Labor during the fiscal year 1916 (H. Doc. No. 778); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 779); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 235), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 8489) providing for the erection of a public building for the city of Urbana, Champaign County, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 8490) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the erection of a Federal building at Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALDOW: A bill (H. R. 8491) empowering the President to take possession and assume control of projects for the generation of hydroelectric power from the waters of Niagara River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 8492) to increase pensions of certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 8493) to regulate solicitation of funds for educational, charitable, and philanthropic purposes, and for war aid and war charity; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 8494) for the relief, civilization, and education of the Alabama and Coushatta Indians, located in Polk County, Tex.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 8495) for increased allowance for carriers on rural free delivery mail routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 214) to pay to Carl Polling, clerk of the late Hon. E. R. Bathrick, the sum of \$166; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. FOSTER: Resolution (H. Res. 215) for consideration of House joint resolution 200; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POUL: Resolution (H. Res. 216) to appoint a special committee to consider all bills and resolutions pertaining to the development and utilization of water power; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 217) instructing the Clerk of the House to secure a service flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS: Resolution (H. Res. 218) providing for an investigation of the Post Office Department in relation to the transmission of mail to our forces abroad; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS: Resolution (H. Res. 219) authorizing the Doorkeeper to appoint an additional page; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 210) for the adoption of an official country service flag by the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) creating a joint committee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and the House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to investigate the present condition of the Post Office Department and to report to Congress such recommendations as will insure prompt and efficient postal administration in the present emergency; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8497) granting a pension to George F. Bostwick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8498) granting a pension to Crawford Byers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8499) granting a pension to Bert Wassem; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8500) granting a pension to Eduard McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8501) granting a pension to Minnie E. Lowery; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BESH LIN: A bill (H. R. 8502) granting a pension to Lucinia Bartholomew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 8503) granting an increase of pension to Lewellyn L. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8504) granting an increase of pension to George Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8505) granting an increase of pension to Stephen K. Lyons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8506) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Hull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 8507) granting a pension to John Sellers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 8508) granting a pension to William Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPSTICK: A bill (H. R. 8509) for the relief of Paul Guenther (Inc.) and Paul Guenther and Olga Guenther; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 8510) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Hyatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 8511) granting a pension to Mary Ann McMailhu; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8512) for the relief of William Thomas Winstanley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 8513) granting a pension to Eliza Frederick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 8514) granting a pension to Charles H. Jessee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 8515) granting a pension to Mary E. Beltzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 8516) granting an increase of pension to Salathiel Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8517) granting a pension to E. Dora Cutler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8518) granting a pension to Lida G. Frantz; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 8519) granting a pension to Martha B. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8520) granting a pension to John H. Norris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of J. Homer Reed; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8522) for the relief of Albert C. Burgess; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8523) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Regan, alias George S. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 8524) granting an increase of pension to Harlan Cowgill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8525) granting a pension to James Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 8526) granting an increase of pension to Jarrett E. Burgess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8527) for the relief of George Miller; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 8528) granting an increase of pension to Phebe Schonhoff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 8529) granting a pension to Sophronia Lemmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8530) granting a pension to George W. Earhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 8531) granting a pension to Taylor Hoskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8532) granting a pension to Joel Petrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8533) granting a pension to William Sizemore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8534) granting a pension to William A. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8535) granting a pension to Charles F. Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8536) granting a pension to Clyde A. Klinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 8537) granting an increase of pension to David Lemon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8538) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8539) granting an increase of pension to James Altic; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8540) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8541) granting an increase of pension to Montgomery Z. Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8542) granting a pension to Margia Alice Raines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8543) granting a pension to William S. Harrell, alias James Strawther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8544) granting a pension to Sarah E. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 8545) for the relief of Leonore M. Sorsby; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 8546) for the relief of John G. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8547) for the relief of Levi R. Whitted; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8548) for the relief of certain pay officers of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8549) for the relief of Paymaster Alvin Hovey-King, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8550) for the relief of Col. Henry L. Newbold; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 8551) granting an increase of pension to Frank H. Bruce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8552) granting a pension to William Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 8553) granting a pension to John Lippincott; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8554) for the relief of William Henry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 8555) granting an increase of pension to Edward Springer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 8556) granting a pension to I. Lillis Pettit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8557) granting a pension to Annie T. La Marche; 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): Resolutions of the City Federation of Colorado Springs, Colo.; City Council of Colorado Springs, Colo.; and the Delaware branch of the National Woman's Party, urging the submission of the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also (by request), resolutions of Universal Commandery, No. 476, A. and I. O. K. of M. Sewickley, Pa., favoring the Moore purple cross bill (H. R. 5410) or the Wolcott purple cross bill (S. 2692); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions of the City Council of Minneapolis, Minn., requesting Congress to pass a law punishing those guilty of impeding or interfering with the United States Government in prosecuting the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolutions of United Mine Workers of America, pledging the loyalty and support of that organization in carrying on the war, and promising not to strike or stop work unless life or health is at stake; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of 289 residents of Wood County, Wis., favoring the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Wisconsin Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, against passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of the American Society of Equity, relative to Government controlling the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the National League of Postmasters of the United States, favoring increase in pay of fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Council of Women, favoring passage of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of George R. Downs and 21 other citizens of Erie, Pa., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 3063, for the repair, preservation, care, and future maintenance of the restored naval brig *Niagara*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COADY: Memorial of Bohemian (Czech) and Slovak citizens of Baltimore City, Md., declaring their loyalty to the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of R. J. Caldwell Co., of New York, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, against the zone system to second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Memorial of the Passaic County (N. J.) Board of Agriculture, relative to the farm-labor situation in New Jersey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the Vernon County board of supervisors, National Council of Women, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Wisconsin State Council of Defense, relative to Members of Congress from Wisconsin giving their support to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Society of Equity, favoring Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Petitions of various women's organizations in Marysville, Ohio, urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, favoring the adoption of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of the National League of Postmasters of the United States, desiring more pay for fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the National Union American Society of Equity, relative to the railroad situation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, opposing the adoption of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of Frank Bogard, of La Salle, Ill., for the relief of rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Memorial of Denver Typographical Union, No. 49, urging passage of House bill 1654, granting an increase in pay to post-office clerks and letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Laura C. Hollschneider, Isis O. Mackenzie, Hallie S. Lock, Harriett T. Dougherty, Elvina A. Baker, C. H. Pettenger, Mary H. Blakely, Jennie C. McGehe, Una G. Roberts, M. D., Matilda Bowman, Mattie MacNeill, Lina Johnson, Emil Johnson, Cora E. Lind, Emma E. Smith, William S. White, Mrs. Caroline White, Walter C. Beall, Mary A. Wascha, Ida A. Hart, Melissa Ruddett, A. B. Hart, Albert E. Chase, John W. Hart, Mary E. Hughes, Mary Wascha, Terence Hughes, Martin John Suhly, William A. Grund, and Mrs. William A. Grund, all of Denver, Colo., urging the immediate adoption of the national-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. KAHN: Papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to E. Dora Cutler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Alaska Fisherman's Union, urging the passage of House bill 5875, for the erection of a general hospital on or near the shores of Bristol Bay, Alaska; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Stockton, Cal.; Chamber of Commerce of Santa Barbara County, Cal.; San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce; Chamber of Commerce of San Jose, Cal.; and the Humboldt Chamber of Commerce, Eureka, Cal., indorsing the proposed military highway from Blaine, Wash., to San Diego, Cal., as a means of protection to the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Lock Haven, Pa., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Letters and telegrams from 16 citizens of Baltimore, Md., asking for the submission of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, letters and telegrams from six Baltimore citizens against the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial from the Maryland Woman Suffrage Association, the Woman Suffrage League of Maryland, and of the Baltimore Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, urging favorable vote on the suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, petition of A. R. Katz and the members of the firm of Lyon, Conklin & Co. (Inc.), urging the passage of the Chamberlain universal military training bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Traffic Club, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the Madden bill, H. R. 1654; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a letter from McCormick & Co., Baltimore, Md., protesting against the reduction of second-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the E. E. Jackson Lumber Co., Baltimore, Md., relative to eight hours a day for all workers; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of S. Nalle Sons, Baltimore, Md., against repeal of the bankruptcy law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Schapiro Waist Co., against the repeal of the bankruptcy law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of 68 citizens of Hartford County, Conn., in favor of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Petitions of citizens of Manchester, Mass., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of numerous citizens of Noble County, Okla., praying for an amendment to the Constitution expressing our national acknowledgment of Almighty God; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of the New York State Wholesale Bakers' Association, by Mr. F. W. Dawdy, treasurer, Elmira, N. Y., favoring congressional action to fix the price of corn, barley, rye, and oats in the same manner as has been done in fixing the price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the New York State Wholesale Bakers' Association, by the Nye Baking Co., of Owego, N. Y., favoring appropriate action to fix the price of corn, barley, rye, and oats in the same manner as has been done in the price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE: Petition of men and women of Cecil County, Md., favoring the woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Resolution of the Bronx Board of Trade, New York City, N. Y., protesting against the discontinuance of the pneumatic-mail service for New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STEVENSON: Petition of prominent men and women of Lancaster County, S. C., desiring the immediate submission of the Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Rhode Island, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer H. Spaulding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of rural letter carriers of Madison County, Ind., urging increase in salary, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of the eighth district of Indiana, urging passage of Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 10, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the midst of the world's great clamor for justice and freedom we pray that Thou wilt help us first of all to be just to ourselves, that we may hold ourselves to the highest standard, that we may appear before God clear upon Thy book, that our hearts may be right in Thy sight. If we are just to ourselves we know that we can afford to be generous to others. So do Thou mold us according to Thy will and enable us to bring ourselves completely into submission to the Divine will. To this end do Thou bless us and guide us to-day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.