

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Joseph W. Osborn, Porterdale.

OKLAHOMA.

J. T. Holley, Stigler.

PENNSYLVANIA.

John H. Fahl, Auburn.

Watson B. Reisinger, Wrightsville.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 27 (legislative day of March 26), 1918.

POSTMASTER.

Roy F. Santner to be postmaster at Glen Elder, Kans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, March 27, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou who hearest and answerest prayer, our God and our Father, hear and answer our prayers, mingled with the prayers of our allies.

Our heroic sacrifices mingled with the heroic sacrifices of our allies, our patriotism mingled with the patriotism of our allies pours itself out in deeds of heroism and valor, in defense of human liberty.

Our tears and sobs mingle with the tears and sobs of our allies for the precious dead and dying, the wounded and mangled on the field of carnage.

These are our prayers which spring spontaneously and fervently from the heart in behalf of human rights.

Thou art the God of justice, mercy, and love; all our faith and confidence are centered in Thee. In this hour of supreme trial, forsake us not, we beseech Thee, in the name of the world's great Redeemer. Amen.

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

REPORTING OF ILLNESS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent for three minutes in which to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent for three minutes in which to make a statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have asked for this time in order to have read at the desk a letter in regard to the illness and death of a sailor, statements having already been made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] in regard to the illness of soldiers and the reporting of such illness.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., March 20, 1918.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A friend of mine named Anderson Knowles enlisted in the Navy at Bremerton about eight months ago. He bought a \$50 liberty bond, took out \$5,000 worth of insurance, and sent all his spare money to his mother as long as he was stationed at Bremerton.

Quite a while ago he was sent East, and his mother heard nothing from him for many weeks. Finally she received a telegraphic notice of his death somewhere in Massachusetts from pneumonia, and word that his body would be sent to her. She does not know whether he was sick for a long or short time, and is in much distress.

I do not wish to publish any complaint, or, in fact, to make any complaint, but I have a boy at Bremerton likely to be sent away any day, and I should like to feel that should he be taken down by sickness I would be notified of his condition.

Yours, truly,

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the Members that I understand that the Army is undertaking to send notice to parents of the serious illness of their sons. This is in line with what the Reavis resolution sought to accomplish. It is right and proper. I sincerely hope that a similar policy may prevail in the Navy.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I have made several applications to the Bureau of Navigation in the Navy Department to learn of the condition

of sailors in different parts of the world, and at no time have I failed to receive the information promptly, even though it was obtained by cable. I suggest to the gentleman—and I am in entire sympathy with the movement which he generously desires to make—that if he desires the information for any of his constituents he will ask the Bureau of Navigation to furnish the information, when I am sure it will be supplied cheerfully and readily. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman permit? If the parents of a sick sailor boy are not notified, certainly his Member in Congress can not be notified by the parents.

Mr. BUTLER. That may be true, but why does not the parent or some one interested in the parent apply to the Bureau of Navigation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They have had no notification of his illness, which is the very point.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I wish to state that my experience in getting information in relation to sick and deceased soldiers is the same as that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. A short time ago a young man of my district who had enlisted in the marines lost his life on one of our battleships at sea. I went to headquarters, and they did everything that could be done, not only the chief clerk but the officer in charge. At the Navy Department they took pains to send a wireless message, and furnished me with immediate information. I was not denied information in any way. And not only the officers themselves but also their secretaries took a personal interest in furnishing all possible information.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 9867. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

CORRECTION IN ENGROSSMENT OF BILL (H. R. 9414).

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, on page 4104, where the section making appropriation for the bill that passed yesterday occurs, the motion was made—

That additional compensation granted by the provisions of this bill shall be paid out of the revenues of the Post Office Department.

I want to ask unanimous consent, before the bill is printed, to strike out the word "bill" and insert the word "act." That is the usual provision.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill that was passed yesterday that the word "bill" be changed to the word "act" in the connection stated by him. Without objection, the correction will be made, and the enrolling clerk will take notice.

There was no objection.

THE BUDGET SYSTEM (H. DOC. NO. 1006).

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Colorado yield to me in order to place a small privileged resolution before the House?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Colorado in a minute.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 289 (H. Rept. No. 416).

Resolved, That there shall be printed 1,000 additional copies of A Brief on the Adoption of a National Budget System for use in the House document room.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, has consent been procured?

The SPEAKER. It does not take consent.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to ask the gentleman if this resolution that is being presented is predicated upon any reasonable expectation that some action is to be had during the present session looking to the adoption of a budget system?

Mr. BARNHART. I am not authorized to speak as to that. It is a very feasible proposition. I can say, so far as I am concerned personally, that I would be in favor of taking up such a proposition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I have any objection to the resolution, but I call attention to the fact that this is Calendar Wednesday, and no business is in order except Calendar Wednesday business, unless that is dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will not insist on it if it takes only a short time, but—

Mr. McCORMICK. I hope the gentleman will not object. This matter interests all the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is going to make a speech the Chair will rule this out of order.

Mr. WALSH. If you have got to act upon resolutions without information, I suppose a request for information is out of order.

The SPEAKER. Well, the rule is—

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman was attempting to answer a question that I propounded when this interruption came.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can answer the question. Mr. BARNHART. He had answered it before this interruption took place.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following personal request, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 25, 1918.

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

DEAR SIR: I ask a couple of weeks' leave of absence from the House, on account of the illness of myself.

I am, respectfully,

CALER POWERS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF THE WAR-RISK INSURANCE BILL.

Mr. RAYBURN rose.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to make an inquiry of the Speaker. The Senate, on Senate joint resolution 133, refused to concur in the House amendments and asked for a conference. That is the resolution authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured. The House agreed to the conference. This morning we met, and when the House amendments were explained to the Senate committee they asked the privilege of going back to the Senate and moving that they rescind their action in asking for a conference, stating that they were going to move that the Senate concur in the House amendments. I do not know in what shape that leaves it.

The SPEAKER. That automatically kills the conference.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that ought to be laid down as a rule.

The SPEAKER. Did not the Senate agree to the House bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. What the gentleman from Texas reports is that they met in conference, and, without having made any report at all, the Senate conferees proposed to go back and recede from their position.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thought they had gone back and receded.

Mr. SHERLEY. No. The papers are in the hands of the conferees, and not in the hands of either House, and there ought to be a report made by the conferees to the respective Houses.

Mr. RAYBURN. That was what I was going to ask. I do not know what the practice is in the premises.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, the House agreed to the conference report, and therefore the papers are in the possession of the House conferees.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Therefore it is necessary, as I see it, for the conferees on the part of the House to make a formal report.

The SPEAKER. But the House conferees can not make a report until they know what the Senate does.

Mr. SHERLEY. They can report a disagreement and have the conference ended in that way. But the Senate can not act,

not having the papers. It can not dispose of a conference simply on its own accord.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Senate has such rules that they can move to reconsider the matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the matter be allowed to go over until to-morrow.

FUEL ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for seven minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to address the House for seven minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I shall object to further speeches this morning.

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we know on what topic?

Mr. KEATING. It is on the order of the Fuel Administration. Mr. McCORMICK. As it affects Colorado?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on March 11 the National Fuel Administration reduced the price of bituminous lump coal at the mine in Colorado 50 cents a ton, and announced that on April 1 there would be a further reduction of 70 cents a ton. Other varieties of coal were reduced in proportion. I was notified of the action of the Fuel Administration through the following letter from Mr. Harry D. Nims, assistant to Dr. Garfield:

UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION,
March 8, 1918.

Hon. EDWARD KEATING,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KEATING: We have telegraphed to Colorado a new schedule of prices effective 7 a. m., March 11, 1918, as follows:

Bituminous domestic coal:	
Run of mine	\$2.25
Prepared sizes	3.50
Slack of screenings	1.25
Bituminous steam coal, Trinidad district:	
Run of mine	2.35
Prepared sizes	3.25
Slack of screenings	1.65
Lignite coal:	
Run of mine	2.25
Prepared sizes	3.25
Slack of screenings	1.00

The above prices are subject to the following summer reductions:

Bituminous domestic coal:	
Apr. 1	\$0.70
May 1	.50
June 1	.35
Aug. 1	.15
Bituminous steam coal, Trinidad district:	
Apr. 1	.40
May 1	.30
June 1	.20
July 1	.10

I hope this will meet your approval and that you will agree with us that it should iron out most of the difficulties which have been involved in the situation.

Very truly, yours,

UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION,
By HARRY D. NIMS.

The moment it became known that the Fuel Administration had ordered a reduction in the price of coal in Colorado the coal mine operators of that State began bombarding Congress and the Fuel Administration with telegrams of protest. They asserted that the reduction would close scores of mines and seriously curtail the output of the State. In fact, one earnest protestant went so far as to say that thousands of miners had already been dismissed and that the State's coal production had been cut in two.

These statements found their way into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, as I had urged the National Fuel Administration to cut the price of coal, I was naturally curious to ascertain just how much truth there was in these alarming stories. I wired to friends in Colorado asking for the facts, and received many replies. Among those I addressed was John A. Rush, a prominent attorney of Denver and the president of the Consumers' League of that city. This league was formed for the purpose of protecting the people against the exactions of the coal interests, and it has done much excellent work. As Mr. Rush was out of the city when my telegram reached Denver his law partner, Mr. Foster Cline, replied as follows:

John Lawson, John McLennon, the State mine inspector, and others say there are more coal miners now at work than ever before for the month of March. Some few mines are closed as usual for this time of the year because their coal can not be stored. Some smaller mines are short of orders because the consumers are waiting for lower prices on April 1.

John Lawson and John McLennon, referred to in the telegram, are leading officials of the miners' organization, and therefore in a position to know conditions at the various mines.

One of the leading newspaper men of Colorado wired me, denying the alarming reports circulated by the coal operators and concluding with the expressive, if not elegant, expression, "It is all bunk."

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to injure the coal-mining industry in Colorado or elsewhere, but it is just as well that gentlemen should understand that the coal consumers of this country have some rights which the Fuel Administration and the coal-mine owners are bound to respect. When Congress enacted the law which gave the President control over the coal mines of this country I am sure it was not our purpose to have that law administered exclusively in the interests of the men who own coal mines. If I understood the purpose of Congress, it was that the Fuel Administration should fix the price of coal at a figure which would insure every one engaged in the business a generous profit, but which at the same time would safeguard the public against extortion.

I think that was the thought that Dr. Garfield had in mind when he accepted the position of Fuel Administrator; but I am also convinced that at times he has been sadly imposed upon by representatives of the mine owners and that he has been led to issue orders which were not in the public interest.

In that connection Colorado's experience may prove illuminating. Some time in August last the President of the United States fixed the price of bituminous lump coal at the mine in Colorado at \$2.70 a ton. At that time the people of Colorado were complaining that the price of coal was unreasonably high. This complaint, by the way, was not confined to Colorado but was quite general throughout the Nation, and the justice of it was largely responsible for the passage of the bill placing coal mines under governmental control. The people of Colorado, in common with the people of the rest of the country, looked for relief through governmental regulation. You can therefore imagine their surprise when on the 1st of October, instead of reducing the price of coal, the National Fuel Administration issued an order advancing the price of bituminous lump coal from \$2.70, the figure fixed by the President, to \$4 a ton. This was done at the urgent solicitation of a committee of coal-mine owners which had been sent to Washington from Colorado. The coal consumers were given no chance to present their side of the case, and the first they knew of the decision was when it was announced in my home town—Pueblo, Colo.—that the retail price of lump coal, instead of being reduced, would be advanced 50 cents a ton.

I immediately began to receive protests by letter and telegram, and I suggested to the Fuel Administration that the order advancing the price of coal be suspended until such time as all the parties in interest could be heard. This was not done, but Mr. H. D. Nims, representing Dr. Garfield, assured me he would be glad to make an investigation. When he learned that I was about to leave for Colorado he suggested that I examine into the situation "from the consumer's point of view" and let him know the result.

I agreed to do this, and on my arrival in Colorado went to some trouble to get at the facts. I found that the city of Denver was operating a municipal coal yard, having been compelled to enter into the coal business because of the unreasonable prices charged by the coal dealers. The city purchased its coal from two independent coal operators and paid \$2.20 a ton for lump coal at the mine. The leading paper of Denver, the Post, was also in the coal business, and I found it was purchasing its coal from three different companies on the basis of \$2.10 a ton for lump coal at the mouth of the mine. Here were five companies selling lump coal at the mouth of the mine for \$2.10 and \$2.20 a ton and making money, while the National Fuel Administration was insisting that \$4 a ton was a reasonable price.

Mr. SLAYDEN. At the mine?

Mr. KEATING. At the mine.

Mr. SHERWOOD. For the same class of coal?

Mr. KEATING. In some cases.

Mr. FARR. Does the gentleman say it was the same class of coal?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. In some cases it was the same kind and in some cases not.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand, the Fuel Administrator fixed \$4 a ton, and the dealers raised the price to the consumer 50 cents?

Mr. KEATING. Yes; the price—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given such time as he requires.

Mr. KEATING. It will require only a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. I transmitted these and other facts to the Washington office of the Fuel Administrator, and urged that an investigation be made and that the price of coal be reduced.

The exactions of the coal interests aroused deep resentment among the people, and organizations were formed all over the State to assist in the fight for fair coal rates, but nothing definite was accomplished. Instead the President ordered an additional advance of 45 cents a ton to cover the cost of an increase of wages which he had authorized. There was little opposition to this, because the people felt the money was going to those who actually dug the coal, but they continued to insist that the original increase authorized by the Fuel Administration of \$1.30 a ton was without justification.

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

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. During the confusion I did not hear the early part of the gentleman's remarks. Did I understand him aright that he contends that the people have some rights that the Fuel Administrator is bound to respect?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. Not only that, but I am trying to demonstrate that the Fuel Administration is recognizing the rights of the people.

When I returned to Washington in December I again presented the facts to the Fuel Administration, and after many conferences was told that the entire subject would be referred to a board made up of experienced coal men, who would go over the cost sheets of the coal companies and all other data which might be available. This board devoted much time to the work, and I am sure was in no sense unfriendly to the coal-mine owners. It was on the recommendation of this board that Dr. Garfield finally ordered the reduction in the price of coal in Colorado to which I have referred.

Therefore the reduction was not made hastily. It was not suggested by inexperienced men who had only an "academic" knowledge of the coal business. It was made after the people of Colorado had been compelled to pay exorbitant prices for a period of five months, and after the facts had been so clearly proven that they could no longer be controverted.

In support of this latter statement permit me to quote from a letter written to Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS, of Colorado, by Dr. Garfield on March 20, 1918. After stating that he had based his action in the Colorado case on a report submitted to him by a committee of engineers, consisting of Mr. Cyrus Garnsey, jr., Mr. R. V. Norris, and Mr. James H. Allport, all experienced coal men, Dr. Garfield writes:

I have examined the costs reported by 13 of the mines reported by Mr. Nash to have shut down; the sheets of the others, apparently, have not been turned in to the Federal Trade Commission. The costs reported reveal the fact that not in a single instance did the August costs reported by the mine exceed the price fixed. Indeed, the highest cost for August allowed a profit of 2 cents per ton and the lowest 80 cents per ton. In September two of these mines reported costs slightly in excess of the price fixed. In one case only was the cost excessively high, and that was of a mine which produced only 298 tons. This mine reported \$1.69 less cost per ton on a still smaller tonnage for August.

An examination of the costs available of these mines does not warrant the assumption that they have closed down because of inability to produce at a profit.

Sincerely, yours,

(Signed) H. A. GARFIELD,
United States Fuel Administrator.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman tell me the highest price he knows of that any consumer paid for soft coal in Colorado?

Mr. KEATING. That would depend on the location. In the mountain districts it went very high.

Mr. SNYDER. About how high?

Mr. KEATING. In my own town, which is in the valley, it was \$7.25.

Mr. SNYDER. I just want to say that there are some consumers in the East who are now paying as high as \$4.50 at the mine.

Mr. KEATING. The situation in the East and the situation in the West are not at all alike. In the West we had no coal shortage worth mentioning. There it was entirely a question of price; and our contention was that the price charged by the coal-mine owners was unreasonable and extortionate.

Mr. SNYDER. I think the gentleman is quite right. I just asked for information, that is all.

Mr. KEATING. My only criticism of the Fuel Administration is that it was unreasonably slow in responding to the complaints of the coal consumers of Colorado; but, in explanation of the administration's conduct, it is only fair to state that Dr. Garfield and his lieutenants were so busy endeavoring to straighten out the coal situation in the Northern and Eastern States that they had little time to devote to Colorado's problems.

My object in making this statement to-day and in taking up the time of the House in this fashion is to indorse the order of the Fuel Administration and to express the hope that Dr. Garfield will not be influenced by the clamor of the profiteers. [Applause.]

When I returned from Colorado last December I submitted the following statement to the Fuel Administration at the request of Mr. Nims, Dr. Garfield's assistant:

DECEMBER 6, 1917,

Mr. H. D. NIMS,
United States Fuel Administration,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NIMS: When I was leaving for Colorado early in October you asked me to report to you on the coal situation in that State "from the consumer's point of view." I endeavored to comply, and from the 14th to the 20th of October submitted to you by wire the results of investigations which I conducted in Denver, Pueblo, and other Colorado cities and towns.

Permit me to again summarize my findings, which I assure you can be supported by ample evidence:

COST OF COAL AT THE MINES.

President Wilson fixed the price of bituminous lump coal at the mines in Colorado at \$2.70 per ton. At the solicitation of the coal-mine owners, your office on October 4 advanced this price to \$4 per ton and, later on, the President added another 45 cents to cover a general advance in wages which he authorized. Corresponding advances were made in the Colorado lignite fields. I will not burden you with all the figures, as I know you have them in your office. For the purposes of this letter, I will deal with the price of bituminous lump, which is the coal used by the people of my home city—Pueblo, Colo.—but the argument which I will make for the reduction of the price of bituminous will apply with equal force to lignite, the coal largely used by the people of Denver and other northern Colorado towns.

In my judgment the Fuel Administration's action in advancing the price of bituminous lump from \$2.70 to \$4 was without justification and should be rescinded.

When this advance was ordered, and for weeks thereafter—or until the President directed the last advance of 45 cents per ton—the Denver Post was purchasing both lignite and bituminous lump at the mine for \$2.10 per ton and carrying on an extensive retail trade in the same in the city of Denver.

Mayor Robert W. Speer, of Denver, on behalf of the municipal coal yard, was purchasing lignite lump from three different companies for \$2.20 per ton and selling the same to the people.

Mayor Speer and the Post took practically the entire output of five coal mines at the prices indicated, and my information leads me to believe that the coal operators made a reasonable profit.

If five companies—operating under union conditions and without any material natural advantage—could afford to sell lump coal at the mine for \$2.10 and \$2.20, why was it necessary for the Fuel Administration to authorize an advance to \$4 a ton?

On April 1, 1917, all the retail coal dealers of Pueblo were purchasing bituminous lump at the mines for \$2.75 a ton, and the coal companies were prospering.

What occurred between April 1, 1917, and October 1, 1917, to justify an advance of \$1.25 a ton? I have endeavored to ascertain the facts and am convinced that 25 cents a ton would more than cover any increase in cost of production.

Bituminous lump should be reduced \$1 a ton at the mines and a similar cut should be made in lignite.

I have received a number of complaints from granges and other organizations which have been accustomed to buying coal in carload lots and distributing it among their members. They allege that since you issued your regulations, the dealers' combines have induced many of the coal companies to refuse to sell to them. Other citizens have had similar experiences.

I hope it will be possible for you to break up these combines and to restore free competition. There should be no question about the citizen's right to purchase at the mine in carload lots.

As I stated to you in my telegram of October 18, I am sure that an investigation will show that the consumers of Colorado are paying not less than \$1.50 a ton too much for their coal.

They have submitted to this extortion with marvelous patience, hoping that the National Fuel Administrator, exercising the ample powers vested in him by Congress, would eventually afford relief. That relief, if it is to be of value, must be granted at once. Already many of our citizens have purchased their winter's supply of coal. You can not return the money which has been unjustly taken from them, but you can protect the pocketbooks of the others.

Sincerely,

EDWARD KEATING.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order to-day under the rule.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the attitude of the majority leader [Mr. KITCHIN] is on that question. I have not talked with him personally, but representing him here in his absence I think, from what understanding I have of the matter, I shall have to object to unanimous consent.

Mr. LEVER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the proceedings in order to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is entitled to five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I have five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman does not care to debate it, I do not care to do so.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business.

The question being taken, on a division, demanded by Mr. STAFFORD, there were—ayes 104, noes 24.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 47, not voting 85, as follows:

YEAS—299.

Alexander	Esch	Kreider	Rucker
Almon	Evans	La Follette	Russell
Ashbrook	Fairchild, G. W.	Larsen	Sanders, Ind.
Aswell	Fairfield	Lazaro	Sanders, La.
Austin	Farr	Lee, Cal.	Sanford
Ayres	Ferris	Lee, Ga.	Saunders, Va.
Baer	Fields	Lehlbach	Scott, Iowa
Bankhead	Fisher	Leshner	Scott, Mich.
Barkley	Focht	Lever	Sears
Barnhart	Fordney	Little	Sells
Beakes	Foss	Lobeck	Shackleford
Bell	Foster	London	Shallenberger
Beshlin	Francis	Longworth	Sherwood
Black	Frear	Lundeen	Shouse
Bland	Freeman	Lunn	Sims
Booher	French	McAndrews	Sinnott
Bowers	Fuller, Ill.	McClintic	Sisson
Brand	Gallagher	McCormick	Slayden
Britten	Garland	McFadden	Slomp
Brodbeck	Garrett, Tex.	McKenzie	Sloan
Brown	Glynn	McKeown	Smith, Idaho
Browning	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Brumbaugh	Gordon	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snell
Buchanan	Graham, Ill.	McLemore	Snook
Burroughs	Gray, Ala.	Madden	Stegall
Butler	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Stedman
Byrnes, S. C.	Green, Iowa	Mansfield	Steele
Byrnes, Tenn.	Hadley	Mapes	Steenson
Campbell, Kans.	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Campbell, Pa.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mason	Stephens, Nebr.
Candler, Miss.	Hamlin	Mays	Sterling, Ill.
Cantrill	Hardy	Meeker	Stevenson
Caraway	Harrison, Va.	Montague	Stines
Carl	Haskell	Moon	Strong
Carter, Okla.	Hastings	Moore, Ind.	Sumners
Cary	Haugen	Morgan	Sweet
Chandler, Okla.	Hawley	Morin	Swift
Clark, Fla.	Hayden	Mudd	Switzer
Clark, Pa.	Heaton	Neely	Tague
Claypool	Heflin	Nelson	Talbot
Cleary	Helm	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Coady	Helvering	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Colo.
Collier	Hensley	Nolan	Temple
Connelly, Kans.	Hicks	Norton	Thompson
Cooper, Wis.	Hilliard	Oldfield	Tillman
Cox	Holland	Oliver, Ala.	Timberlake
Crago	Hood	Oliver, N. Y.	Towner
Cramton	Houston	Olney	Vare
Crisp	Howard	Osborne	Venable
Crosser	Huddleston	O'Shaunessy	Vestal
Currer, Mich.	Hull, Iowa	Overstreet	Vinson
Dallinger	Hull, Tenn.	Padgett	Voigt
Dalring	Hutchinson	Park	Volstead
Davis	Igoe	Parker, N. Y.	Waldow
Decker	Ireland	Phean	Walker
Dempsey	Jacoway	Polk	Walton
Dent	James	Porter	Wason
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Pou	Watkins
Dickinson	Johnson, Wash.	Pratt	Watson, P. I.
Dill	Jones, Tex.	Purnell	Watson, Va.
Dillon	Jones, Va.	Quin	Weaver
Dixon	Juul	Ragsdale	Webb
Dominick	Kearns	Raker	Welling
Donovan	Keating	Ramsey	Welty
Doolittle	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	Whaley
Doughton	Kelly, Pa.	Randall	Wheeler
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Rankin	White, Ohio
Drane	Kettner	Reavis	Wilson, La.
Dunn	Key, Ohio	Reed	Wingo
Dupré	Kless, Pa.	Robinson	Wise
Dyer	Kincheloe	Rodenberg	Woods, Iowa
Eagan	King	Romjue	Woodyard
Eagle	Kinkaid	Rose	Young, N. Dak.
Elliott	Knutson	Rowe	Zihlman
Emerson	Kraus	Ruby	

NAYS—47.

Anthony	Elston	Langley	Sabath
Bacharach	Fuller, Mass.	Loneragan	Sherley
Burnett	Gallivan	Lufkin	Smith, C. B.
Cannon	Garner	Maher	Snyder
Connally, Tex.	Garrett, Tenn.	Merritt	Stafford
Dale, N. Y.	Gillett	Paige	Tilson
Dale, Vt.	Greene, Mass.	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Delaney	Greene, Vt.	Rainey	Walsh
Denison	Gregg	Rayburn	Wilson, Ill.
Dooling	Griffin	Riordan	Winslow
Doremus	Humphreys	Robbins	Young, Tex.
Edmonds	Husted	Rogers	

NOT VOTING—85.

Anderson	Church	Denton	Flynn
Blackmon	Classon	Dies	Gandy
Blanton	Cooper, Ohio	Drukker	Gard
Borland	Cooper, W. Va.	Ellsworth	Glass
Caldwell	Copley	Estopinal	Godwin, N. C.
Carew	Costello	Fairchild, B. I.	Good
Carter, Mass.	Curry, Cal.	Fess	Goodall
Chandler, N. Y.	Davidson	Flood	Gould

Graham, Pa.	Lenroot	Platt	Sullivan
Griest	Linthicum	Powers	Templeton
Hamill	Littlepage	Price	Thomas
Harrison, Miss.	McArthur	Roberts	Tinkham
Hayes	McCulloch	Rouse	Van Dyke
Heintz	McKinley	Rowland	Ward
Hersey	Mann	Sanders, N. Y.	White, Mo.
Hollingsworth	Miller, Minn.	Shall	Williams
Johnson, S. Dak.	Miller, Wash.	Scott, Pa.	Wilson, Tex.
Kahn	Mondell	Scully	Wood, Ind.
Kehoe	Moore, Pa.	Siegel	Wright
Kennedy, R. I.	Mott	Small	
Kitchin	Overmyer	Smith, T. F.	
LaGuardia	Peters	Sterling, Pa.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BLANTON with Mr. MCKINLEY.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.
 Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. DAVIDSON.
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. FEISS.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. ROBERTS.
 Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. DENTON with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. FLOOD with Mr. GRAHAM.
 Mr. CHURCH with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. GARD with Mr. HERSEY.
 Mr. GANDY with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MANN.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. McCULLOCH.
 Mr. ROUSE with Mr. McARTHUR.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. PETERS.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
 Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. ANDERSON.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

SALE OF SEED GRAIN TO FARMERS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (H. Rept. No. 417) from the Committee on Rules, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 281.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the following bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture as a committee substitute for H. R. 7795:

"A bill to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers in certain areas for the production of grain through advances, loans, and otherwise, and by providing for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1918, to make advances or loans to farmers in spring-wheat areas of the United States where he shall find special need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes, or, when necessary, to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each such farmer to use the seed thus to be obtained by him for the production of grain during the crop season of 1918. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450. All such advances or loans shall, as far as practicable, be made through the agency of State and National banks. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500,000, available immediately.

"Sec. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to provide for and secure the voluntary mobilization and distribution of farm labor for the production and harvesting of agricultural crops for the year 1918, and to advance railroad fares and other actual traveling expenses for the transportation of such labor, upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as he shall pre-

scribe. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500,000, available immediately.

"Sec. 3. That, in carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Labor or any other Federal, State, county, or municipal department, agency, or officer, or with any person or with any association of farmers, board of trade, chamber of commerce, or similar organization.

"Sec. 4. That until the purposes of this act have been accomplished the Secretary of Agriculture shall, as soon as possible after the close of each calendar year, cause to be made to the Congress a detailed report showing all proceedings and transactions under this act during such calendar year. Such report shall, in addition to other matters, contain a statement of all persons employed, the salary or compensation of each, the aggregate amount of loans, advances, or sales, and the total amount thereof unpaid, and all receipts and disbursements under this act. All moneys collected by the United States under this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Sec. 5. That any person who shall knowingly make any false representation for the purpose of obtaining an advance, loan, or sale under this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months, or both.

"Sec. 6. That not exceeding \$100,000 of the moneys appropriated by this act may be expended for the payment of such administrative expenses, including such rent, the expense of such printing and publications, the purchase of such supplies and equipment, and the employment of such persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary for the purposes of this act."

Resolved further, That there shall be not exceeding two hours of general debate, the time to be controlled, one hour by Mr. LEVER and one hour by Mr. HAUGEN; that all debate shall be confined to the subject matter of the bill; that at the expiration of the general debate the committee substitute shall be read section by section for amendment under the five-minute rule; that at the conclusion of such reading the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and amendments to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommitt.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
 Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the rule by striking out "two hours" and inserting "four hours."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can not get the floor to make that motion.

Mr. WALSH. I have been recognized, I submit. I was asked why I rose.

Mr. FOSTER. Under all parliamentary rules the gentleman has no such right. I was on my feet just as the Clerk completed the reading of the rule.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman was on his feet, but not seeking recognition.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman was seeking it at the proper time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois had had recognition.

Mr. POU. The motion is not in order.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman can not supersede me by getting up and "hollering" out in that way.

Mr. WALSH. It is necessary to "holler" out to obtain recognition from the Chair, and I received recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois already had recognition. The gentleman from Illinois had the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, does the Chair rule that my motion is out of order?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the committee substitute for H. R. 7795, which is for furnishing of seed to farmers by the Government to increase the supply of food for the coming year. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules, has just been called to the War Department, and he requests me to state for him that he is in favor of the rule and also for the bill.

Personally, I think this rule simply makes it in order for this House to consider another one of those radical measures that we have been accustomed to consider during the present session of Congress under the caption of war-emergency legislation. Last week when we were discussing the war finance corporation bill that measure was characterized, as I remember it, by both the leader of the minority and the majority as one of the most radical measures that had ever come before the House, and as a measure that would not receive a moment's consideration in time of peace. I believe this measure is even more radical than the war finance corporation bill, and goes further toward

committing the Federal Government to the policy of paternalism than any measure yet considered, and when we have once committed this Government to the principle of paternalism it is going to be mighty difficult to get away from it. Personally I am against this Government adopting that principle, but as long as we have adopted it, as far as big business is concerned, ship-building, public utilities, and the railroads, I do not believe we can consistently refuse to comply with the request from the farmers when their request is a moderate one, when we consider that they are conducting the most important business in this country at the present time, not only from our own standpoint, but from the standpoint of our allies. [Applause.] And if loaning them a small amount of money will in any way increase the food production during the present season, I think we are under obligations to do it, no matter how radical the measure may seem to be at the present time.

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

Mr. SNELL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does not the gentleman think that this bill would accomplish the end more effectively if it were broadened so as to include other farm products?

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman will wait a moment, I shall come to that.

Mr. SNYDER rose.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wish the gentleman would discuss the corn-seed problem.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. To the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has had any particular deluge of requests from farmers in his district for this measure?

Mr. SNELL. Not a one, as far as seed is concerned, but many on subject of labor shortage.

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

Mr. SNELL. I want first to finish my statement, and then I will yield. I consider that when we adopt the provisions carried in this bill we are committing this Government to the wildest kind of wildcat banking, and I doubt if much of this money will ever be returned to the United States Treasury. But, on the other hand, if we are going to consider this legislation at all, it should be considered at this time, because if we wait a little longer it will not do any good to the farmer and not in any way help to increase the crop for 1918.

Now, just a moment on the provisions of the bill itself. Section 1 appropriates \$7,500,000 for relief of farmers in the spring-wheat areas of the United States. This, of course, to a large degree confines the relief to the Northwest. As I look at the whole bill, if it is good for the Northwest, it ought to be good for the Northeast; if it is a good thing for the State of Montana, it ought to be a good thing for the State of Maine; and, whether the people of my district have requested it or not, if it is the proper thing that this Government should loan \$450 to any individual farmer to buy seed in the spring, it is certainly a good thing to loan it to any farmer in any part of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. In just a minute. When the time comes I propose to offer an amendment to the bill making it applicable to any and every farmer in any and every part of the whole country. [Applause.] The second provision of this bill, in my judgment, is by far the better part of the bill and a step in the right direction. It appropriates \$2,500,000 for the mobilizing and distribution of farm labor, the only help the farmers, as a whole, need and the only part of the bill I am deeply interested in. As far as I have learned the needs of the farmers of the whole country, they are more in need of labor to help them put in a crop, cultivate and harvest it than they are in need of seed. [Applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. In view of the gentleman's statement about not confining it to any particular area, why not include corn, timothy, and clover seed?

Mr. SNELL. It is perfectly agreeable to me, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not include clothes to the farmer?

Mr. SNELL. I represent an agricultural district. The people in my district are so busy they do not bother their Representative about matters unless they are important. I have received more letters from the farmers in my district in the last 60 days than in the previous 3 years of my service here, and every letter I have received has been along the lines of the shortage of farm labor, and, as far as I am able to learn, there

is almost an entire disappearance of farm labor in all rural parts of this country. You must remember the farmer can not compete in question of wages with the munition manufacturer, ship-builder, and contractor who is working for the Government on a cost-plus basis. In addition to this, you have taken during the last year over 200,000 of the best young men from the farms and put them in the Army; so it is up to us, if we want them to continue to furnish food supply for the world, to do something definite in the way of relief for the present labor shortage in rural communities. I am assured by the Labor Department here in Washington that there is plenty of labor in this country, but that it is simply a matter of distribution. Now, this bill provides \$2,500,000 for this distribution of farm labor, and I trust that the Agricultural Department will get to work at once and, if this labor is available, see that it is distributed where it is most needed. Thus they will be rendering a real aid to every farmer in every part of the country.

The President and Mr. Hoover are all the time appealing to the patriotism of the farmers to raise more food products. Their advertisements are in every newspaper and magazine in the country. The farmers do not need to be appealed to on the ground of patriotism. What they need is more actual man power to help put in the crop, cultivate, and harvest it. [Applause.] You must understand that it takes more than patriotism to hold a plow and follow a drag on the farm. They have got the patriotism, but they lack the man power. The second part of this bill to a certain extent provides for that man power, and for that reason I am in favor of the bill and I hope that the rule and bill will be approved by the Members of this House. [Applause.]

I reserve the balance of my time. How much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman used eight minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with that portion of the bill which provides for the making of advances or loans for the purpose of purchasing of seeds I am not in sympathy. I have not been convinced from such study as I have had the opportunity to give the question that the exigency is such as to require this extremely radical legislation, but I may be mistaken about it; I know that a great number of my colleagues who have given much thought and attention to it feel that it is a necessary measure and for that reason I have not felt disposed to undertake to wage any very bitter fight upon the rule or upon the bill itself, but I did not wish it to go by without at least stating my attitude toward the matter, because I may want to refer to it in the future when other legislative matters shall arise here upon the floor of the House. I yield back whatever time I may have left.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, having the honor to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture that presents this bill I feel it my duty, having the opposition point of view, to present that point of view. I am opposed to this bill as being one of the most dangerous precedents that could ever be established by any legislative body on earth. I do not believe in the principle involved in the bill. I did not support it in the committee, and I shall not support it here. We need not try to deceive the country. We are now pretending to pass a bill appropriating \$7,500,000 to be given to the spring-wheat section of the country—three or four States. We are engaged in that important work in this House the last of March. April is the planting season, and you are holding out here, this great body of legislators, that we are going to get \$7,500,000 loaned to the individual farmers during the month of April when another legislative body must deal with this proposition and April will be passed before it can be reached, and you know it. You will never get any legislation in the first place—

Mr. EVANS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. No; I have but five minutes. In the next place, if you get the legislation, then this money is to be loaned by the Secretary of Agriculture, loan \$450 to an individual allotment, through the \$7,500,000 that you are giving. Where is your machinery that you are going to be able in a few days' time to make these loans to the individual farmer? You need not try to fool the country. You can not get the machinery together to do it, and every Member of this House knows it. Now, what is the proposition? One hundred and sixty-six thousand six hundred and sixty-six families will be entitled to the loan. Who is going to find those people and who is going to draw the contracts? You know it can not be done; it is a perfect impossibility. The Secretary of Agricul-

ture knew it. He is opposed to the legislation and so stated in the committee, and yet we engage in this foolish piece of conduct.

Now, another thing: Some four or five States up there are involved. I sympathize with those people who have had droughts. My State has had the most severe drought in its history, and yet they have not asked anything on this floor. Let Texas take care of Texas is my slogan. Let these States that have suffered these droughts exercise their ability to take care of the situation, if it is possible to do it, but not go on the principle of coming to the Federal Government and ask that the Secretary of Agriculture go out to Tom, Dick, and Harry and make these loans. And what is the security? That, in his judgment, he need not take any further security than a loan on the crop. And there, gentlemen of the House, you run into the proposition of separate and distinct laws in the several States involved. I presume that every State involved in this matter has its landlord-and-tenant statute. My State has. The landlord has preferential liens on all the crops grown, and nobody can get in under that lien. It is statutory. I understand that a great deal of this land is owned by absent landlords, and they have not sufficient confidence in their own land and in their own tenants to advance this seed with which to seed the land. Are you going to be engaged in the foolish proposition of advancing to various people when the landlords will not advance to them, and let him step in with the statutory lien that is prior to the lien of the Government, collect his debt, and let the Government stand the loss? That is what this bill does. It lets the absent landlord reap the reward upon the taxes of the American people, who must be called upon to contribute this \$7,500,000. And with these principles involved in the bill I can not give it my support.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am not so much interested in the feature of the bill that provides for the loan of money to farmers as I am for the part of the bill that provides for the purchase and reselling of the seed. I am not sure that I can support this bill in its present form, because I do not think we ought to take care of the spring-wheat area alone. In my State last year practically 75 per cent of the corn was frostbitten, and the question of seed corn in Indiana is a serious one to our people. They can not get it. I do not care so much about the loaning of the money with which to buy it as that the Government get it and sell it to the farmer.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman know that \$6,000,000 was appropriated to sell seed for cash to farmers in that country?

Mr. BLAND. Then why is there necessity for this bill at all?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no necessity for it at all, then.

Mr. BLAND. This bill—

Mr. HAUGEN. And I might add that a bill is to come in in the near future that will take care of the proposition the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BLAND. I am confining my remarks to this bill. Unless it was amended to include corn for the Middle West, I think it would fail in its purpose very largely. If there is necessity for seed anywhere in the world, it is in the corn districts that were frostbitten last year. I do not see why the committee should overlook such an important proposition as this. If I have an opportunity I am going to offer an amendment to strike out the words "spring-wheat area," so that the bill will apply to all of the United States, and then insert the word "corn," because I think if there is any necessity for anything to be furnished it is for seed corn. Recently we had the food department of the State over here investigating this question, and the secretary told me they were having an awful time trying to locate seed corn. They tried to prevent the farmer from selling their good corn on the market, and were trying to get what they could saved for seed purposes. The price was so attractive that most of the good corn for seed was sold and no doubt consumed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the membership of the House voted erroneously a few minutes ago, under the impression that the Congress had not provided ample funds to purchase seed and resell it to the farmers in those districts of the country where there was a drought or where there were poor crops. In the bill that was signed by the Speaker this morning, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, \$4,000,000 was provided as a revolving fund to the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, in addition to the \$2,500,000 that was provided last year, the very purposes which the gentleman

from Indiana and others have in mind to accommodate the farmers. But this bill goes further. This bill is a reflex—

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. This bill is a reflex of the opinions of the Nonpartisan League in securing radical and socialistic legislation in North Dakota. The legislature of that State in special session this spring authorized all the counties to advance money by loans to the respective farmers for the very purpose which is embodied in this bill. And this Congress now is emulating the socialistic principles of this Nonpartisan League for the first time, by establishing a policy of loaning money to farmers. Where will we stop?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] says we have a precedent in the action taken the other day in authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to loan money to various commercial and industrial activities. Why, the very warrant for that legislation was that the Federal reserve banks did not have authority, and that the Federal Reserve System would break down in making long-time loans.

If I had not had some experience with North Dakota in years back, during periods of excessive droughts, I would not to-day be so strongly in opposition to this measure; but I am somewhat acquainted with the conditions out there, and know the conditions when they have suffered successive droughts by reason of the Chinook winds coming from the south and blighting their crops. And yet in those days, when wheat was less than \$1, less than 75 cents, less than 50 cents, they were able to meet the conditions. And since then we have passed the Federal reserve act that brings relief to the farmers from the local banks for short-time loans, and we have passed the Federal farm-loan act that brings relief for long-time loans, and notwithstanding these, as a sop to this Nonpartisan League, at the instance of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER], a bill is introduced in here, and Congress is asked to ratify the fundamental principles of this new socialistic party, which is running wild in the western prairie States and which has not the courage of its principles to announce that they are socialistic fundamentally.

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

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. In the legislation that has already been passed on this question does the gentleman take the position that the spring-wheat field area has been taken care of as well as the corn question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to say that the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations show that the Agricultural Department has been doing everything in its power to meet the drought conditions in the various parts of the country by furnishing at cost not only seed wheat but seed corn. The department has been doing everything, and the committee has just voted \$4,000,000 additional to the \$2,500,000, which it makes a revolving fund, whereby adequate means are furnished for that very purpose.

Mr. BLAND. For what purpose?

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

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the resolution making in order this proposed legislation is a very simple one. It is not the character of rule that I objected to a few days ago, under which the Post Office salary-increase bill was taken up. There are no riders or jokers introduced under this rule. It provides simply for the consideration of the bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture as a committee substitute for the bill H. R. 7795, and the committee substitute, including the title and enacting clause to be considered, is set out fully in the rule. The rule does not provide for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7795.

The committee substitute that is to be before the House for consideration if this rule is adopted may be divided into two parts. The first part provides for an appropriation of \$7,500,000, to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage the production of wheat, oats, and barley in the spring-wheat growing areas of the United States. It is provided that the Secretary of Agriculture may make contracts with farmers to increase the production of wheat, oats, and barley and to advance them money for seed in connection with these contracts, or the Secretary may loan to farmers outright an amount not exceeding \$450 to each farmer, to enable him to secure seed to put in a crop and increase the production of wheat, oats, or barley.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, or would he rather not yield?

Mr. NORTON. Not just now. If this war has made clear anything, it has made clear the fact that agriculture and the production of foodstuffs is one of the things most essential to the success of our Nation and our allies in this war. If any of the industries are to be helped and encouraged by the Government during this war, agriculture is deserving of the first and highest consideration.

One of the questions which has arisen in the discussion of this bill is as to whether there is any necessity for this legislation, or whether it does not come too late. If there is necessity for it, I dare say there is not a single man in this House who will object to this legislation or who will oppose it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. A married man may do it? [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. Well, I think, on the merits of the proposition, both the married men and the single men of the House will support it.

If there is a real necessity for this legislation—and I believe there is—if under the authority proposed to be granted by this bill to the Secretary of Agriculture it will enable him to give aid and encouragement to farmers in the spring-wheat growing areas of the United States to such an extent that a material increase will be made there this year in the production of wheat, oats, and barley; if, as it clearly appears, the enactment of this bill as drafted in the Committee on Agriculture is likely to result in an increased production this year of more than 20,000,000 bushels of wheat, the bill merits the support of every Member of the House interested in a sufficient supply next year of wheat for the people of our own Nation and for those of our allies in this great war. If, on the other hand, the Secretary of Agriculture finds that the aid to be extended by this proposed legislation comes too late or is not needed, then the appropriation of \$7,500,000 provided in the bill for seed will simply not be used and the money will remain in the Federal Treasury to be used for other purposes of the Government. By the terms of the bill it is left wholly within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to make contracts with farmers for increased production of wheat, oats, and barley or to advance or loan them money to secure seed, so that they may sow and produce this year a greater amount of these grains than, without such aid, they otherwise would be able to do.

The second and most important part of the bill provides for the mobilization of farm labor and the distribution of it to different sections of the country where it may be most needed. An appropriation of \$2,500,000 is proposed for this purpose. Surely everyone who knows anything about how the attraction of new war industries and high wages in the cities has depleted farm labor in many sections of the country will give his support to this feature of the bill.

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

Mr. NORTON. I should like very much to yield to my friend, but I have but a few minutes of time—not enough even to permit me to conclude my own reasons why this rule should be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the principle of this bill. It may be that this bill will need amending. It may be that it is not broad enough to cover all sections of the country. But the amount of money appropriated will not go very far. It will not wreck this Government. We are daily appropriating money here to carry on the war of the ages. We are here to-day asked to appropriate some money to produce foodstuffs to feed the men, and we are told, "This is revolutionary; this is unprecedented."

My friends, within a year we appropriated \$800,000,000 for aeroplanes. I wonder if anybody thinks we are going to get any of it back? Of course it is unprecedented. Of course nothing was ever done before of the kind, nor did you ever see upon the floor of this House a bill to furnish money to munition factories, to shipbuilders, to railroads, until now.

Mr. Speaker, there is a class of people that need financial help just now. Let me speak to you about my own State, because I know more about my own State than I do of other sections of the country. Our people are a wheat-growing people, largely in all eastern Montana. They have settled that country within the last few years. Last year there were 20,000 homestead entries made in the State of Montana and the year before probably as many. There are 60,000 land entries in Montana to which people have no title yet. There is nothing that they can

give as security to any bank or financial institution, because they have no title to the land. Six years ago we raised about 5,000,000 bushels of wheat in Montana. Five years ago we raised about 12,000,000 bushels. Three years ago we raised about 18,000,000 bushels. Two years ago we raised about 25,000,000 bushels. Last year we had a failure of crops for the first time. If we had raised what we planted we would have raised 50,000,000 bushels of wheat. Our people lost their crops last year. They borrowed from every bank and financial institution all that they would lend them for the purpose of putting in seed, but they now have no finances; they have no title to the lands. The entryman who has not yet secured title can not go to his merchant or banker and obtain a loan, because he has no security to offer.

He can not go to his banker or to his merchant and borrow anything, because he has no title to his land. There are at least 60,000 of these men in the State of Montana, and every other Western State is to a greater or less degree in the same situation.

Mr. BUTLER. Will we be in time to help these people make a wheat crop if we pass this bill promptly?

Mr. EVANS. I think we will, but not if the bill suffers from the usual inertia of Congress. This bill has been before the Agricultural Committee for two months. It should have been acted on long ago. I introduced a similar bill last fall in the hope that it might be passed before this, but the inertia of Congress is almost beyond belief.

Mr. SWITZER. How late do they plant spring wheat in Montana?

Mr. EVANS. Probably until the 1st of May.

Mr. SEARS. Does the gentleman remember that it took the Federal farm-loan banks more than a year to get started before they could pass on titles and make loans?

Mr. EVANS. I suppose it did, but in this case there is no title to pass upon, except the mortgage on the man's crop.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. How late can they seed barley in Montana?

Mr. EVANS. I do not know. I should say all through the month of April and part of the month of May.

Mr. FOSTER. Gentlemen say that this action is unprecedented. Yes; but we have done things during this war and during this Congress that were unheard of before, and that no one of us would do in time of peace; but when it comes to doing something to help the farmer increase the food supply of the country the farmer is entitled to consideration. This action is unprecedented, of course, but we ought to give it fair consideration.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I think it unnecessary for me to say that under ordinary circumstances I would be the last man in this body to support a proposition of this kind. I recognize that it is carrying paternalism almost to the breaking point, and I am not a paternalist in my political or economic views. But our country is at war, and in the successful prosecution of this war bread is proving itself to be as important as cannon, munitions, bullets, and the like. [Applause.] We can not afford, because of any squeamishness, to take the risk of reducing the bread supply of this Nation. When I say the bread supply I have in mind especially the wheat-bread supply.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman believe—

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield. It came to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture that in certain sections of the United States, notably in North Dakota, South Dakota, portions of Montana and Minnesota, the so-called spring-wheat area of the United States, they had suffered during the last year from a rather severe drought. It was argued to the committee with great force that in certain sections of that country many homesteaders were without means to buy wheat seed. It was argued that with proper encouragement from the Government, with a sufficient amount of seed for the purpose, the spring-wheat acreage of the United States could be increased three or three and one-half million acres during the 1918 crop year. If the yield from that acreage should be normal, it would add anywhere from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels of wheat to the wheat supply of this country. That amount may be critical. I have been very much encouraged at the sowing of winter wheat. The figures show that we have in already one of the largest crops of winter wheat that has ever been sown in this country. For quite a little while the reports as to the condition of the winter wheat were anything but encouraging. I am very happy to tell the House that reports received within the past few days from reliable sources convince me that there is nothing in the situation at this time, so far as the winter wheat is concerned, to give us any alarm. On the contrary, the situation is quite encouraging. If we should

have a normal production of wheat from the winter-wheat area, we should increase the amount of wheat in this country during this crop year. But we can not afford to take any chances. We ought, if possible, to sow this year in spring wheat not less than 23,000,000 acres. If we can do that and no unfortunate accidents happen because of unfavorable weather, or something of that kind, we should be able to harvest in the neighborhood of a billion bushels of wheat this year. We shall need between 850,000,000 and 900,000,000 bushels of wheat if we are to supply our own civilian population, our armies, and the armies and navies of our allies, and the civilian population of our allies. If there is any one thing that this country can not afford to neglect, if there is any one thing that this Congress can not afford to neglect, if there is any one thing the overlooking of which would be fatal to the successful prosecution of this war, it is the proposition of wheat bread.

You say, "Why wheat bread?" For the reason that wheat flour is practically the only material out of which you can make Army bread. You say, "Why not feed our allies with corn bread?" The answer is that probably 99 per cent of the bread consumed by our allies is baked in bakeries. More than that, the populations of our allies know nothing of corn bread. They have never been taught to use it. They are a wheat-bread-eating people, and we have got to recognize that if we want to deal with the situation intelligently.

There is another proposition in this bill which I think ought to challenge the attention of this Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I have received complaint after complaint about the farm-labor situation throughout the country, regardless of section or location. I presume every Member of Congress has received these complaints. I confess that I have no patent upon the solution of that problem. I think the Government is doing something that is going to help the situation somewhat. We are providing in this bill a fund of \$2,500,000 in the hope that the Department of Agriculture may find some way out of this difficult labor situation. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the resolution.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH), there were—ayes 97, noes 15.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 279, nays 40, not voting 112, as follows:

Alexander	Crago	Fuller, Ill.	King
Ashbrook	Cramton	Garland	Kinkaid
Aswell	Crisp	Glynn	Knutson
Austin	Crosser	Godwin, N. C.	Kraus
Ayres	Currie, Mich.	Graham, Ill.	Kreider
Bacharach	Dale, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	La Follette
Baer	Dallinger	Gray, N. J.	Langley
Bankhead	Darrow	Gregg	Larsen
Barkley	Davis	Hadley	Lea, Cal.
Barnhart	Decker	Hamilton, Mich.	Lehlbach
Beakes	Delaney	Hamlin	Lever
Bell	Dempsey	Hardy	Little
Beshlin	Denison	Harrison, Va.	London
Bland	Dent	Haskell	Longworth
Blanton	Dewalt	Hastings	Lufkin
Booher	Dickinson	Haugen	Lundeen
Bowers	Dill	Hawley	Lunn
Brand	Dillon	Hayden	McAndrews
Britten	Dominick	Heaton	McArthur
Brodbeck	Donovan	Heflin	McCormick
Browne	Dooling	Helm	McFadden
Browning	Doolittle	Helvering	McKenzie
Burnett	Doughton	Hensley	McKeown
Burrroughs	Dowell	Hicks	McLaughlin, Mich.
Butler	Drane	Hilliard	McLaughlin, Pa.
Byrnes, S. C.	Dupré	Holland	McLemore
Byrnes, Tenn.	Dyer	Hood	Madden
Campbell, Pa.	Eagan	Houston	Magee
Candler, Miss.	Eagle	Howard	Maher
Cantrill	Edmonds	Huddleston	Mansfield
Caraway	Elliott	Hull, Tenn.	Mapes
Carlin	Emerson	Hutchinson	Martin
Carter, Mass.	Esch	Igou	Mason
Carter, Okla.	Evans	Ireland	Mays
Cary	Fairchild, G. W.	Jacoway	Mondell
Chandler, Okla.	Fairfield	James	Montague
Church	Farr	Johnson, Ky.	Moon
Clark, Fla.	Fields	Johnson, Wash.	Morgan
Clark, Pa.	Fisher	Jones, Tex.	Morin
Claypool	Focht	Juul	Neely
Cleary	Fordney	Kearns	Nelson
Coady	Foster	Keating	Nicholls, S. C.
Collier	Francis	Kelly, Pa.	Nichols, Mich.
Connelly, Kans.	Frear	Kennedy, Iowa	Nolan
Cooper, Wis.	Freeman	Kettner	Norton
Cox	French	Kless, Pa.	Oldfield

Oliver, Ala.	Rose	Snook	Volstead
Oliver, N. Y.	Rowe	Steagali	Waldow
Oliney	Rubey	Stedman	Walker
Osborne	Rucker	Steenerson	Walton
O'Shaunessy	Russell	Stephens, Nebr.	Wason
Overstreet	Sanders, Ind.	Sterling, Ill.	Watkins
Padgett	Sanders, La.	Stines	Watson, Pa.
Park	Sanford	Summers	Watson, Va.
Polk	Scott, Iowa	Sweet	Weaver
Pou	Scott, Mich.	Swift	Welling
Pratt	Sears	Switzer	Whaley
Purnell	Sells	Tague	Wheeler
Quin	Shackleford	Talbot	White, Ohio
Raker	Shallenberger	Taylor, Ark.	Wilson, Ill.
Ramsey	Shouse	Taylor, Colo.	Wilson, La.
Ramseyer	Sims	Temple	Wilson, Tex.
Randall	Sinnott	Thompson	Wingo
Rankin	Slayden	Tillman	Winslow
Reavis	Slomp	Timberlake	Wise
Reed	Sloan	Towner	Woods, Iowa
Robbins	Small	Vare	Woodyard
Robinson	Smith, Idaho	Venable	Young, N. Dak.
Rodenberg	Smith, Mich.	Vestal	Zihlman
Romjue	Snell	Vinson	

NAYS—40.

Almon	Gallivan	Merritt	Sabath
Anthony	Garner	Moore, Ind.	Sherley
Black	Garrett, Tenn.	Paige	Sisson
Buchanan	Gillett	Parker, N. J.	Stafford
Cannon	Gordon	Phelan	Stephens, Miss.
Connally, Tex.	Greene, Mass.	Platt	Tilson
Dale, Vt.	Greene, Vt.	Ragsdale	Treadway
Elston	Husted	Rayburn	Walsh
Fuller, Mass.	Kincheloe	Riordan	Wright
Gallagher	Leshner	Rogers	Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—112.

Anderson	Foss	Key, Ohio	Rouse
Blackmon	Gandy	Kitchin	Rowland
Borland	Gard	LaGuardia	Sanders, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tex.	Lazaro	Saunders, Va.
Caldwell	Glass	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Campbell, Kans.	Good	Lenroot	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Goodall	Linthicum	Scully
Chandler, N. Y.	Goodwin, Ark.	Littlepage	Sherwood
Classon	Gould	Lobeck	Siegel
Cooper, Ohio	Graham, Pa.	Loneragan	Smith, C. B.
Cooper, W. Va.	Green, Iowa	McClintic	Smith, T. F.
Copley	Griest	McCulloch	Snyder
Costello	Griffin	McKinley	Steele
Curry, Cal.	Hamill	Mann	Sterling, Pa.
Davidson	Hamilton, N. Y.	Meeker	Stevenson
Denton	Harrison, Miss.	Miller, Minn.	Strong
Dies	Hayes	Miller, Wash.	Sullivan
Dixon	Heintz	Moore, Pa.	Templeton
Doremus	Hersey	Mott	Thomas
Drukker	Hollingsworth	Mudd	Tinkham
Dunn	Hull, Iowa	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Ellsworth	Humphreys	Parker, N. Y.	Voigt
Estopinal	Johnson, S. Dak.	Peters	Ward
Fairchild, B. L.	Jones, Va.	Porter	Webb
Ferris	Kahn	Powers	Welty
Fess	Kehoe	Price	White, Me.
Flood	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey	Williams
Flynn	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	Wood, Ind.

So the resolution was agreed to. The Clerk announced the following additional pairs: Mr. ROUSE with Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. GRIEST. Mr. CAREW with Mr. PETERS. Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. HAMILL with Mr. COPLEY. Mr. LAZARO with Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. DIXON with Mr. DUNN. Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. FOSS. Mr. FERRIS with Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. GARRETT of Texas with Mr. HAMILTON of New York. Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. HUMPHREYS with Mr. MEEKER. Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. MUDD. Mr. LOBECK with Mr. PARKER of New York. Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. PORTER. Mr. RAINEY with Mr. SNYDER. Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. STRONG. Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. VOIGT. Mr. WEBB with Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. WELTY with Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. STEELE with Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay" on the first call of the roll, but I understand the bill is to be broadened so as to make it more equitable, and I want to change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded. A quorum being present, the doors were opened. The SPEAKER. The House will automatically resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] will take the chair. Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7795, with Mr. POU in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the substitute for House bill 7795, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7795) to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers in certain areas for the production of grain through advances, loans, and otherwise, and by providing for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri reported the bill and is in a position to advise the House what it contains, and I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill which is reported to you to-day from the Committee on Agriculture has had very earnest and serious consideration by that committee. It might not be out of place for just a moment if I were to give you some of its history. It was first referred to a subcommittee. That subcommittee went over it very carefully, revised it, rewrote it, and reported it back to the full committee. Even then the full committee was not satisfied. The bill went to another subcommittee, was again rewritten and re-drafted from the beginning to end, considered from every viewpoint, and that subcommittee reported the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, and the Committee on Agriculture presents this bill which is before you to-day. In that connection permit me to say that we had extensive hearings in regard to the subject matter contained in the bill. There came before our committee a number of gentlemen from the Northwest and from other sections of the country who presented to us the facts and needs of the communities to which this bill applies. Now, I want to call your attention to the further fact that this bill presented here to-day is a workable measure. I want to call your attention to the fact that this bill has the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding the statement as made upon the floor of the House to-day that the Secretary of Agriculture is opposed to this measure. He is not opposed to it; he is in favor of the proposition. I hold in my hand a letter from the Assistant Secretary to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary of Agriculture was called away about the time this bill was reported. He was attending a series of war conferences which were being held in the South under the auspices of the Committee on Public Information. I have here a letter from the Assistant Secretary to Mr. Houston from which I want to quote just a few words. I will not take up the time of the committee to quote it all. The Assistant Secretary, Mr. Harrison, says:

I have called his attention to the bill (H. R. 7795) which was reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture on March 8. I have received word from him that he believes the plan proposed would be workable, and that he favors the new measure and urges its immediate passage.

Now, I am quoting from the Secretary of Agriculture, and that is where he stands upon this proposition. I will here insert the correspondence for the information of the House:

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 20, 1918.

DEAR GOV. RUBEY: I take pleasure in sending you herewith a copy of a letter which I have just written to Mr. LEVER regarding H. R. 7795.

Very truly, yours,

F. R. HARRISON,
Assistant to the Secretary.

HON. THOMAS L. RUBEY,
House of Representatives.

MARCH 20, 1918.

DEAR MR. LEVER: As you know, when the Secretary recently appeared before the Committee on Agriculture he stated that he would be sympathetic with any plan that could be devised and operated on a business basis for assisting farmers in the spring-wheat areas who are unable to secure credit for the purchase of seed. The Secretary, as you know, is attending a series of war conferences which are being held in the South under the auspices of the Committee on Public Information. I have called his attention to the bill (H. R. 7795) which was reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture on March 8, and I have received word from him that he believes the plan proposed would be workable, and also that he favors the new measure and urges its immediate passage. Of course, if the bill is to be passed, it should be passed immediately. On account of the lateness of the season it is impossible to say just how much money can be advantageously utilized in carrying out the provisions of the bill or to what extent relief can be furnished. It seems desirable, however, to provide the full amount, especially in view of the fact that whatever is not required will remain in the Treasury.

Very truly, yours,

(Signed) F. R. HARRISON,
Assistant to the Secretary.

HON. A. F. LEVER,
House of Representatives.

Here is another thing: It has been stated upon the floor of this House that this bill is not workable; that if we pass it, it can not be put into effect. Let me say to you that the Department of Agriculture is getting ready to put this bill into operation. It has made an investigation of the State laws between tenants and landowners in every State to which this bill is applicable. All the blanks—the blank forms and agreements and everything of that sort which will be used when this bill goes into operation—are being formulated, and the Department of Agriculture will be ready to put this measure into operation immediately; just as soon as it passes this House and the Senate and becomes a law. I make that statement now to show you that the Department of Agriculture wants this measure and is getting ready to put it into operation. If you pass it and give the opportunity it will be put into operation at once. In every State in the northwest country we have the agents of the Department of Agriculture and we have the boards of national defense; we have the banks; and this bill provides that they may utilize both the State and the National banks to get the information in order to put this measure into operation.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RUBEY. I will.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman explain to the committee this: This morning some gentleman raised the question that this bill applied only to the spring-wheat area of the country. Will the gentleman tell the committee why his committee limited it to that area?

Mr. RUBEY. As every Member of this House must know, we can not always grant what each individual Member wants. There were some members of that committee—I was one of them—who wanted it extended to the entire country, but a majority of the committee in its wisdom confined it to the spring-wheat area for the reason that that was the only part of the country that we could reach at this late day.

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

Mr. RUBEY. I will.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman stated the purpose of this bill was to grow wheat so we could feed our allies with wheat bread. Now, if that is true, why are oats and barley included in this bill?

Mr. RUBEY. For this reason, we want to raise all the foodstuff we can. We want to raise everything that will help in raising foodstuff that is possible, and we are told that there is some land in that section of the country where they can raise barley, some land where they can raise oats, new ground where they can raise oats the first year and where you can not raise wheat the first year. That is the reason we were willing to extend the provision so that we could raise all the foodstuff and feed possible.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The gentleman regards corn bread as good food, and there is plenty of time yet to plant corn?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I do not like to take the gentleman's time—

Mr. RUBEY. I will have to answer one at a time; I can not answer both at once.

Mr. LANGLEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I thought he had finished.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I do not want to take the gentleman's time, but it strikes me, knowing something about farming, that if the Government is to furnish seed for wheat alone that the farmer will be induced, perhaps, to sow wheat instead of oats or barley.

Mr. RUBEY. That question can be discussed, I will say to the gentleman, better by those who come from that section of the country and who will speak for it and possibly answer that question better than I can.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RUBEY. For a question.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Of course, the gentleman knows that corn is as much a substitute for wheat as barley. Now, in the great corn belts of the country, by reason of the premature frosts of last year, seed corn that is good is selling at \$20 a bushel. Why did not the committee include corn as well as barley?

Mr. RUBEY. I answered the question when I stated a moment ago that the committee decided after mature deliberation that the best thing to do in order to get the bill through this House and get it through quickly was to bring in a bill that would apply to the spring-wheat area, and for the further reason that we want the wheat to feed the soldiers.

It has been stated here to-day that this bill is unprecedented, that this matter of furnishing seed to the farmers on credit, and so forth, is something that we have never done before. I want to say to the gentlemen of this House, and if you will think for

a moment you will remember it, that we passed through this House last May the bill H. R. 4188—I think it was the latter part of May—known as the food-survey bill to assist and stimulate production. That bill had in it a provision appropriating several million dollars and authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish seed corn, seed wheat, and every kind of seed for the farmer, and as that bill passed this House it contained a provision in it that this seed should be furnished to the farmers on credit. That bill was voted upon by you gentlemen here on the floor of this House. I do not know how many voted for it or how many voted against it, but it passed this House about the 25th of May last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. I will take five minutes more. I have control of the time in the absence of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RUBEY. I can not yield. I have only five minutes, and I want to call your attention to the provisions of that bill. The bill to which I have referred and which was passed last May appropriated several million dollars, and the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to purchase, grow, or to otherwise secure such seed, and store them and furnish them by sale to farmers on credit or on other terms at cost, including the expense of packing and transportation. Now, this House voted for that proposition. This House said to the people of this country that we were going to furnish the farmers of the country seed, and were going to furnish them seed on credit, and that is what we are asking you to do to-day. In this hour, when we need to produce wheat and other crops, we come here and ask that the Congress of the United States do everything in its power to see that every acre of land is put into cultivation, to see to it that the farmers produce just as much as possible, to the end that we may have the foodstuff necessary for our armies and to carry on this war.

I must not take further time, Mr. Chairman; there are other Members of the House who desire to speak, but I want to urge upon the membership of this House that they vote for this bill for another reason. The second section of this bill appropriates \$2,500,000 to help out the farm-labor situation, and we all know that the question of farm labor is the most serious one confronting our farmers to-day. Let us pass this bill to-day, and enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the Secretary of Labor, to mobilize the farm labor of this country, transport it to the places where it is needed, and give the farmers relief along that line. I am sure this is something in which we all are very deeply interested. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, the bill carries \$7,500,000 for the purchase and distribution of seed, \$2,500,000 for voluntary mobilization of farm labor. I believe we all agree that there is need for foodstuffs, especially wheat. We had a short crop of wheat last year, probably less than 600,000,000 bushels, and when we consider the world's limited shipping facilities and loss and danger from the black rust and drought, it is up to us to encourage this production. We are expected to supply a large portion of the world with foodstuffs, and there is urgent need of increasing production. I trust that this bill will pass and that we may get through with it this afternoon.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does not the gentleman think that the committee has been very generous in providing for the expense of the mobilization of farm labor \$2,500,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. I think we all appreciate that if we are going to increase the production it is necessary to provide the farmers with farm labor.

Mr. HAMLIN. You are not going to pay these laborers for their work?

Mr. HAUGEN. We are going to pay the transportation and whatever expenses the Secretary may determine.

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman does not think it will take \$2,000,000, or even one-tenth part of it, to pay the transportation, does he?

Mr. HAUGEN. That depends on how extensively the Secretary goes into the scheme.

Mr. HAMLIN. I think \$2,500,000 would pay about all the farm laborers in the wheat-growing sections of the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. If \$2,500,000 is not needed, it will not be expended.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Is not there enough wheat in the spring-wheat States for seed purposes that may be purchased?

Mr. HAUGEN. There is possibly plenty of wheat. There is no question about that; that is, for seed, but there is a question whether we will have enough wheat for seed and food, too. We may have to substitute other cereals for the wheat.

Now, as to the wheat situation, it is this: Our yield for 1917 was probably less than 600,000,000 bushels, though the department estimated 668,000,000 bushels. Compare that with the yield for 1915—1,025,801,000 bushels—and you will see the shortage.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thought the committee had investigated and found that the farmers could get seed wheat, but they could not get credit through the banks to purchase the wheat.

Mr. HAUGEN. The purpose of this bill is to supply the homesteaders and other people in the spring-wheat area, who have not money to purchase their wheat. There are other sections in this country where there is as much need of seed as in that section of the country, but they have money and credit, and do not need this legislation. What we are now trying to do is to supply the people without seed and without credit. We propose to take chances in loaning this small amount to the farmer in that section of the country where crops are uncertain. In other words, if he will take the chances on planting and harvesting, we propose to take a chance on loaning him the money to buy seed with up to the amount of \$450.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I think where those conditions exist we can well afford to do so. The other day we appropriated \$50,000,000 to house the workmen in our shipbuilding plants. The laboring men of this country must be fed, and their Representatives on this floor can well afford to appropriate this money to provide the food with which to feed them.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is but a drop in the bucket compared with the total annual appropriation.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, while the roll calls indicate that there is some opposition to this bill, up to this time only two gentlemen have spoken against it. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] opposes it on principle, because it is proposed to sell seed on time; but if I am not mistaken, he voted last year for the bill H. R. 4188, which passed this House, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell millions of dollars' worth of seed on time. And on this side I am glad to see that there is only one gentleman who has talked against it, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and he happens to be a gentleman who does not know from what direction the Chinook winds come. He seems to be obsessed with the idea that the Chinook winds come from the south, while everybody knows, at least those in the West know, that they come from the west. They get the name because there is a tribe of Chinook Indians near the mouth of the Columbia River, and the warm winds come east along the river. Again, these winds come in the winter, and not in the summer, as the gentleman seems to think.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] also claims that this bill is without precedent. It is the first time, so he says, that the Government has ever undertaken to loan money to farmers for seed or otherwise. The State of South Dakota, or at least the Territory before it became a State, passed such a law something like 35 years ago, and did business under it. The State of North Dakota has a law that is over a quarter of a century old under which seed has at different times been sold to the farmers under terms similar to those proposed in this bill. The State Safety Commission in Michigan has purchased, as I understand it, a couple of million dollars' worth of farm machinery to sell to the farmers on time this very year, and the corresponding commission in the State of Wisconsin is spending a large sum of money to sell various kinds of farm machinery to the farmers on time.

A year ago we passed in this House what is known as the bill H. R. 4188, which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase, grow, or otherwise procure seed grain, to store same, and to furnish same by sale to farmers on credit.

Now, we passed that bill in this House last year. It was changed in the Senate to read "for cash"; but, so far as this House is concerned—

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; I regret to say I can not yield, because my time is so limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. But, so far as this House is concerned, we went on record for the bill authorizing the Secretary to sell seed on time.

Another objection raised is to the inclusion in this bill of oats. In the State of Montana it is known that many of the farmers will want to raise a crop on new breaking. Wheat will not grow on new breaking, but oats will, and it is better to have oats grow on the land than no crop at all. Besides, it will get

the virgin sod ready for a wheat crop in 1919; and it is not inconceivable that this war will continue throughout next year. Prairie land seeded in oats this year will be ready next year for seeding to wheat.

I was glad to hear the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture, who has heretofore withheld his approval, has decided to indorse this bill. The Food Administrator, Mr. Hoover, is strongly in favor of it. He indorsed it before the committee and he has indorsed it since, and he has called attention to the very great need for its passage in order to increase food production.

The food-conservation campaign of Mr. Hoover has been a great success, but that does not remove the necessity for increased food production. Mr. Hoover was himself one of the first to point out that fact. When Roumania fell into the hands of the central powers they captured 1,400,000 tons of cereal grains, and it is believed that very large quantities of foodstuffs have come into the possession and control of the central powers from Russia. That is an added reason why it is necessary for us to increase the food production in the United States.

It is not proposed, as some think, to make a gift of the seed to farmers. The bill proposes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers to grow wheat, barley, or oats and advance a part of the cost in the shape of seed grain at a reasonable price. If the bill is passed it will bring about a substantial increase in grain production—perhaps 40,000,000 bushels—and will tend to reduce the cost of living. The labor feature of the bill will also greatly increase agricultural production. Some seem to think that we may have too great a production—too much wheat, too much barley, too much oats, and so forth. Yes; and we may get too many bullets, too many guns, and too much ammunition if the war ends suddenly, which will, much of it, be little better than junk after the war is over. Gentlemen, it is high time to get down to business. Let us quit using smooth phrases such as "food will win the war." Instead, let us say in tones loud enough to be heard all over the United States, that bread, barley, beefsteak, bacon, and beans will win the war, and then boost it along by passing this bill quickly and by putting it into operation without delay.

If the wheat acreage is decreased this year no one should jump at the conclusion that it is by reason of a lack of patriotism upon the part of grain growers. There may be causes beyond their control. Some of these reasons will be:

First. If this bill is not passed quickly many of them will be without seed.

Second. Many of the farmers are short of feed because of the high price and other reasons. This will mean that they can not get the usual amount of work out of their horses, their work will be delayed, and it will be necessary for them to seed coarse grains or none at all.

Third. The shortage of labor will have the same effect. It will retard the seeding.

With an almost certain decrease in the wheat acreage in sight, is it not the part of statesmanship to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to contract for the growing of 3,000,000 acres of wheat which would otherwise grow to weeds?

The problem of securing farm labor is causing our farmers much concern. They are wondering if they put in the seed whether they can secure help to harvest the crop. Five hundred thousand men have gone from the farms to the Army and Navy. More than that many have gone from the farms into the war industries. While other much more ambitious schemes were being talked of to obtain labor for the farms we concluded to report an item in this bill of \$2,500,000 to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in mobilizing farm labor upon the voluntary basis. All the big employers of labor in the United States find it necessary to furnish railway transportation to obtain and keep up their working forces. How can the Secretary of Agriculture hope to compete for men against such corporations if we do not arm him in the same way?

Mr. Chairman, with the great cause of humanity hanging in the balance, with the health and even the life of our American public involved, we should speed the passage of this meritorious bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I would like to have permission to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the lady from Montana.

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from Montana is recognized for five minutes.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to talk to you a few minutes about the conditions in Montana; not that I wish to interest you in the farmers in one part of the country more than in another, but so that you may know the details of the wheat situation.

Within the last 10 years Montana has changed from a grazing State to an agricultural State. But the farmers are new. They have taken up homesteads. There are still about 60,000 farmers who are in the homestead stage. Others have just "proved up." The business men—the merchants and the bankers—are new. They are not guided by an approved knowledge of the business integrity of their patrons, as in most other parts of the country; they are giving their credit on faith—faith in the country, and faith in the men with whom they deal, and faith in the possibilities of a good crop.

Our farming is different from that of other sections of the country, in that we have not diversified farming. Wheat, alternating with other grains, is the specialized crop. We have all the difficulties of a new country; great distances of the farms—50 or 75 or 100 miles—from the railroads.

But in spite of these difficulties our production of wheat has been remarkable. In 1910 Montana produced 7,000,000 bushels of wheat; in 1911, 10,000,000 bushels; in 1912, 12,000,000 bushels; in 1913, 20,000,000 bushels; in 1914, 18,000,000 bushels; in 1915, 42,000,000 bushels. That was the banner year all over the country. In 1916 we produced 30,000,000 bushels. Last year, in the drought year, we produced 18,000,000 bushels.

These figures mean more, when they are compared with other States, when you realize that in 1916 Montana produced almost a third as much wheat as the State of Kansas, which is the largest wheat-growing State in the Union, Montana producing 30,000,000 bushels and Kansas 98,000,000 bushels. We produced more wheat than the State of Minnesota and more than the State of Pennsylvania, and almost as much as the State of Oklahoma. Last year, in a drought year—and you can see from the figures given that last year was the only year we had a drought—we produced 18,000,000, while North Dakota produced only 39,000,000 bushels. Nobody doubts that North Dakota is a wheat State, a State that grows wheat successfully. Yet even in our drought last year we produced almost half as much wheat as North Dakota, and more than the State of Michigan, and more than the State of Virginia, and more than the State of Texas.

Last year the farmers all over the State wanted to put in war crops. They borrowed money far beyond what their judgment dictated. The bankers and the stores gave credit, more credit than they ever gave before, and then there was no crop. Now the bankers and the merchants can not give credit because they have not the credit themselves. The farmers have not even a title to the land. The title still belongs to the Government.

The State has recognized the seriousness of the situation. An extraordinary session of the legislature was called and bills were passed making it possible for the counties to use \$10,000 in the purchase of seed wheat. In counties where \$10,000 would not be enough they made it possible for the counties to bond themselves for the proper amount. In some of the counties they have already held elections. One county telegraphed me that their returns were 934 to 30 votes in favor of bonding the county.

But this bonding is only possible so long as they stay within the constitutional limit of the authorized total indebtedness. The wheat counties are new counties and are already bonded almost to their constitutional limit of indebtedness. These counties can not meet the situation. They can not furnish the necessary amount of seed wheat even by bonding to the total indebtedness provided by the Constitution, and they must have Federal aid.

These counties have their land in perfect condition to plant the wheat, because last year they had no crop and there was no harvesting, and no hauling of the crop to the market. So they devoted their energies to putting the ground in condition for the spring planting. But they have no credit. There is no way in which they can get the credit, not even with all that the State can do. There are about 15 of these new counties that need aid from the Federal Government, and they must have it if we are to have wheat from those counties next fall. I urge the passage of this bill that we may have wheat to win this war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the lady from Montana has expired.

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, we are involved in war. Without regard to the views we may have entertained as to the propriety of entering the conflict, it is now too late to debate the question. As patriotic Americans, we must stand as one in front of the advancing foe. While all, I am sure, are hoping and praying for the dawn of the day that will bring an end to the ugly struggle, I am wondering if the people realize the seriousness of the situation. We are engaged in a mighty conflict; on its result depends the happiness of mankind. If the forces of democracy win, this world will move forward with the same rapid stride that has witnessed its progress during the past century. The peoples of the world will be free to determine their own destiny. If we lose, the clock of time will be set back and the iron heel of military despotism will dominate for many troubled centuries. Our brave boys—your sons and mine, and the sons of our friends—are going forth to sacrifice their lives in the holy cause, the cause of liberty. They are willing to die that liberty may live. I would to God that some one might rise, who could speak in a voice that would awaken the Nation and arouse it to a sense of its imperious duty. A great world tragedy is in progress beyond the sea. Congress has done its duty. With practical unanimity and without political division it has responded instantly to every request from the President, and placed without restraint under his control the wealth of the Nation. Into his hands it has given more power than that hitherto possessed by any man. If the sentinel on the watch tower is unable to report "All is well," the blame can not be laid at the door of Congress. In the future there will be no hesitancy in granting whatever authority is needed to successfully and vigorously prosecute the war.

We are engaged in an undertaking that will tax all our resources and demand undreamed sacrifices on the part of all. The quicker the Nation awakens to a realization of this dreadful truth the sooner we will be able to put the whole unhappy affair behind us. There must be no division in our ranks now. The time for united and energetic action is here. This can only be accomplished if all classes of our citizenship are convinced that there has been no discrimination in the distribution of burdens. Every person, every item of property, every dollar of wealth must be made to bear its just portion of the sacrifice. In no other manner can the voices of discord be hushed. Perfection can not be attained, but we should spare no effort to approximate it. The contribution by a citizen, safe in his home, of all his property is not comparable to the sacrifices of the brave lads who will surrender their lives in the struggle. In the presence of such sacrifice it is regrettable that any of us are capable of thinking in terms of profit and loss. As no one is being asked to give all his wealth, it behooves us to see that everyone contributes in the ratio of his ability. When another revenue act is prepared, profiteers must come through. Industries accumulating vast riches from war contracts must be made to pay. Eighty-five cents of every dollar of war profits is collected by Britain to pay the expenses of her war. There is no reason why profiteers here should not receive the same treatment. The war should not be a period of profiteering. Capital should be given a fair return sufficient to stimulate production and maintain itself. The same fair profit should go to the working man and the farmer; all should fare alike. If this is done, all will be well; if not, the inequality will sooner or later plague us.

In normal times this bill would not be proposed. It is brought before the House with the favorable recommendation of the Committee on Agriculture because we are living in unusual times and laboring under extraordinary and unprecedented conditions. All admit that it is of supreme importance that sufficient food for the armies and peoples of our own and allied countries be produced. In this connection I invite attention to the conflicting views expressed by the Department of Agriculture and the Food Administration on the food situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture says we have an abundance of food to satisfy present and future needs. The Food Administration proclaims "meatless and wheatless days," requires the use of flour substitutes, commands us to keep the hens, to increase pork production, to increase wheat production, warns us there is a great shortage and we and our allies are facing starvation. I agree and disagree with both. There is no danger of immediate starvation. I am not, however, so optimistic about production. It is idle to boast at this time of an abundant future supply. It is not the part of wisdom to dodge unwelcome facts. We are engaged in a monstrous undertaking and should prepare for it. Food is as indispensable for our success as bullets and men. It is folly to arm, equip, and send our boys across the sea without food. It is foolish to spend billions on transports if there is no food to carry. It is idle to hunt down submarines if there is

no food to destroy. Food is vital. With an abundance the war will be won; without, the fight is lost. Wheatless and meatless days and the elimination of waste will help, but will not prove a substitute for decreased production. An abnormal demand can not be supplied by a normal yield. It can be satisfied only by supernormal production. The problem is to increase production. The people are told food will win the war. It is therefore pertinent to inquire, What has been done to insure such supply?

The American farmer is a man of ordinary intelligence. He realizes during these years of war every business engaged in manufacturing war materials has grown enormously wealthy by reason of the war. He knows that no restrictions have been placed upon them. He knows what we all know, that there is a shortage in the food supply of the world. He knows that several causes have contributed to this shortage; that it has come about in part by scant production in the warring countries, but more largely because of lack of transportation to make available the yield in Australia, India, and Siberia. He knows that the world's need presents an opportunity to reap a rich reward of good prices for his products. The prospect for that reward was sufficient incentive to stir the farmers of the Nation to unparalleled activity, and it had that effect. They were willing to risk the prices they would receive for what they grew.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AYRES. Is it not a fact that the wheat producer is not complaining so much of the fixing of the price of wheat as he is of the fact that the prices of other articles that enter into the cost of wheat producing are not fixed?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the gentleman from Kansas is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. AYRES. It is a fact that the wheat producer would be perfectly willing to have the price of wheat fixed if the prices of other articles that enter into the cost of the production of wheat were also fixed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that is correct. So far as I know, the farmer is not complaining of the prices fixed on his products, but he is complaining because the prices of other commodities have not been fixed in comparison with his prices.

Without suggestion from him, prices have been fixed on a part of what the farmer grows, but he is left to the tender mercy of the profiteer when he comes to purchase. Naturally this has produced much complaint, and the farmer has gradually become convinced that he is being treated unjustly. I am surprised that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Administration do not realize such feelings prevail. Whether there is reason for it is beside the question. We are concerned about the fact. If such a feeling exists, it means less effort on the farmer's part and a correspondingly decreased yield. This should not be permitted, if avoidable, in these perilous times. The farmer had many lean years before the war and feels that he is entitled to sufficient profit now to care for those losses. He knows that when this war ends, guaranteed prices end also, and henceforth his product will go on the market in competition, not only with the product of the world but also with the unlocked supply now accumulating in Australia, India, and Siberia. He feels that when he is producing at a profit during these war times, it is not fair to select his product alone and fix a price on it without considering his prewar losses, and the situation he will face after the war, when forced to compete with the hoarded surplus of the world.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MORGAN. My colleague is one of the members of the Committee on Agriculture, perhaps the most important committee in Congress in the interest of the farmer. I know that he has been of great service to the farmers not only of his own State but of the Nation in that capacity. Inasmuch as it does not seem fashionable for some reason to equalize the prices of the things which the farmer has to buy, does not the gentleman in his position as a member of this committee think it would be proper, if we can not equalize these other prices, to raise the price of wheat a little?

Mr. THOMPSON. As far as I am concerned, I am in favor of raising the price of wheat to \$2.50 a bushel.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. I will ask the gentleman if he does not think the price of other products ought to be fixed the same as that of wheat, and if the price of other products is not fixed, should the price of wheat be fixed?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Kansas I will say that the farmers are not complaining about \$2 wheat. The complaint that they make is that the price of their product is fixed, while the prices of the articles

which they are compelled to purchase are not fixed. They are perfectly willing to accept any price that is fixed on their products, if the prices of all other articles are fixed at the same time, but they do not think it is right to fix the price of their product and let the profiteer get whatever he can, according to the law of supply and demand on every other product. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a matter of selfishness with the farmer, or with me, or with my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES], or with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who injected a question into this debate, or with anybody else in this House. I am sure we all want to win this war. That is what we are interested in. If we win this war we must have a sufficient amount of food to supply our forces in Europe. Unless you take care of the farmer you will not get a sufficient amount of food to supply the boys who are fighting our battles on the front.

Mr. AYRES. Another question, if the gentleman will yield. Is it not true that consumers have been advised to use substitutes for flour, such as corn meal and other things that have advanced anywhere from a cent to a cent and a half a pound above flour?

Mr. THOMPSON. A little later on in my speech, if I have the time, I will be glad to touch upon that, because they advise us to use corn meal, oatmeal, rye, and other substitutes. Now, the only man who gets any advantage in this price-fixing matter is the man over in Europe to whom we loan money to buy our food supply. He takes our money and comes back over here and buys our wheat. The price of wheat is fixed, but the prices of rye, oats, barley, and other wheat substitutes are not fixed. Therefore the man who produces wheat in this country has got to go to the store and purchase these substitutes at greatly increased prices. He does not get the benefit of this decreased price of wheat.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield for a moment right there?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. Among the things which enter into the cost of wheat production are the sacks in which the wheat crop is carried to market. Those sacks are brought from Calcutta, and the price of Calcutta sacks for this year's wheat crop will be about 32 cents apiece.

Mr. THOMPSON. The gentleman is absolutely right in his statement. The farmer in this country gets no benefit from the fixing of the price of wheat. That is what I am trying to impress in these few remarks I am making here. Now, I have got to hurry along.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that the usual price of sacks is about 8 or 10 cents to the farmers of America.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thank the gentleman for the information. Our soil is rich, our farmers are patriotic, but the soil will not yield unless seeded and cultivated. Farmers are ordinary men, and will seed and harvest those crops that yield the most profitable returns. They tell us it is wheat and pork that are most needed to win the war. The question then is, How can their production be stimulated? The answer is easy—make their production profitable. Their production must not only be profitable, but it must be more profitable than the production of substitutes. One dollar and ninety cents for wheat and 15½ cents for pork under normal conditions would enrich the farmers and result in increased production; not so now. According to the Department of Agriculture it requires 13½ bushels of corn to produce 100 pounds of pork. Corn costs in my district from \$1.75 to \$2 per bushel. The farmers can not produce pork from this high-priced corn except at the cost of bankruptcy. If he purchases the feed, he is loser from \$8 to \$12 on every hundred pounds; if he produces the corn, there is more profit in selling it. This condition has resulted in the wholesale shipment and slaughter of immature hogs, and a totally paralyzed industry in my State. The Oklahoma Council of National Defense has just completed a live-stock census and found seven sows to every nine farms in the State. It found the same alarming condition was true of other meat-producing animals. The farmers write me the cost of feed is so high that they have been compelled to dispose of their herds. This may account for an abundance of pork now, but it does not indicate a future supply. The farmer can not produce meat at the price fixed without loss. If he is blessed with a bank account, he may engage in the pleasant pastime, but it is certain he can not operate on borrowed capital, because banks do not make advances to finance losing enterprises. The farmers say the price on articles they purchase—farm machinery, farm wages, and supplies have advanced to such a point that prices fixed on wheat and pork are not profitable. They write

me that disk harrows that sold for \$21 when wheat brought 97 cents now sell for \$75; a three-and-a-quarter wagon that sold in 1916 for \$80 now costs \$175; harness that cost \$35 then, now sell for \$80 and \$90; a 7-foot binder with fixtures cost wholesale f. o. b. Chicago in 1915, \$120.50, now \$203; a 12-foot harvester with attachments cost f. o. b. Chicago in 1915, \$210, now costs \$395. In 1915 a three-bottom tractor-engine plow cost, wholesale, \$80; the manufacturer now demands \$186. The farmers advise me they sell their wheat at a fixed price, but there is no limit when they purchase the same wheat in manufactured form. I have investigated the matter. On January 28 I addressed a letter to Hon. J. M. Aydelotte, chairman Oklahoma State Council of Defense and chairman of the board of public affairs of my State, which does all the purchasing for the State's activities, and who, prior to accepting this position, was for 25 years one of the State's most prominent and active dealers in grain and grain products, a man of high character and recognized ability. Here is what he said:

Answering your favor of January 28, in reference to the food situation and the recent food law enacted fixing the price on raw products, wheat mainly. Now, they can not regulate conditions when the raw-product price is fixed only. If the department will authorize the fixing of the price of the finished product, then something can be done. Consequently the farmers are suffering, also the consumer of food, as well as the consumer of concentrated feeds for stock.

Dr. Brooks, the food administrator for the State of Oklahoma, has no jurisdiction over the milling interests. They are selling through jobbers and brokers and not complying with the law; that is, a great many of them. The price of bran, shorts, and by-products of wheat are being sold at enormously high prices compared to the price paid for wheat. The corn prices have not yet been fixed. The grain men and millers have filled up their storage capacity and now are raising the price.

I have been manufacturing various kinds of feeds for 20 years before I accepted this position with the State, and I well know that no one can control food conditions as long as they only fix the price of the raw material.

I have a letter from a farmer, who tells me that he has been compelled to pay \$52.40 per ton for bran; that he had his hogs on feed, and this was the only way that he could market them; that the price he paid not only wiped out all his profits, destroyed his work, but that he lost about 50 per cent of the money invested. There is no excuse for such a price for bran while the farmer receives only \$1.90 for his wheat. Fifty-two dollars and forty cents a ton for bran is 100 per cent in excess of the price he ought to pay if the price for his wheat were carried through the transaction. Farm labor, I am informed, can hardly be obtained at any price. Day laborers are charging from \$3.50 to \$5; farm hands paid by the month are charging from \$60 to \$100, and this includes their board. Two years ago they could be obtained from \$25 to \$40 per month. The farmers do not object to price fixing if it is applied to all articles, those they purchase as well as those they sell. What they object to is being singled out and saddled with the whole burden of the war. They are willing to bear their part, but they do not want to pull the whole load. The food bill passed a year ago was not a price-fixing bill; Congress was not asked to enact such a law. When that bill passed it was intended to destroy speculation and profiteering, and in that way increase the price to the farmer and reduce the cost to the consumer.

Here is what Mr. Hoover said in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture on June 19 last with reference to the bill:

From a number of current illusions about the legislation proposed, the first is the illusion in some quarters that the bill is directed against the producer. It would not be necessary to traverse this statement to anyone that had read the bill. It especially exempts the producer from every one of its provisions, with the exception of one section, and that is the provision for a guaranty, and this section is designed to entirely benefit and secure the producer. The savings of the American consumer ought not and should not be made by a sacrifice on the part of the producer. They should be made by the exclusion of speculative profits from the handling of our foodstuffs.

In the same hearing, and to show the effect of excluding speculative profits between the producer and the consumer Mr. Hoover gave as illustration the price for bread to the consumers in Belgium, France, and England. He said:

Practically the entire wheat supply to Belgium is to-day imported from the United States, and despite the extraordinary costs of transportation the price of bread is 60 per cent of the price in New York City. A large portion of the wheat of France comes from this country, and yet the price of bread is, again, 40 per cent below our own. In England, where food control was started too late, the price is 30 per cent below our price, and in Canada, again, we see a lower range of prices to the consumer than in our own country, although the producer realizes the same price.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] if he will grant me a little more time.

Mr. HAUGEN. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. THOMPSON. About 10 minutes.

Mr. HAUGEN. I regret exceedingly that every minute is taken of my time.

Mr. RUBEY. All of my time and more, too, is spoken for.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I can not get an extension of time, because I think this is the most important bill that we are considering during this entire Congress. Here we are talking about billions and spending hundreds of billions—

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Millions.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, hundreds of billions; and when it comes to taking care of the farmer we can not spend 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman realize the rule provides for only two hours of general debate, and that the effort of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] to extend the time to four hours is ruled out of order?

Mr. THOMPSON. I voted to extend the time, and I would be glad to have the time.

The farmers must be relied upon to increase production. They are dissatisfied. They do not feel they have received fair treatment. Under these circumstances increased production can hardly be expected. There should have been universal price fixing or no price fixing. The Food Administrator has the same authority to fix prices on corn and farm implements as on wheat and pork. Why has he not done so? I tried to find out. For that purpose I addressed a letter to both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Food Administrator. The one addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture reads:

Section 1 of the act of August 10, 1917, commonly called the "food bill," defines the word "necessaries" as embracing foods, feeds, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, etc."

Section 5 of the same act authorized the President, from time to time, whenever he found it essential, to license importation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessities."

Under these provisions of the food bill the price of the 1917 wheat crop and the price of meat was fixed. The bill did not confer specific authority to fix the price of any article.

The Food Administrator licensed the elevators. One of the provisions of the license was that no more than a specified price should be paid for wheat. If the elevator violated that regulation, its license was revoked and it went out of business.

The Food Administrator also licensed the packing houses, and one of the regulations of the license was that a price not exceeding 15¢ per pound should be paid for hogs. If the packer paid more, his packing house was closed.

The farmers of the country have not complained at this exercise of authority in fixing the price of their products—wheat and meat.

They have wondered, however, why the authority to fix the price on "tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, and fuel" has not been exercised and the price of these articles fixed so that they can continue to produce wheat and raise hogs without becoming bankrupt.

Harness, plows, mowers, wagons, farm labor—practically everything required for the production of wheat and hogs—has increased in price from 200 to 300 and in some cases 400 per cent. The farmer has had the price of his products fixed, but he has been compelled to pay two, three, and four times the normal price of everything he used in making possible that production.

The President pointed out this injustice to the farmer in his address to the Congress delivered December 4 last. He said:

"The farmers, for example, complain with a great deal of justice that while the regulations of food prices restrict their incomes no restraints are placed on the prices of most of the things they must themselves purchase."

At this time when an increased production is so necessary and when your department is appealing to the farmer to increase the production do you not think it would be wise to remove this just complaint by fixing a fair price on those articles required for the actual production of foods and feeds and which the farmers are compelled to purchase?

I am convinced that no other action you could take would quite so hearten the farmers and stimulate them to increased effort.

If price fixing on farm products is continued and the farmer is left to the tender mercies of the profiteer in his purchases, I greatly fear it will result in discouragement and the consequent reduction of production of farm products.

I take it for granted that the authority conferred in the food bill is ample, if exercised, to take care of the situation I have described. Otherwise, I feel sure you would have already suggested to Congress the necessity of conferring additional authority. Congress has always stood ready to give you all the authority necessary, and had additional power been requested it would have been granted for the asking.

In conclusion, may I ask if the farmers can hope for any relief from the extortionate prices they have been and are being compelled to pay for "tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, etc."

I will thank you for the courtesy of an early reply.

Though the letter was written on the 23d day of February, the Secretary has not yet replied. For that reason I am unable to state the Secretary's position on the matter of price fixing.

A letter dated January 31 of this year, addressed to Mr. Ed Hockaday, Kingfisher, Okla., and signed by Arnold P. Yerkes, assistant agriculturist, I presume represents the views of the department. It reads:

Your letter of January 1, addressed to Mr. Victor Murdock, care Federal Trade Commission, has been referred to this office for reply. However, the question of prices for farm machinery is one over which this department has no jurisdiction whatever.

You, of course, realize that the price of raw material is only one item which is involved in figuring the cost of producing any machine. The cost of labor is also a large item, and this has increased tremendously. The price for fuel and other supplies necessary have also increased greatly. It is not meant by this to defend the prices which you mention, but merely to call your attention to the fact that it is not fair to judge the cost of production by the cost of raw materials.

On the whole, while farm machinery has advanced tremendously during the past few years, it has not increased proportionately with the price which the farmer is receiving for his products. This you can easily prove to your own satisfaction by taking the price of any of the staple farm products for the past three or four years and figuring the number of bushels of corn or other crops it required to purchase any machine. To-day it actually takes fewer bushels of corn or wheat to purchase a plow, corn planter, or any other machine than it did three years ago, or, in fact, for several years past. Looking at the matter from this standpoint, the prices do not seem out of proportion. However, if you still feel that some other action is necessary in the matter, it is the writer's opinion that you should take it up with the legislators, for, as above stated, this department has no authority in the matter.

I judge from this letter that the Department of Agriculture believes that the prices which the farmer is compelled to pay is not out of proportion to the prices he receives.

On the same day I addressed a letter to Mr. Hoover. I said:

Section 1 of the act of August 10, 1917, commonly called the "food bill," defines the word "necessaries" as embracing "foods, feeds, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, etc."

Section 5 of the same act authorized the President from time to time, whenever he found it essential, to "license importation, manufacture, storage, mining, or distribution of any necessities."

Under these provisions of the food bill the price of the 1917 wheat crop and the price of meat was fixed. The bill did not specifically authorize the fixing of the price of any article.

The Food Administrator licensed the elevators, and one of the provisions of the license was that the elevator should not pay more than a fixed price for wheat. If the elevator violated that regulation its license was revoked and it was no longer in business.

The Food Administrator licensed the packing houses, and one of the regulations was that not exceeding 15¢ per pound should be paid for swine. If the packer paid more than 15¢ per pound for hogs his packing establishment was closed.

The farmers of the country have not complained at this exercise of authority in fixing the price on two of their products—wheat and pork. They have wondered, however, why a price has not been fixed on the manufactured products of their wheat—shorts and bran—and why a price has not been fixed on corn and its products—meal, etc.—and why a price has not been fixed on oats and rye and barley.

The Food Administrator has the same authority to fix a price on these products as he had to fix a price on wheat and pork. Prices on these articles could have been fixed in the same way. The failure to fix prices on these products has resulted in my State in practically the complete destruction of the live-stock industry. Bran is selling to the farmer at \$52.40 per ton. The farmer is paying from \$1.75 to \$2 per bushel for corn. Feeding 13 bushels of \$2 corn to produce 100 pounds of pork and selling that pork at 15¢ cents per pound is not a very profitable business, and the same is true of feeding \$52.40 per ton bran.

The food bill confers ample authority to protect the farmer from the conscienceless greed of a lot of profiteers. I am convinced that one of two courses must be pursued. The law of supply and demand must be permitted to control and govern when applied to what the farmer sells if it is to be applied to what the farmer is required to purchase.

May I ask, in conclusion, if any action is contemplated looking to the fixing of prices on what the farmer is compelled to purchase?

Will you be kind enough to reply at your earliest convenience?

To this letter Mr. Hoover replied under date of February 26:

I have your letter of February 23, 1918. I believe that you have somewhat misunderstood the power conferred by the food-control act in regard to the fixing of prices and the method by which the price of wheat has been stabilized.

The food-control act does not authorize the fixing of a price even by regulations issued under the license system. No regulation has ever been issued prescribing the price which elevators must pay for wheat, nor has any license ever been revoked because of the price paid for wheat. The result accomplished was made possible only because of the power to purchase wheat and to enter into voluntary agreements conferred by the food-control act.

In regard to hogs, no regulations have been issued forbidding the packers to pay more than 15¢ cents per pound, nor has any packing establishment ever been closed because of the payment of a higher price. The price of hogs has, in fact, averaged more than 16¢ cents per pound during the past three months.

I inclose herewith a pamphlet showing what has been done in the matter of hogs in order to assist the producer.

You will see from this explanation that the Food Administrator has no authority to stabilize the price of corn and other grains. I can scarcely believe that the price of corn is as high as \$2, for the average price paid at country stations in Nebraska, for instance, during the last week has been \$1.10 to \$1.30 per bushel.

In regard to the price of bran, our chief difficulty has been to prevent the jobbers and retailers from running up the price to meet the very high prices of other feeds. As you know, we have required all mills to sell bran at not more than 38 per cent of the price paid by them for wheat, and I inclose a copy of the regulations governing feed dealers which have been recently issued. I have sent a special agent to Oklahoma and the Southwest to investigate the numerous complaints regarding the price of bran, and I am very hopeful that we will be able to enforce strictly the regulations as drawn. We are somewhat handicapped in this matter by the absence of control over retailers, who are specifically excepted by section 5 of the food-control act from the license provisions.

If the licensing section does not give him that power, what does the last paragraph of his letter mean? He says:

We are somewhat handicapped in this matter by the absence of control over retailers, who are specifically excepted by section 5 of the food-control act from the license provisions.

The food bill conferred no authority on Mr. Hoover to fix prices. However, he has exercised the authority with reference to certain products desired for over-sea shipment—wheat, sugar, and pork—and it was done not only by virtue of authority conferred by the licensing section but by reason of the fact that he became the purchasing agent for our over-sea allies. It does not make any difference to the farmer whether the price was

fixed by virtue of authority conferred in the bill or by manipulation outside of the bill's provisions. The fact is he has been compelled to accept prices for his product that makes it unprofitable to continue its production. Mr. Hoover does not desire to fix the price of other articles than those I have mentioned. Here is an interview he gave out on the 25th of February to counteract the effect of a published statement that the Government might set maximum prices on all the farmer's products. He said:

There appears to be a good deal of misinformation circulated among the agricultural communities as to the policy and scope of the Food Administrator with relation to price fixing.

I wish to say at once, and emphatically, that the Food Administration is not a price-fixing body, except with regard to certain commodities which are to-day dominated by wholly abnormal over-seas commercial relations and the surrounding factors with regard to which are such as to project great dangers both against the farming community and at the same time the consuming community.

The two commodities under regulations are sugar and wheat. With the further exception of cases in which it has intervened purely as a friendly intermediary between organized producers and consumers, the Food Administration has no authority and no desire to fix prices on the products of agriculture.

This interview discloses Mr. Hoover is aware the farmers are not satisfied with price fixing. It was intended to reassure them, so there would be no decrease in their activities. It will perhaps have that effect as applied to every farm product except wheat and pork. It is likely to have the opposite effect on these two articles—the most necessary of all. When the farmer comes to plant he will take into consideration two things: First, that wheat substitutes—corn, oats, rye, and barley—are not controlled by fixed prices; and, second, that they command a price which will make their production more profitable than the production of wheat.

The farmer is as patriotic as any of us; he is ready to do his part. A few weeks ago the national Red Cross officers sent down word that Oklahoma would be expected to furnish 190,000 Red Cross members in the great drive in the week before Christmas. When the smoke had cleared away, it was found that more than 750,000 had been enrolled. This is not only four times the number expected, but it is the largest number in proportion to the population that was returned by any State. The farmers of Oklahoma did it. There was a great and almost unflinching response in the towns and cities, too, but listen to this from one of the head officials in charge of the membership campaign:

The farmers of Oklahoma responded even more nobly than the city people. There was a greater membership rolled up in the country than in the cities in proportion to their relative population. Many whole country townships furnished as many members as there were people in the township, and everywhere in the country there was general enthusiasm and interest in the great campaign, which means so much for the relief of the war sufferers.

I congratulate the farmers of Oklahoma. The fact is, the farm folks did just what they always do when there is a worthy cause that is properly put before them.

Farm, Stock, and Home, an agricultural paper published at Minneapolis, Minn., having a circulation of 140,000, principally in spring wheat growing States—Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana—has compared the value per acre at prices prevailing February 16, 1918, at Minneapolis, taking the average pre-10-year period yield. The average yield with present value per acre is:

Wheat, 11.9 bushels.....	\$23.80
Oats, 28 bushels.....	24.77
Flax, 8.7 bushels.....	32.80
Barley, 21.7 bushels.....	36.32
Rye, 16.9 bushels.....	37.18
Corn, 28.4 bushels.....	49.70

The farmers will be guided when they come to sow by the profits promised by different wheat substitutes. The result will be a decreased wheat acreage. We are spending billions for ships, for ammunition, for transports, for equipment, and for training our men; we are opening wide the doors of the Treasury to every war industry except agriculture. Would it not be well in the midst of these lavish expenditures to make sure of our food supply? Here is the way one of the great papers of Great Britain views the peril. The Daily Telegram in its issue Friday, March 15, 1918, among other things said:

We are approaching the supreme test of the issue which depends on the merchantmen. It may be a matter for serious consideration by the United States Government, whether it may not give more essential aid at this moment by holding back temporarily further reinforcement for their Army, with a consequent increase in the quantity of ocean-borne supplies.

The paper asserts that if American soldiers continue to come over at the present rate, tonnage which might be devoted to food will be utilized for military instead of economic purposes, and while both soldiers and food are required, food is the more urgent matter.

Another important item to be considered is the labor situation. Wheat is a crop that must be harvested immediately when ripe. It will not stand in the field for a long period, like corn and

cotton. Farmers consider this when they sow. The scarcity of farm labor and high prices for that available will make the farmer timid about planting wheat he is not sure he can harvest. High wages paid in war industrial activities, manufacturing, munition making, lumbering, carpentry, shipbuilding, railroading, and many others, with immunity from military service, has stripped the farm of workers. Farm laborers receive less pay and no deferred classification. Agricultural experts tell us 2,000,000 workers have been taken from farms in the past year for the Army and war works. It seems to me this is a colossal blunder. It is impossible to increase production with decreased man power. The administration of the selective service act has not been satisfactory to the people. Honorable men with dependents, men engaged in producing food on farms that now lie fallow, have been taken while men without encumbrance have been left at home. Personally I know of many such cases, and have repeatedly called them to the attention of the authorities. These authorities have uniformly shifted the blame to the local and district exemption boards.

After nearly running my legs off in an effort to get some relief, I finally placed the matter before the Provost Marshal's Office in record form so that the people might know where the blame belongs. On February 23, 1918, I addressed a letter to Gen. Crowder, as follows:

I desire to emphasize what I said to you yesterday regarding the labor situation as it affects the farmer and farming industry. I regard the classification given farm laborers as unfair, and believe if it is permitted to stand will shortly result in a paralysis of the farming industry. Farm laborers without dependents, unless graduates of an agricultural college, are classed as nonexpert laborers.

It may be said "anyone can break a furrow," but running a furrow is not all there is to farming. Every farmer must also be a business man and a small stock raiser. He must possess, if successful, unusual intelligence along many lines. He must know live stock, their habits, their dispositions, the diseases that commonly affect them. He must know how to care for them; how to feed them with the least possible loss and the greatest economy. They must be kept and raised on the farm at the same time the crops are planted, grown, and harvested. The crops must be so diversified as to produce a yield, and at the same time they must mature at different periods so that the live stock—the hogs, cattle, horses, and sheep—can be cared for. A successful farmer must not only possess great industry and high intelligence, but he must also be a good business man if he avoids bankruptcy. He must know how and when to plant; how to cultivate; and the proper time and method of harvesting. He must also know what to do with his yield; whether to sell, to hold for future market, or to feed and dispose of the same in live stock.

This knowledge can not be acquired overnight. It accumulates slowly and as the result of long years of training. You can not make a farmer out of a doctor, lawyer, baker, merchant, bank clerk, store clerk, a railroad, a carpenter, a painter, a factory worker, or a day laborer by waving a wand and repeating the words "Presto change."

A large per cent of the persons following these different occupations could not stand the physical strain; the hours of labor and the exposure required of the farmer, and practically all of them would be compelled to learn the manifold and changing labors of the farm.

So, when a farm laborer is classified as "nonexpert" and sent to the trenches, he leaves a vacant place on the farm that is impossible to be filled. When the laborer on the railroad, in the factory, where guns and ammunition are made; in the factory, where clothes are cut and shaped; in the forest, where the timber for ships and aeroplanes is cut; in the yards, where the rivets are driven in the ships, aeroplanes, motors, freight, and passenger cars, is classified as "expert" and exempted from military service, a situation is produced which necessarily draws the farm laborer away from the farm.

The farm laborer can, by changing his occupation, change also his classification from that of a non-expert laborer subject to military duty to that of an expert laborer exempted from military duty. The preferred classification, together with higher wages paid in the factory and shop, over that received on the farm, has already depleted the farms of their laborers and brought about a situation which presents a serious national menace.

The farmers are not asking to be exempted from military service. They are quite willing to bear their full share of the burdens of this war. It is the duty, however, of those in command to look ahead and see that the farms are not stripped of their laborers. Bullets without bread will not win this war. I do not think the laborer on the farm should be preferred over any other class of labor. At the same time I do not think it fair nor in the interest of the public that he be discriminated against. I think the class of work he is performing is quite as important to the success of our arms as the labor performed by those engaged in any other industry.

If available, I would be glad to have a statistical report showing from what occupations the soldiers already called have come; the per cent from each, and particularly would I like to have this information as it affects my home State, Oklahoma.

On March 7 he replied:

In response to your letter of February 23, permit me to say that your analysis of the agricultural situation as affected by the selective-service law has had careful consideration.

With reference to the work of the district boards of your State in classifying farm laborers, the attention of the district boards has been invited through the adjutant general of the State to the fact that the definition of skilled labor is not to be restricted to graduates of agricultural schools or to those who have scientific or highly technical knowledge.

The adjustment of the labor supply on our farms as related to the necessities attendant upon the enrollment of our Army is the more difficult, because of the fact that before the enactment of the selective-service law the trend of labor was away from the farms.

The selective-service act and the presidential regulations issued pursuant thereto have placed the problem of relief from military service in respect of industrial and agricultural workers primarily in the hands of the district boards. The rules for deferred classification have been carefully worked out, with a view to providing a degree of protection

for agricultural interests coextensive with that provided other industries, and it is believed that the district boards in general, especially in agricultural regions, have keen interest in the maintenance of the farm-labor supply.

However, in farming communities it can not be expected that quotas can be raised without interference with farm labor, which in individual instances may seem severe.

As you are doubtless aware, a bill is pending before Congress which will authorize the granting of furloughs for agricultural workers already in the service for their temporary return to the farms. If this legislation is enacted, it may afford a considerable degree of relief to many farmers.

In your letter you requested statistics showing the occupations from which drafted men have been taken. Permit me to invite your attention to the report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War on the first draft, which gives many statistics. On page No. 62 of this report you will find a chapter headed "Industrial necessity as a ground for discharge." The tables there given will throw much light on the operation of the first draft in respect of agriculture. It is interesting to note the relatively small inroad made on agriculture as shown by these figures.

It is hoped that this will give you the information desired.

He continues to place the responsibility for errors on the local and district boards. The tragic part is they continue taking the farmers. Last week in one county in my district 16 out of 19 called were farmer boys. If this is continued, it does not promise increased food production.

The Committee on Agriculture has also reported a bill authorizing the Food Administrator to restrict the consumption of food in hotels and public eating houses and to prohibit the use of foods in the manufacture of nonessentials, and so forth.

I doubt if it will assist to any appreciable extent in solving food difficulties. I shall, however, gladly support those provisions desired by the administration. There is one provision, however, to which I wish to direct your attention. It is the clause giving the Food Administrator power to ration. It reads:

(c) Prescribing the more equable and economic distribution of foodstuffs and feeds by limiting and regulating the sale, purchase, and distribution by any manufacturer or person engaged in the business of distributing foodstuffs, feeds, or materials or equipment necessary for the production, manufacture, or preservation of foodstuffs or feed: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to any farmer or gardener, including live-stock farmers, with respect to the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him.

The proviso excepting "any farmer or gardener, including live-stock farmers, with respect to the products of any farm, garden, or other land owned, leased, or cultivated by him" makes it possible for one who can deal direct with the farmer, gardener, and live-stock raiser to evade the law. The bill will not affect the rich who can purchase direct from the producer. The authority conferred is unlimited. He may "regulate the sale, purchase, and distribution by any manufacturer or person engaged in the business of distributing foodstuffs, feeds, or materials or equipment necessary for the production, manufacture, or preservation of foodstuffs or feeds." If the Food Administrator can limit the amount of sugar, salt, or any other food the retailer can sell and the amount a person can purchase, he can ration every man, woman, and child in the country. I do not believe it necessary or wise to enact a rationing statute at this time. The effect will not be wholesome. If, in the future, it should become necessary, Congress will be in session and can act. The President has not asked it. Mr. Hoover, before the committee, said he did not desire such authority. Rationing has proven a failure wherever tried. England, France, Italy, and Germany so report. Its enforcement is expensive and irritating; it requires an army of petty officers nosing and prying into the kitchen affairs of every household. It consumes a large part of the people's time forcing them in line with bread cards.

There are two classes of folks who can not be reached by rationing legislation; it does not reach them in Germany—the producer and the wealthy. The producer manages in some way to hold out sufficient for himself and family and the wealthy are able to deal with the producer direct, and thus avoid the law. The Government can not keep a policeman in every farmer's door. The only classes reached by this legislation are the poor, the workers, and those unable to sport the luxury of automobiles. There is no necessity for such legislation. The farmers will produce and produce abundantly if properly encouraged. Prices that yield a profitable return will stimulate and increase production. In this connection it might be well to recall that prices are always high in war times; everything is abnormal and prices therefore are out of the ordinary. We think prices are high to-day when we are fighting the war for democracy, but they are not so high as in the days when our forefathers were winning our independence. Here are a few prices in 1776:

Meat.....	per pound.....	\$1 to \$2
Rye.....	per bushel.....	30
Molasses.....	per gallon.....	12
Butterine.....	per pound.....	3
Corn.....	per bushel.....	25
Potatoes.....	do.....	10
Flour.....	per pound.....	5
Cheese.....	do.....	2
Sugar.....	do.....	3

In 1779 sugar sold for \$4 per pound; in 1780 butter sold for \$12 per pound and tea \$40 per pound. I do not give these figures to justify such prices now and I hope prices will not mount higher as the war proceeds. War, however, is but a manifestation of an unusual upheaval and high prices always follow in its wake. If it continues for any considerable time, prices will soar far higher than any heretofore known. If production is not increased, I greatly fear the question will not be so much the price of a loaf, but can a loaf be obtained at any price?

Those who would visit all the burden of this war on the producer may say if the farmer's price is raised the cost to the consumer will be increased. The answer is, "The burden of this war should not be borne by any part of the people but by the whole people equitably distributed. In England, France, and Italy the people are paying less for flour than the people of the United States, where it is produced. On the 23d of February, 1918, I addressed a letter to Mr. Hoover, which in part reads:

If available, I would be glad to be furnished with the following information:

1. The price the consumer is required to pay for flour in Great Britain, France, and Italy.

On March 1 Mr. Hoover sent me an inter-office memorandum, which reads in part as follows:

In compliance with the request of Hon. JOE B. THOMPSON in his letter of February 23, I may say that the retail prices of flour in the countries named is as follows, according to the latest reports:

GREAT BRITAIN.

(1) Flour: On a sack of 280 pounds of flour the maximum retail price is \$11.91, equivalent to \$8.33 per barrel of 196 pounds, the American unit.

ITALY.

(1) Flour: The market price on November 1, 1917, was 54 lire per quintal, equivalent to \$6 per barrel at the rate of exchange prevailing on that date.

FRANCE.

(1) Flour: No retail prices are available. The wholesale price of flour, 61.3 francs per quintal is equivalent to \$9.53 per barrel.

Why is this possible? It is because they are doing across the sea what we have not done. They fix the price paid the producer and the cost to the consumer; they squeezed out the profiteer and took care of the differential between producer and consumer from the national treasury. They refused to visit upon any part of the people the burdens of the war; they make all the people bear these burdens equitably. In this way they have been able to pay better prices to the producer than our producers receive and to sell to the consumer for less than our consumers pay.

The Commerce Reports, issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, on February 2, 1918, contained this information:

Food controller fixes prices for grain harvested in United Kingdom in 1918. Wheat and rye will be based on average price of 75s. per quarter of 504 pounds; barley, 65s. per quarter of 448 pounds; oats, 46s. 3d. per quarter of 336 pounds. Higher prices will be allowed for better classes of oats for milling purposes.

Translated this means \$2.17½ for wheat, \$2.02½ for rye, \$1.69½ for barley, and \$1.27 for oats. These prices are better than the American farmer receives. This is done by reducing the profit of middle men and making the differential a charge against the national treasury. Since 1914 Great Britain has paid out of its treasury more than half a billion dollars to care for this differential. That Government has also stimulated production by paying a bonus on every acre of wheat planted regardless of the amount produced.

This has been done across the sea to stimulate production, and if the war continues, as in my judgment it will, Congress will soon be forced to some such measure here.

We should not forget in considering this question it is necessary for us to think in relative terms. Gold has increased many fold. The Federal Reserve System authorized a 60 per cent asset currency; billions of bonds have been issued. The modern method of doing business has created what for lack of a better term might be called "check currency." All these concurring have produced an enormous expansion in our currency. Dollars have multiplied, but their purchasing power has decreased in the same ratio.

Nor should we lose sight of the fact our consumers are not profiting by the fixed price of wheat. Every time they buy a pound of flour they are required to purchase a pound of flour substitute—meal, oatmeal, rice, and so forth. While it is true the price of flour was slightly reduced when the wheat price was fixed, the price of meal, oatmeal, rice, and other wheat substitutes has increased, and the consumer finds the cost of living on the whole as high now as before. Those who have benefited by the operation are the consumers living oversea. We loan them money, and with it they purchase our bread at a price less than it costs our own people.

Mr. Chairman, two distinct and antagonistic forms of government are facing each other in a life and death struggle. Somewhere on the battle fields of Europe will be determined whether justice and liberty or brute force shall rule the world. We can not lose. It would be contrary to the laws of God. Let us so coordinate our every activity that there will be unity in spirit and purpose among all classes of our people. In this faith and under the guidance of our matchless leader we will go forward to certain victory. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, when the urgent deficiency appropriation bill was being considered in the House on the 18th of last month I offered an amendment to an item in that bill for the purchase and sale of seeds for cash, providing that those seeds might be sold on credit. That bill will become a law within a day or two, and had my amendment been adopted the farmers would soon be receiving seed. It was not adopted, however, and I hope that this bill will pass. When the proper time comes I desire to offer an amendment adding to the cereals enumerated in the bill, the purchase of which is proposed, rye, which is the surest cereal crop grown in the semiarid sections of the Northwest. It should be added to those mentioned in the bill. I hope this bill will become a law, but I regret that it has been so long delayed. I fear if there is any delay in the Senate the season will be so far advanced before the bill becomes a law that it will be of very little benefit to the farmers this season.

I discussed at length on the 15th of last month, during the general debate, and later, on the 18th, when I offered the amendment to the deficiency bill, the need of seeds on credit by the farmers of certain portions of the West. Drought has been severe in certain sections and seed is scarce and high. I hope this bill will help, and regret the plan I proposed more than a month ago was not adopted.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address my remarks particularly to section 2 of the bill under consideration, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for and secure mobilization and distribution of farm labor. To my mind a prime requisite, so far as the production of food and feed in the country at this time is concerned, is that of farm labor. In my native State there is no such thing any more as sufficient farm labor. It is extinct. The farmers have to compete in bidding for hands with manufacturing concerns, munition plants, and others engaged in the making of war materials and other merchandise. The result has been that the farms have been drained of the labor they once had by the young men and the older ones going to the cities where the hours of labor have been more inviting and where eight hours are considered a full day's labor; whereas, on the farm, as we all know, it is a question of work from sunup until dark. Volunteer enlistments and the draft have also cut deeply into the labor supply.

Mr. Chairman, a survey has been made in a general sort of way of the farm-labor situation in some of the States, and report has been made thereon in some of the leading farm journals. Those reports show the widespread shortage and requirement of farm labor. This bill will help out, we think, to some extent. It is not expected by the proponents of the measure that it is a cure-all, but it will help some. To show how Nation wide is the demand for farm labor I desire to read the following summary of reports that have been turned in from the various States:

"Maine: Great shortage of farm labor; acreage probably will be reduced by one-fourth or one-third. Texas: More labor needed than ever before, but supply is much below normal. North Dakota: Alarming shortage; farmers discouraged and can not plant for normal crop. Vermont: Shortage means a cut in production. Massachusetts: Serious situation; farmers can not go ahead with only the help of boys and untrained workmen. Connecticut: Depressing conditions; farmers may try to raise only enough for their families. Rhode Island: Many will not plant as much as last year. New Jersey: Farmers think that planting of even the usual acreage will be very hazardous. Pennsylvania: Very great shortage of skilled farm labor; the exodus from farms has been continuous. Delaware: Unless relief comes, the usual acreage can not be prepared. Maryland: Labor situation is acute. Virginia: Lack of labor, and acreage reduced accordingly. Georgia: Impossible to cultivate as much land as last year's area. Florida: Affected by loss of negro workmen drawn to the North; hope the Government will bring Porto Ricans. Ohio: Farmers discouraged and

at their wits' ends. Indiana: Probably a reduction of acreage. Illinois: The number of idle acres will be increased."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If all of these localities are so short of labor, how is the money, two and a half million dollars, to be expended in finding labor to be sent to other localities that are also short?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I will say to my friend that there are many people in the country who may make good farm labor, who could be collected under the provisions of this bill and sent to places where they could do the most good. They may be taken from unnecessary occupations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am quite serious about this. In western Washington the lumber labor shortage was so serious that soldier labor had to be sent in there to make up the deficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope what I say will not be misunderstood, for it is not my intention to criticize the administration or in any way to oppose legislation that will help in winning the war.

This is a time when everybody is required to do their utmost in their particular line of duty whether it be on the battle field, in the factory, or on the farm.

The legislation under consideration has to do with the farmer or producer of food for all mankind, and there is not a man in this Congress who will do more to help that class of citizen than myself.

We all know when bountiful crops are produced the farmer not only helps himself, but it is the consumer as well that receives the direct benefit of his efforts, and I feel that an injustice has been done to the man who toils for the production of crops when we singled out the result of that toil and by price-fixing legislation placed a limit on what he shall receive for his product and permit the charging of unlimited prices for what he must buy and what is essential to make his crops possible.

The price-fixing arrangement is confused by rules and regulations adopted for a good purpose, no doubt, but so far from being practical that the manufacturer of food products does not know where he stands, and the farmer also has become discouraged and has lost sight of the importance of his mission simply because he has been chosen as the one expected to do the most for the least return, when, in fact, the law under which the price of his product has been limited is supposed not to regulate or control his effort.

I recall the speech I made in this House on June 20 of last year, in which I predicted just what the result would be, and at that time I was strongly opposed to price fixing unless it was made to apply to both producer and consumer.

Under the license feature of the food-control law the President fixed the price of wheat, and if he can say what is to be paid for wheat and what the products of wheat shall be sold for certainly he can do the same with other grains and foods.

Our farmers are to-day asked to plant a larger acreage of wheat, and to show the unfairness of such a request I quote the prevailing prices of relative grains:

- No. 1 spring wheat, \$2.20, Chicago, for 60 pounds.
- No. 1 winter wheat, \$2.17, Chicago, for 60 pounds.
- No. 2 rye, \$2.91, Chicago, for 56 pounds.
- No. 2 white corn, \$2.25, Philadelphia and New York, for 56 pounds.
- No. 2 yellow corn, \$2.25, Philadelphia and New York, for 56 pounds.
- No. 3 yellow corn, \$1.90, Philadelphia and New York, for 56 pounds.
- No. 2 white oats, \$1.08, Philadelphia and New York, for 32 pounds.

From these prices you will see that with the exception of oats wheat is the lowest of all grain, and the farmer knows that with the same effort he can produce from two to three times as much corn, oats, rye, or barley per acre, and he will be a hard man to convince that this sacrifice is necessary when the coarser grains are being used instead of wheat and will yield such greater return.

The consumers have been appealed to to cooperate in the saving of wheat, and have willingly accepted the ruling of the Food Administration to buy a pound of substitute with each pound of wheat flour, but they, too, are becoming discouraged when

compelled to pay a premium for the substitute or inferior article, much of which is wasted for want of knowledge as to its best use. Let me quote what the consumer must pay for grain products:

	Per barrel.
Wheat flour.....	\$11.00 to \$12.00
Rye flour.....	14.50 to 15.50
Corn meal.....	11.00 to 14.00
Oat meal.....	13.00 to 15.00

From the above I am convinced that the Food Administration, by lack of complete regulation, has placed a penalty rather than a reward on the consumer for the sacrifice he is making.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I would like to do so, but I have not the time.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like just to get a comparison of those prices.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I have not the time; I will later if I have the time.

We have a new proposition before us, one that unless handled properly will stand out in future years as a rebuke to our judgment, and rather than spend money for seed wheat, to be sold to the farmers on credit, I would be willing to advocate the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the purchase and free distribution of seed wheat under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, such seed to be available to those who are unable to purchase seed or any farmer who would be willing to cultivate such a crop under rules and regulations prescribed by the Department of Agriculture.

By an arrangement of this kind our Western States could be made to increase their yield of spring wheat at least 50 per cent, which would remove all question of a wheat shortage.

I have before me a publication called the Seed Reporter, issued by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, which shows how the Grain Corporation proposes to take care of the seed-wheat business on a small profit for the purpose of increasing production. We are told by the Grain Corporation, which, by the way, is a child of the Food Administration, that they have 500,000 bushels of Marquis spring wheat to supply Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, all winter wheat States, and in which the planting of spring wheat would be an experiment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the name of the publication.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The Seed Reporter, March 20, 1918.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is a Government publication?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes, sir. Bureau of Markets, Department of Agriculture.

This wheat is in Buffalo, and has cost the Grain Corporation about \$2.25 per bushel, and they propose to sell it by the car to any dealer or elevator man at \$2.35 per bushel f. o. b. Buffalo, and the dealer or elevator man has the privilege to resell the grain to the farmer for 15 per cent increase over that price, or a profit of 35 cents per bushel. If a man is unable to purchase a full carload he may buy a less quantity, but the price will be \$2.65 per bushel, and by the time this reaches the farmer, with the 15 per cent added, it will cost him \$3.05 per bushel sacked.

When you consider these profits, compared with those allowed by the rules of the different exchanges dealing in wholesale grain, you can get an idea that the Grain Corporation has gone far from the policy of doing business at cost, especially when the Government furnishes the capital without interest, which amounted to \$150,000,000, in the food-control bill for a revolving fund, and also \$2,500,000 for administration expenses, and a further appropriation of \$1,750,000 in the recent urgent deficiency bill, making a total of \$4,250,000 for expenses from August 10 to June 30 of the present year.

In normal business the brokerage on grain permitted by the different exchanges usually run from 1/4 to 1 cent per bushel, which, together with interest, insurance, and storage, seldom makes more than 3 cents per bushel.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that the Grain Corporation has no right to conduct business for a greater profit than will pay their expenses, especially when its chief function is to encourage the production and regulate the distribution of grain, and if the situation is so serious as to require the furnishing of seed wheat the Department of Agriculture should be authorized to make free distribution, and with their efficient organization keep strict supervision over the planting and growing and use every possible means to see that the results desired are accomplished. [Applause.]

I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SNYDER. I was going to ask the gentleman if the gentleman could give the relative difference in price between wheat and corn, wheat and oats, wheat and rye, say, three years ago?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I can not recall just what it was.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman insert it in his extension?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will.

On page 30 of the Monthly Crop Report, published by authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, issue of March, 1918, the following figures are given as the average prices paid to producers, based on reports from 7,000 country buyers. This table does not include commissions, insurance, elevator charges, or freight to destination.

	Wheat.	Corn.	Rye.	Oats.	Barley.
Mar. 1, 1915.....	\$1.336	\$0.751	\$1.051	\$0.521	\$0.677
Mar. 1, 1916.....	1.029	.682	.856	.427	.595
Mar. 1, 1917.....	1.644	1.009	1.26	.569	.969
Mar. 1, 1918.....	2.027	1.543	2.01	.862	1.161

Mr. WALDOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I will.

Mr. WALDOW. This grain corporation of which the gentleman speaks is a corporation authorized by Mr. Hoover, is it not?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time, and ask the privilege of extending and revising my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I think that some of the gentlemen present do not understand just what this bill is and the principle on which it is framed. Appropriating a comparatively small sum, \$7,500,000, it is solely for the purpose of supplying seed grain to the farmers of the spring-wheat area where they are not able to buy it. It has been urged that it ought to be extended and that seed grain ought to be made available all over the country. I think gentlemen who are urging that really do not mean what they say. This amount of money will not cover the entire country. This is for a part of the country in which, on account of failure of crops, the people are not able at this time to buy the wheat or other grain, nor have they credit with which to buy it. When a gentleman from one of the other States asks that his State be put in with the spring-wheat States he does not mean what he says, and he loses sight of what has been done and is being prepared for other sections. Other bills that have been passed and have become laws, other bills that are pending, that will be passed provide for more money and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of seed grains at cost. The other States in which it is difficult to get seed grain will be accommodated by those laws. I am sure that the great State of New York, from which we hear opposition to this bill; the great State of Massachusetts, and some others, do not wish to come to Congress and ask for Federal aid.

In the first place, I think the farmers of those States are abundantly able to buy seed if they have an opportunity to do so, and that business and financial interests of those States are abundantly able and ought to be willing to help their farmers who are not able to buy and have no credit. They are not in the unfortunate condition in which the people whom this bill will help are now placed. Now, the Committee on Agriculture refused to approve this bill when it first came before the committee because it did not approve the principle of indiscriminate loaning of money by the Government to the farmers or supplying seed on credit, whether they need it or not; but, after extended hearings and testimony brought before the committee to the effect that the spring-wheat section of the country is in great need and must have this help, a majority of the committee yielded and prepared and reported this bill. I early urged financial assistance to farmers to enable them to procure seed, but the majority of the committee were tardy in taking that position. That is the situation in which the bill in its present limited scope comes before the House, and that is the reason the committee has reported it.

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

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do.

Mr. CANNON. This provides for spring wheat?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. For the spring-wheat area.

Mr. CANNON. I am informed by the Representative from South Dakota that his State has fully provided—

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. North Dakota.

Mr. CANNON. And also North Dakota.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. North Dakota, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, has at a session of its legislature authorized the counties to bond for that purpose, and they have pretty well taken care of the needs of their people. There has been some action by the people of South Dakota, and they have given as far as they are able—

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from South Dakota informed me that they had fully cared for it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not understand the situation has been fully taken care of in the State of South Dakota, but shall be pleased to be corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. DILLON. If the gentleman will yield, I might say that South Dakota has had no failure of crops and that our legislature convened last week and provided by resolution that we did not need this aid. They are only taking care of their own people.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Well, this "last week" was since this bill was reported. This bill was reported to the House by the Committee on Agriculture nearly three weeks ago.

Mr. Chairman, I am altogether unable to account for the attitude of gentlemen of this Congress who oppose almost every measure calculated to assist the farmers of the country. They realize, as every sane man does, that there must be increased production of farm crops, particularly wheat. They join in the demand for larger crops, and swell the popular cry that "food will win the war." They are sensible enough to place food on a level with munitions and men for the Army and Navy; they vote for appropriations carrying billions of money, and authorize the departments to enter into contracts with private corporations for munitions, ships, aircraft, and material and supplies of all kinds; to make contracts by which money and material are advanced and supplied by the Government, and in addition, in many cases, the corporations are guaranteed a profit on all their operations. But as to the farmers, the Congress and the administration appeal to their patriotism and let it go at that; the suggestion of contracting for production of wheat or other farm products or of financial assistance in procuring seed is scoffed at; or if help is given it is given grudgingly and not in sufficient measure. I do not forget that the food-control act of August last guarantees a minimum price of \$2 a bushel for wheat of the 1918 harvest, but the failure in any manner to regulate the prices farmers pay for machinery and equipment, or prices of other things farmers must buy, has so increased the cost of farm operations that \$2 wheat is not very profitable. A minimum price of \$2.20 was fixed for wheat, the crop of 1917, but the manner in which that price was fixed or the manner of control of the wheat market by the Food Administration has resulted in making that price the maximum as well as the minimum price. The result has been, further, that prices of all other grains, in no way regulated or interfered with by the Food Administrator, have risen very high, out of all proportion to the price of wheat, and during 1918, at least, the farmers will find larger profit in growing the other grains than in growing wheat. In the face of this novel and unfortunate situation the farmers are urged to continue to sow wheat; their patriotism is appealed to, but substantial assistance is refused—assistance, if promptly given, that would encourage them and enable them to overcome some of the serious difficulties confronting them.

This bill was prepared and reported in the hope that this substantial assistance might be given.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized—

* * * to make advances or loans to farmers in the spring-wheat areas of the United States where he shall find special need for assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes or, when necessary, to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers * * * upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe.

And provides further—

That a first lien on the crop to be produced from such seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed security therefor, and that the total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450.

It seems to me the amount of money to be here appropriated for this purpose, \$7,500,000, is small, when we consider the urgent and immediate need of assistance to farmers of the spring-wheat section of the country, the only section in which an increased production of wheat can be had this year; and as we take into consideration the immense sums of money expended or provided for other war operations, some of them of no greater importance than is the growing of grain for food.

It has been said here that as the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized by this measure, if it shall become law, to loan money or supply seed grain to farmers "upon such terms

and conditions and subject to such regulations" as he may prescribe, he would virtually be authorized to enter into contracts with farmers for the production of grain. And why should not contracts for foodstuffs be made? Money so used will produce larger and better results than will expenditures in many of the other of the activities in which we are engaged during this war emergency. There will certainly be abundant return to justify the expenditure of this money—or for its investment, as it surely is—and in my humble judgment the bill, more restricted in its terms than it ought to be, ought to be passed, and it must be passed and become law without further delay if it is to be of use this year.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that his time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HAUGEN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER].

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Committee on Agriculture for its patience, its hearty cooperation and support of this measure.

Its indorsement of this bill is sufficient argument for its passage. This bill was considered from every angle and entirely upon its merits. It is not a partisan measure. It is a war measure, and there is no partisanship in patriotism. I believe that Congress will act with the same high spirit of patriotism and nonpartisanship with which it has met all the war emergencies.

Critical conditions without parallel have compelled me to urge the passage of this resolution. I believe that you realize the gravity of the situation and the imperative necessity of food at this time. This war will be won by the gradual process of attrition; that is the gradual exhausting of the enemy's resources. Victory rests with the side that has the last bushel of grain in its bin; and I want to see that Uncle Sam is on that side. [Applause.]

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield? I am not antagonistic to the bill. I shall vote for it. You provide by this bill that this money shall be loaned through State and national banks. Are the banks of your State refusing now to make these loans, as they are authorized to do under the Federal reserve act?

Mr. BAER. There is no authorization for loaning money for seed under the Federal reserve act unless the bank guarantees it.

Mr. WINGO. You have got to make a showing that it is for agricultural purposes, and, of course, properly indorsed. Under the Federal reserve act when any farmer gives his note for getting seed or implements or fertilizer for the purpose of the production of food, such a note is eligible for rediscount at the Federal reserve bank, and against it Federal reserve notes may be issued.

Mr. BAER. I want to say to the gentleman that in North Dakota—

Mr. WINGO. Are your banks refusing to grant that relief?

Mr. BAER. No. They can not give the relief, however, because they have not sufficient money. The liberty loans and other conditions have taken the money out of the State. They will loan on land and chattels.

Mr. WINGO. I am not talking about loans on the land. That is under the farm-loan act. But I am talking about the agricultural paper provision of the Federal reserve act. Unless I am misinformed, your Federal reserve bank is in Minneapolis?

Mr. BAER. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Unless I am misinformed, that bank has already loaned \$1,700,000 on this character of paper. If your banks are not granting the relief they should if able, and as they seem unable, I can see the necessity for this relief, and for that reason shall vote for it.

Mr. BAER. I have the reports, in which they say they can not get the relief.

Mr. WINGO. If the banks will not grant the relief—

Mr. BAER. The banks have got to guarantee it. That is another reason, in addition to lack of funds. I can not yield further.

There is plenty of authority in support of this measure. Mr. Hoover says that Congress should make considerable appropriations to farmers who need advances against animals and crops. Mr. Lubin, of the Agricultural Institute of Rome, says that the allies are depending upon the United States for food.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BAER. I can not yield further.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One question.

Mr. BAER. I can not yield.

Lord Rhondda, the food controller of England, says if we do not ship England more wheat he can not take the responsibility of assuring his people that they can win this war.

I have received 14,000 answers to questionnaires showing the need. In fact there are 40,000 homesteaders and twice as many needy farmers in the Northwest who require credit. They have the land and the man power, but need seed on time.

Our farmers have striven and will strive to support our Nation, and those who have seed and are guaranteed labor will raise every possible bushel of wheat they can.

True, the Agricultural Department has made arrangements to have seed on the ground to be sold for cash, but this seed will be of no value to the farmer who has not sufficient funds to buy it. The farmer who has sufficient funds usually carries over enough seed grain for the spring seedling. It is the farmer who has not the seed and has not the credit of whom I am speaking.

There can be no question as to the imperative necessity of increased production. The winter wheat has been planted. The poorest average condition of winter wheat on December 1, 1917, ever reported in the history of the country. On December 1, 1917, the average winter wheat was 79.2 per cent as against 81.4 per cent in December, 1895, the lowest condition ever hitherto reported, and as against 85.7 per cent in December, 1916, when the crop of winter wheat at the following harvest was wholly inadequate to meet our needs. It does not show a yield of over half a billion bushels. The Department of Agriculture has stated that they need a billion bushels. This is impossible. The highest yield of spring wheat in history was 340,000,000 bushels; the average is about 240,000,000 bushels. With the decrease in farm labor and other discouragements it is impossible to raise 250,000,000 bushels of spring wheat, but we must come as close to this as possible. The only way we can approach this need is by passing this bill, which will insure the planting of 3,000,000 acres of wheat with a possible production of 50,000,000 bushels of grain.

If we neglect to pass this measure thousands of acres will remain untilled. Thousands of plowshares will rust and will stand as a reproach of our negligence. To you men who represent city populations I want to say that if you are anxious to decrease the cost of living, vote for this bill. Increased production means the lower cost of living, and food shortage in this country or among our allies would be a very serious problem at this time. Dissatisfaction and social unrest the world over is caused by the lack of bread.

True, we are conserving and we will conserve, but conservation alone will not solve the problem, even if we conserve to a point that endangers the virility of the Nation. Our workers in factories and war industries have been asked to work longer hours to increase production. This raises the question of stamina. If we expect these men to work harder, they naturally will eat more. I believe the conservation problem is a splendid one, but I also want to urge the greatest production. This is the hour of decision. If we do not act, I believe a famine faces the world.

We have basked in the fancied security of our statistics long enough. Let us face the fact and wake up. Let us plant every idle acre. Let us mobilize labor to get the crops out in due season. Agriculture is the chief basis of national prosperity and credit. Let us support this measure; first, to produce more food for our allies and ourselves; secondly, as a vote of confidence in the American farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I am sorry that I can not yield to the gentleman more time. I have about 30 on the list here.

By unanimous consent, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, Mr. McFADDEN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. FOCHT were granted leave to extend their remarks in the Record.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and upon that I ask for tellers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Mr. CANNON. Does that motion take precedence of the gentleman's point of order that there is no quorum present?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion for the committee to rise, the Chair thinks, would take precedence.

Mr. LEVER. I insist on my motion, Mr. Chairman, that the committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. LEVER and Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania took their places as tellers.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, did the Chair state the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the question. Those who favor the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] will pass between the tellers and be counted.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 2, noes 81.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee refuses to rise.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, not a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, there is not a quorum present. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is evident from the vote that there is not a quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anderson	Flood	Kelley, Mich.	Rosenberg
Barkley	Flynn	Kennedy, R. I.	Rose
Blackmon	Gandy	Kettner	Rouse
Borland	Gard	Key, Ohio	Rawland
Brodbeck	Glass	Kitchin	Sanders, La.
Burnett	Good	Laguardia	Saners, N. Y.
Calwell	Goodall	Lazaro	Fanford
Campbell, Kans.	Goodwin, Ark.	Lenroot	Schall
Carew	Gould	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham Pa.	McCutchoh	Scully
Classon	Gray, Ala.	McKinley	Sherley
Cooper, Ohio	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Cooper, W. Va.	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Sims
Copley	Griest	Meeker	Slemp
Costello	Griffin	Miller, Minn.	Small
Crago	Hamill	Miller Wash.	Smith, T. F.
Curry, Cal.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mondell	Steele
Lawson	Harrison, Miss.	Mott	Steing, Pa.
Denison	Harrison, Va.	Nicholls, S. C.	Stines
Dent	Hayden	Nichols, Mich.	Strong
Denton	Hayes	O'Shaunessy	Sullivan
Dies	Hertz	Overmyer	Templeton
Dooley	Helvering	Parker, N. J.	Thomas
Doremus	Hersey	Parker, N. Y.	Tirkhom
Drukner	Hollingsworth	Peters	Van Dyke
Dunn	Houston	Porter	Vinson
Edmonds	Hull, Iowa	Powers	Ward
Ellworth	Humphreys	Price	Workins
Estopinal	Igoe	Ragsdale	White, Me.
Fairchild, B. L.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rainey	Williams
Fairchild, G. W.	Jones, Va.	Reed	Wood, Ind.
Fairfield	Kahn	RJordan	Woodyard
Fess	Kehoe	Roberts	

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. POW, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the committee substitute for the bill H. R. 7795, had found itself without a quorum, and he had caused the roll to be called, whereupon 300 gentlemen had answered "present"; and he submitted a list of absentees to be recorded in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for four solid days this House spent its time in the very important matter of fixing the salaries of postal clerks, post-office officials, and the like. A quorum was always present when that bill was being considered. That was a bill taking something out of the Federal Treasury in the way of salaries for somebody else, mostly somebody else who are organized and have votes. [Laughter.] Here is a proposition which a great committee of this House believes is important in the winning of this war, and yet gentlemen come in here and make a point of no quorum, and, after the Chairman of the committee exhausts every parliamentary expedient to get a quorum here, we are not able to find it. We have killed 25 minutes in calling the roll because there was no quorum present.

I am not scolding the House at all, and I rise only for the purpose of saying that if the friends of this measure are sufficiently in earnest and are in the majority in this House to put this bill through, and will stay with me, we will keep this committee running until the break of day and put it through. Now, will you stay? [Applause.]

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, this bill appears to me to be very important to the country. In the hour or more of discussion of it several objections have been made to it. One of them was that it applied to only a limited section of the country.

Another was that the bill was fathered by the Nonpartisan League. Another was something else.

Now, I beg to suggest to this House—and I may repeat some things that I said this morning in discussing the rule—the question of authorship of this bill should not enter into it at all. This is not the bill of the Nonpartisan League, I may say. Last August I introduced a bill practically like this. I foresaw that the drought in that western country would cause a shortage of crops, and I introduced a bill and hoped to get it through in time for last fall's planting.

Mr. GORDON. What would you do in case you had another drought? What would you do for these men to whom you have loaned the money?

Mr. EVANS. There would be a greater shortage of wheat than there is now.

Mr. GORDON. And there would be a shortage of the money. [Laughter.]

Mr. EVANS. But what will you say if you lose your aeroplanes? Will you get them back? What will you say if you lose your ships? Will you get them back? What will you say if the soldiers are killed? Will you get them back? We are trying to save them, not trying to get something back.

In all that western country, as I said to you this morning, there are thousands of people—and they are not beggars—who can not give any security except the crop. They do not ask the Government to give them anything, but the Government asks them to raise the wheat, and they say, "We will go you fifty-fifty. If we get a crop, we will pay you back." If they do not get a crop this year, they may not pay it back this year, but—

Mr. MORGAN. Because they do not pay it back this year, that is no sign that they will not ever pay it back. I object to your saying they will not pay it back.

Mr. EVANS. I say if they get a crop they will pay it back on this year's crop.

Mr. GORDON. It is not proposed to take security, but take a chance on this year's crop?

Mr. EVANS. Great God! If they had security they could go to the bank or to the financial institution and borrow the money. That is the kind of men we are trying to help—those who have not the security to give.

Gentlemen, in that section of the country thousands of homestead entries are being made. I am sure 80,000 a year are being made in the public-land States. Those men can not get title in one, two, or three years.

If there are 60,000 a year, there are at least 180,000 of these homestead entrymen of the last three years that have not got title to their lands. They are new people. They have just recently come into that country. They have nothing but their courage and the muscle of their arms to start with.

Mr. CRAMTON. While the Government takes a chance on a few dollars to furnish the seed, the farmer takes the chance of his farm and all his time?

Mr. EVANS. Yes; and the Government does not take a chance longer than six months.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Government preferred to treat the farmer as he treats the manufacturers of munitions—furnishing material and paying a per cent of profit on the cost of production—if it would make the same arrangement with the farmer, furnishing material and paying him a per cent or measure of profit on the production, the farmer then taking no chances, I suppose your farmers would not object to that arrangement.

Mr. EVANS. They are not even asking that.

Mr. CRAMTON. But then they would be on an equality basis with the munitions manufacturers?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. The only difference is that the munition manufacturer in every instance has got property to secure the loan the Government makes to him.

Mr. MORGAN. How much?

Mr. GORDON. The Government does not advance any money unless it is secured.

Mr. CRAMTON. But they are dead sure of a profit.

Mr. GORDON. The Government is dead sure of getting its money back, too.

Mr. EVANS. Let me suggest that in the section from which I come we do not gauge citizenship by the amount of money a man has in his pocket or the credit he has at a bank. [Applause.] We have thousands of these men, who are without title to their property.

They are a courageous, patriotic, self-reliant people. They have just settled in that broad expanse of territory. They are building homes and schoolhouses and roads and bridges. There are no cities of importance. There are no financial centers there, no financial institutions able to extend credit to

these people. Anyone conversant with the settlement of a new country knows that if in the period of two or three years, three or four hundred thousand people migrate into a new farming country, that their greatest drawback is money with which to do business. Ten years from now these people will all be well to do. They have lands—productive lands—but they have not title to these lands and they therefore have nothing to give as security to the man who has money to loan. And, as suggested, there are exceedingly few men in that section who have money to loan because they, too, are new in the country. I hope no one will gain the impression that the people of Montana are mendicants or beggars. There are no more courageous, self-reliant, or patriotic people in the world than these people, half of whom have come into the State within the last two or three years; and everyone knows that as a rule the man who leaves his home and comes to take up land in a new country is a man without money. If he had already gotten a start in life, if he was in good circumstances, he would probably have remained at his original home and not gone into a new country to endure the hardships that are always entailed with such a settlement. Western Montana, the older settled part of the State, is amply capable and willing to take care of any demands made upon its people. The territory to which I here refer is that great expanse of eastern Montana, a territory 400 miles long and 200 miles wide. The men of this House do not seem to grasp the situation. Again I say the people of Montana are not lacking in patriotism, nor are they beggars. When the call to arms was sounded in this country, Montana furnished more men in proportion to her population than any State in the Union. When both liberty loans were placed before our people, we oversubscribed the same to a greater extent than the people of any other State in the Union in proportion to our assessed valuation. When the Red Cross call was made, we oversubscribed our allotment 250 per cent. To show you how that State has grown I beg to say that in two years the voting population increased 143 per cent. That State has two Representatives on the floor of this House based upon the census of 1900, and yet we registered more men under the selective draft than did either of the Dakotas with three Representatives, more than the State of Colorado with four Representatives, more than the State of Washington with five Representatives, almost as many as the State of Kansas with six Representatives. We were able to do this because a large percentage of the newer population are young, sturdy, single men who have come into that State to build homes out of a wilderness. This is the class of people that proponents of this bill ask that seed may be furnished this year that they may double the production of wheat in that section. These people are pioneers—real pioneers—and they are not asking any charity at the hands of the Government.

They want to do their bit. They want to pay for everything they get. When a crop is made they will pay for all seed furnished them, and above all they are patriotic and want to win the war. They want to raise wheat because they are on wheat land and because the American people need the wheat. It is just as important to the American people that we have wheat as it is that we have guns and ships and munitions. Last year we spent nearly twenty billions of dollars in an effort to terminate the war. The President, the Food Administrator, and all other farseeing men are begging and urging the people to conserve the bread supply and to produce more foodstuffs, and we here in Congress haggle over the proposition of appropriating seven and a half million dollars to furnish our armies with bread. We have appropriated money to furnish the capital for the conduct of the railroads, for shipbuilding, for munitions of war, for fertilizer, but we balk when it comes to furnishing money for seed to produce foodstuffs. This is not a "pork-barrel" measure; it is a war measure; and I confidently believe that in proportion to the money carried in this bill it will bring as much or better results than any similar amount of money expended elsewhere in the twenty billions of dollars already appropriated.

Mr. GORDON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Montana be extended five minutes. He was interrupted by Members, including myself.

Mr. WALDOW. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DILL] two minutes.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I come from that part of the wheat country which lies between the Rocky Mountains and the Cascades, known as the dry-wheat section, and I can say that there are literally thousands of farmers in that country who will be able to raise greater acreages of wheat if seed wheat can be furnished them on short credit. The conditions that have been

described as existing in the State of Montana because of the drought exist to a large extent throughout eastern Washington and the adjoining regions. That country has been producing about 20,000,000 bushels of wheat each year. Unless there is some help given to these farmers much of the land that was broken last summer for wheat this spring will not be planted. Because of the drought last year the wheat crop was a failure in many sections. There was a small acreage of wheat planted last fall, and I have received large numbers of letters from farmers asking for this legislation.

Mr. KEARNS. Why can they not go to their local banks and borrow this money?

Mr. DILL. For the simple reason that many of them are tenant farmers who have no security on which to borrow money from the banks. A large number of others are homesteaders or are too poor to give the necessary security.

Mr. KEARNS. What security are they going to give the Government?

Mr. DILL. They will give simply the security of the crop that they will raise.

Mr. KEARNS. Why can they not go to the banks and get the banks to loan them money on that same security?

Mr. DILL. Because the banks will not accept it.

Mr. KEARNS. Why should the Government do something that the banks will not do?

Mr. DILL. Because the Government is in a world war, and it is the business of this country to raise all the food possible. [Applause.]

Mr. KEARNS. The banks are interested in the winning of the war, are they not?

Mr. DILL. Yes; but they can not loan out the money under the State laws controlling banking, nor with safety to their stockholders. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] suggests, they are in the business of banking for the purpose of making money. The Government is going into this business for the purpose of producing food to win the war.

Mr. KEARNS. The banks of that section of the country are a part of the Government, are they not?

Mr. DILL. Oh, no.

Mr. KEARNS. They are interested in it.

Mr. DILL. Yes; they are interested in it. I have no complaints to make against the banks in this regard, because I doubt whether it would be advisable, from a business standpoint, for the banks to loan money on such security. I do not support this bill from a business standpoint, but I do support it from a patriotic standpoint. [Applause.] We can not afford to haggle and delay at a time like this. We must act, and act in the manner that will result in the production of as much wheat as possible.

Mr. RUBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] five minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I do not know that I can add very much to what I said in the discussion of this question while the rule was being considered, but I have such a deep conviction as to the wrong that is about to be done and as to the farce that is about to be perpetrated that I rise for the second time to enter my protest against this kind of legislation. [Applause.] I stated in my speech before that the Secretary of Agriculture opposed the original Baer bill when it was before the Committee on Agriculture. I stand here to reaffirm that he opposed that bill and said it was not a good proposition and not good business, and advocated that it be not reported out of that committee, and no member of that committee will dispute my statement. This is a revamp of the original Baer bill, cutting down the amount from \$50,000,000 to \$10,000,000, because they think they can get \$10,000,000 through. That is all there is to it. But it is the same principle, and the committee killed that Baer bill when it was considered before. Now, how did they camouflage and get it back into the committee and on the floor of this House? They did it by inserting one new proposition. That proposition is a mobilization of labor. God knows we have got a Labor Department down here. We have given them millions of dollars to do the very work that this \$2,500,000 is supposed to do. Here you come and offer to duplicate that expenditure and have another force of employees camouflaging in this bill by bringing a new item into it in order to offer a \$7,500,000 proposition to loan money to 166,666 people to make a crop this year. There are just 30 more days in which to plant spring wheat, and another body has got to pass on this bill. Are you fooling yourselves? Are you not intelligent men? Do you not know that this bill can not pass the other body, if they were favorably disposed to it, and then this machinery be set in motion to loan to 166,666 people \$450 apiece to buy wheat to sow on their land? I will tell you

what is the truth. Why do you not go and do like Texas did? Our legislature appropriated millions in order to relieve the drought-stricken section of that State, where 144 counties were stricken barren. That is the course that ought to be pursued. Oh, I have a feeling for the people in the drought-stricken section, but that feeling can not run away with me and make me violate a governmental principle and perform a farce in this House in saying that we are going to give you \$7,500,000.

I believe in raising this wheat, and here is a sensible proposition. The Secretary of the Treasury will back every one of these banks down there with public funds, as he has done in the industrial centers, and as he has done in my State to relieve the cattlemen who have lost their all, but he made the banks get behind these loans, and he makes it a banking proposition, so that the Government will not lose one dollar of the money, and it will be paid back because these banks back up that credit; and let me tell you a man who is worthy of credit in the country where I come from, and I believe it is true of every other section of the United States, is able now, if he is honest and industrious, to go to his local banks and borrow money with which to buy seed in order to raise a crop. You talk about the bankers not being patriotic. They are patriotic.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. They are patriotic and they will advance this money if the man on the farm is worthy of the credit, because in order that the bank may succeed, the country in which they are located must succeed. I yield.

Miss RANKIN. Has the gentleman any bank in a homestead district in his State that can loan \$1,000,000 to the farmers?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. We have no homestead districts in my State, but it does not change the principle of the thing. I take it that in the homestead districts the banks are anxious that the homesteaders shall succeed, because, unless they do succeed, the banks ultimately will have to go out of business.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Yes.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman please explain the difference between the principle involved in this bill and the principle involved in appropriating every year \$500,000 for the eradication of the Texas cattle tick? [Applause]

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. If the gentleman can see any comparison between the two items, he sees more than any other person in this House can see.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor, and especially when we are at war, as we are now, and when food is so important to the winning of that war, of the Government aiding the farmers as liberally as possible in producing the maximum of foodstuffs of which the soil is capable. Indeed, at the risk of being called a paternalist, I will say that I think the subject of agriculture is so important to the country, not alone in war times but in peace times as well, that I am in favor of still larger appropriations for the distribution of seeds and the dissemination of literature to aid in their proper planting and cultivation. But, Mr. Chairman, returning to this bill and having in mind the discrimination and sectionalism which it embodies, I wish to say that I believe in equal rights to all and exclusive privileges to none. I am that much of a Jeffersonian Democrat. [Laughter and applause.]

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

Mr. LANGLEY. I will not. The gentleman ought to know that he should not seek to interrupt me when I have such a brief time allotted me.

This bill in its present shape reminds me of what a fellow said to his partner who had charge of the cash register and who was using too much of the net profits of the concern. When the other partner complained about that, he said, "Oh, that will be all right in the end. We are in cahoots, you know"; to which the complaining partner replied: "Yes; I know we are in cahoots, but the hell of it is that you are getting the money and I am getting the cahoots." [Laughter.]

This bill as it now stands gives all of the benefit to you fellows who are in the spring-wheat areas, while we of the corn belt are getting the cahoots. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of amending this bill so as to include Kentucky, which I beg to remind you is still one of the States of the Union. [Applause and laughter.] We raise comparatively little wheat in Kentucky, and what we do raise we sow in the fall of the year. We raise some buckwheat, and if I have a chance I believe I will offer an amendment to strike out the word "spring" and insert the word "buck."

[Laughter.] That would come nearer to helping us in Kentucky if the bill is to be confined to the current year. We raise a good deal of tobacco in Kentucky, too, and we also raise some cane in spots. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. And some rye?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; and some rye, too. [Laughter.] But our great staple is corn, and I shall not vote for this bill unless it is amended so as to include corn, because we are short of seed corn there, especially in the mountain section, and my information is that the price of good seed corn is practically prohibitive. There is another reason why I think this bill should include the loaning of money to farmers for the purchase of seed corn, and that is that I think our soldier boys who are over there fighting for us are entitled to the very best of everything. [Applause.] I am in favor of them having biscuit and all of the wheat bread they can eat. Corn bread is good enough for us back here, and I am in favor of us eating corn bread exclusively here at home in order that we may be able to send more wheat "over there." The best way to accomplish that is to amend this bill so that our farmers may be able to purchase more seed corn, which is so scarce in Kentucky and other sections of the country, and thereby enable our farmers to raise more corn, not to be used in producing what Kentucky formerly utilized a great deal of corn for, because the old Commonwealth is going dry pretty soon, but to raise it in order that we may be able to send all of our wheat across the sea to our allies and our soldiers. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, there is only one excuse for this kind of legislation, and that is the Nation's extreme necessity for more bread material. We are the food providers of the civilized world to-day. A few millions of bushels of wheat or corn may mean the winning or losing of this war. The President, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hoover, the Food Director, and the members of the great Agricultural Committee say that this is a war measure of great and imperative importance, and I shall support it on the theory that it is a war measure.

Complaint has been made here by certain Members that this bill means that the Government will take a large part of the \$7,500,000 appropriated and lend it to grain growers without the usual kind of a security which good business men would require. I do not attempt to justify the passage of this bill to enable the Government to go into the business of buying and selling seed or lending money to grain growers and taking a lien upon their crop as security as a banking or money-lending proposition, but as a means of increasing the bread supply of the world, which in my judgment is the most important factor in winning the war if it lasts any considerable length of time.

But, gentlemen, I personally think you could justify the passage of this act better if you did not make it so sectional in its provisions. It is true you have cut out the words: "in the spring-wheat areas" and made its provisions apply to the whole Nation; but since it only applies to the crop of the year 1918 and only provides for wheat, barley, and oats, it will have little other application than to the districts where spring wheat is planted.

I have proposed an amendment to the first section of the bill, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and sell either on time or credit, as he deems best, seed corn in the corn belt of the United States. If any of you gentlemen know any good reason why you should not include seed corn in the districts of the United States where last year's corn crop was frost bitten to the extent of 75 per cent I would like to hear it.

Some one has said that there is already an appropriation to take care of the seed question. If this is true, and if that appropriation is adequate, then why the necessity of this bill for the spring-wheat area? That argument affects this whole bill and should not be used alone against one section of the country any more than another.

And while we are on the subject I want to say to you that you have not treated the farmer of the great Middle West fairly in this and the last session of Congress. The farmers of my district and State are patriotic and are not opposed to their sons going to the battle front to fight in this death struggle for the life of this Republic. They would resent congressional action that would deny to them the privilege of sharing in the glory of this great cause. I think, and many of them think, that there are instances where boys have been taken from farms who could have served their country best following the plow. Congress authorized the President to exempt farmer boys from the draft where they were essential to the conduct of the operation of the farm. In some communities

little, if any, regard was given by exemption boards to this important question. Thousands of young men sorely needed to produce bread are now in the training camps. The cry for farm help is heard on every hand; and I am told that back in my district in Indiana, in every county, auctioneers are busy selling farm implements and farm stock, and that there is great fear that the farmers will not be enabled to produce as much grain as they have been accustomed to producing. Since the world is looking to us for food it is unfortunate if this condition actually exists.

Practically everyone agrees that in instances where boys are essential to the planting, cultivating, and harvesting of this year's crop they should be furloughed and permitted to go home and do this important work before taking up further military duties. By a unanimous vote, as I remember it, two weeks ago we passed a bill authorizing the Secretary of War, under rules and regulations to be made by him, to furlough this class of boys. I have worn the soles off of my shoes and worn out a couple of telephones, figuratively speaking, in the different war departments, trying to find out if there is going to be any rules and regulations made for furloughing these boys, and gentlemen, I finally gave up in despair. No one in any of the war departments knew anything about whether such provisions and arrangements were being made, and I venture the assertion that no such arrangement will be made. The President signed the bill, although I am informed that The Adjutant General prepared and submitted a brief in an attempt to prevent him from doing so. The General Staff is against it. This is not a political matter; the General Staff are only looking to the question of getting an army together. We are trying to look not only to the question of getting an army together, but to raise food to feed them and all of our people and our allies. If they delay much longer, it will be too late to do the farmer any good. He ought to know what to depend upon now.

A large part of Indiana's last year's corn crop, which was frost-bitten, was in the field in December and January. The Indiana Federal food director came over here, and the Hon. LINCOLN DIXON, my colleague, introduced a bill authorizing the distillation of this corn into alcohol to make war munitions out of. For some reason the bill never got out of committee, but after the corn had rotted in the field the President made an Executive order permitting it to be distilled.

The Federal food director in Indiana tells me that the seed-corn question in my State is acute. I fear that worthless seed will be planted, and if seed corn is selling for the fabulous prices reported I fear, in many instances, some good corn land will lie idle. If seed corn is imported into our State from territories north or south of us it may mature too early or too late. If my amendment is adopted, it will leave it up to the Secretary of Agriculture, probably through Mr. Christie or Dr. Barnard, of the Federal food commission of Indiana, to buy the right kind of seed corn, and then through the county councils or county agents get it to the right place at the right time. When I was on the farm I think we planted from 6 to 8 acres with 1 bushel of seed corn. It does not mean a great outlay of money, but it is important that the right kind of seed corn is thoroughly scattered among the corn growers of the Middle West. They ought to be distributing this seed corn now, and if this amendment passes I hope the Senate will quickly act upon this bill, and that it will be put into operation at once.

I am willing to help the great Northwest produce more wheat. I do not begrudge them the money the Government will lend them. If the wheat is planted and we never get the money back, it is, in my judgment, a good investment. About every appropriation made so far has missed the Middle West. I think it is time that you were giving a little consideration to the Mississippi Valley, and unless you adopt my amendment and give us an opportunity at once to get properly tested seed corn for our corn growers at actual cost to the Government, you are doing my people a grave injustice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON].

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, according to the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture in area production Kansas is 25 per cent short, Oklahoma is 20 per cent short, and Nebraska is 20 per cent short. I come from a congressional district that raises every year 42,000,000 bushels of corn, 11,000,000 bushels of wheat, and 22,000,000 bushels of oats, and yet I have seen the time in my life in which these same farmers that are producing these immense crops were mortgaging their crops to buy seeds. This is a question of shortage and of drought; it is not a question of sectionalism. In 1911 there were some five or six counties in the northwest part of my State that by reason of drought had a shortage of crops. We had a law

upon our statute books by which the county commissioners could loan to the farmers and take back a crop mortgage. I want to give you the experience of four counties in 1912. In Perkins County the commissioners loaned \$67,000 to 1,292 farmers, and there remains uncollected only \$5,700. Meade County loaned \$9,000 to 125 farmers, and only \$680 remain uncollected. In Pennington County they furnished 8,190 bushels to 117 farmers, and there has not been a dollar lost of the loans in that county. In Butte County \$10,000 was loaned to 200 farmers, and there remains only \$1,500 uncollected. It is a question of drought in certain sections of the country. You can not produce more winter wheat because the day has passed, but you can produce more spring wheat to feed our armies abroad. Now is the time to do it, and you can do it by granting the provisions of this bill. Out in some of these sections of the Northwest we have had droughts and they are unable to buy seed for cropping purposes. It was stated here by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] that there were 20,000 entrymen on homesteads under the homestead laws last year. Many of those people who have taken homesteads went out there without machinery, without teams, without credit, and without money. You can not raise anything the first year; it takes time to open up a farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that the gentleman be given a half a minute in order to ask a question. Sixty thousand homesteaders in Montana?

Mr. DILLON. I mean 20,000.

Mr. CANNON. But 60,000 throughout the United States; is that it?

Mr. DILLON. I do not know the number. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS] made the statement there were 20,000 homesteaders last year in the State of Montana.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, my support of this measure will not be given it on the ground that I anticipate that this measure alone will win the war, but because I believe it is one that will help to win the war, and because it tends to recognize certain conditions that exist which this country must come to realize more clearly before we do win the war. In that winning we must have men, munitions, food, and ships. If we have not come to realize it yet, we will come to realize before this Nation is a year older that the question of a proper supply of food is not a question in which the farmer alone is interested. [Applause.] It is a question in which the whole Nation is interested; it is a question in which our allies are interested. This bill recognizes the idea that it is not improper, but is highly desirable for the Government to cooperate with the producer of foods to increase the food production the same as the Government cooperates with the producer of munitions or the producer of ships in order to increase the production thereof. In the production of munitions the Government will furnish a contract by which it agrees to furnish the materials and take the product. Under the finance bill recently passed by the House money will be advanced to such manufacturers. Such contracts give the manufacturer a sure thing that he will get a profit of 10 per cent upon the cost of those munitions. They say, of course the Government is sure of the munitions, and therefore can not lose. Even so. But the Government must stand all the wastage of time and material, and is not sure that after the munitions are produced it will want them. If there is a change of conditions it may not want those particular shells, but it will have them on its hands. Will anybody say that the possibility of such loss must prevent the Government from contracting for the munitions it must have and taking such course as will secure the greatest production? But food is just as great a necessity as ordnance or shells, and the prospect for a serious shortage for us and our allies is now dire and threatening.

These are not days for the slavish following of precedents. We must do the things necessary for the winning of the war. The fact that such things have not been done before, or that in peace times hereafter should not be repeated, should not deter such action by us if the thing proposed strengthens our resources or cements our forces for winning the war. Our present critical necessities must guide us.

The Government must encourage the farmer by needed cooperation in any feasible way to increase the production of food. If through this measure the Government happens to lose the cost of the seed, the farmer has lost his labor, the interest on his investment, and his year's efforts. The serious loss to the Government will be not the seed advance but the crop failure. It is to prevent such crop failure that the Government must take the chance. And if, on the other hand,

the Government through that small chance does increase the production of wheat by 100,000 acres or more, the Nation gets its return in that increase for the chance that it has taken. Personally I believe the time is close upon us when a greater share of the chances in food production must be taken by the Government in order to insure sufficient for our absolute necessities. Contracts out and out for production of food are as logical as contracts for production of clothing or ordnance, and are at this moment as necessary to the winning of the war. As yet the country has not realized it. Within a year stern necessity will teach us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is a question of favoring the citizens of Montana or North Dakota. The sole question is whether or not we shall set at work a potentially capable set of people who can not without this assistance render the best that is in them. The winter-wheat crop is not what the Government expected, either in acreage or quality. The one opportunity to increase for America and her allies wheat bread, which has been the war bread for thousands of years, is to increase the spring-wheat acreage. It will not affect my district. It will not affect my State, but it will affect several States where there are tens of thousands of homesteaders. And as the Government desires to make most efficient its soldiers in the field it ought to render efficient the farmers wherever they lack the tools or the means.

I am somewhat familiar with the banking situation in the new parts of Montana, and I know the banks have loaned to their utmost capacity. And this is simply a loan you are making in your own interests to increase this wheat product. I have no doubt that if the Government will make these loans its losses will be very slight. I am confident that if we loan these few millions to the farmers of these Northwestern States we are just about as liable to have it paid as the loans we are making, not by millions, but by billions, to our allied friends in other countries. And while I trust the allies, their Governments, and their people, I would rather trust our friends in our neighboring States and expect to get full return from them than from people of whom we know but little. [Applause.]

I desire simply to say this, and ask leave to extend my remarks in the Record, that I believe by helping those people to-day we are helping the Government in obtaining that which during the coming year will be more efficacious than powder or shell. [Applause.] There has been some question about where this measure came from, or who are its sponsors. These questions do not strongly appeal to me. It is written in the English language. Its terms are understandable. Its purposes and objects are patriotic. It is recommended by the Agriculture Committee. I have in my service here voted for measures on a basis of their merits rather than their origin. I have heard no valid reason for opposing this bill. I expect to vote for it, because it is not a case of aiding Montana citizens. If that were the case, I should say, "Montana, do your duty." But Montana as a State is not at war. The United States is at war and needs the wheat. We should do our share in producing it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill, first, because one of the great committees of this House, after careful consideration, have reported in favor of it; second, I am in favor of it because it is for the purpose of aiding in the successful carrying on of this war; and I believe, Mr. Chairman, that when we have those facts before us we ought to brush aside every other consideration, whether it affects our own locality or not, and look only to the welfare of the Nation at this hour, when our soldiers upon the battle fields of France to-day are fighting and giving up their lives to save the very Republic that we are here to serve. [Applause.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, and a letter I have just sent to the Clerk's desk, which I will ask to have read in my time, indicates very clearly the situation that obtains in regions where there has been drought.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN FALLS, IDAHO, March 8, 1918.

HOB. BURTON L. FRENCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Power County Farm Bureau, with the University of Idaho and the United States Department of Agriculture cooperating, has completed a survey for spring seeding. Over 700 farmers were ques-

tioned and individual reports secured covering over 200,000 acres of farm land in Power County. I beg to hand you herewith a partial summary of this survey:

Number of acres now seeded to fall wheat	95,411
Number of acres intended for spring seeding	59,910
Number of farmers who have no seed	269
Number of farmers who have some seed but not enough for requirements	179
Number of acres ready for seeding for which there is no seed in the farmers' hands	26,045
Number of farmers having no feed for work stock	179
Number of acres to be summer fallowed and seeded to wheat in fall of 1918	58,616

From a careful scrutiny of the above you will readily see that a serious condition exists in Power County. This condition is the result of three years of short crops due to drought. Many of the farmers are without funds to even buy the necessities of life, and, while a patriotic sentiment is evident and the people want to do all they can in the way of raising more wheat, the failures of the past three years in certain sections of Power County and the cash system that now prevails in purchase of supplies have put many of them in a position where they must have financial assistance to carry them through another crop period. The banks here are anxious to help but the situation is a little beyond them, and we must have outside help, either from the State or Federal Government. The time is short. The facts are known. The seed wheat is available if funds can be secured to move it. Many of the farmers will be compelled to desert their farms and go to work in the shops or elsewhere unless immediate action is taken to prevent it.

There should be at least \$250,000 deposited in the banks of Power County to be loaned to the farmers needing help upon the recommendation of the farm bureau and county council of defense after thorough investigation and inquiry into each individual case.

What do you think can be done?

Very truly, yours,

POWER COUNTY FARM BUREAU.
By JOHN R. WRIGHT, Secretary.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, this letter is from Power County, one of the counties in Idaho that is farmed for the most part by dry-farm methods. The same condition exists in some other belts where dry farming prevails. The letter is clear-cut and tells in striking manner of a situation that this bill will relieve.

Several objections have been made to the bill. It is objected that it is too late to do good. Gentlemen, it is not too late if we act now and if the Senate will immediately ratify the bill.

It is objected that the machinery can not be put into motion that will meet the situation with promptness. The letter that I have had read indicates the careful survey of one county. I have no doubt that somewhat similar surveys have been made in almost every region that is in need of help. Through those surveys and with the aid of the agents of the Agricultural Department and the members of the county councils of national defense we shall have the machinery at hand with which to proceed with the work under the bill.

Again, it is objected that the idea is novel and would be a bad precedent. Do we forget that even in days of peace we have spent millions to fight the boll weevil of Texas? That we have spent millions to aid the sufferers through floods in the Ohio and the Mississippi Valleys? That time and again when disaster has visited one section of our country or another our Nation has helped as a Nation to bear the burden? Well, that is in part what is proposed here. The regions to be benefited are regions that have suffered and where drought has greatly reduced or wiped out the normal yield of grain. In normal times this loss could be borne locally. To-day the price of seed is high, the cost of farm machinery has been tremendously advanced, labor can be had at only a high wage. The farmer who has suffered through drought can not bear the burden alone.

But if this legislation would be justified in days of peace, how much more imperative is it now? The farmer is not the only one interested. The country is interested, the world depends upon food, and as a war emergency this bill should pass.

To provide advances of money for the purchase of grain is only one feature of the bill.

There is another feature. The bill provides that \$2,500,000 shall be made available for mobilization and distribution of farm labor; and, as important as is the first feature of the bill, I am inclined to think that this feature is more important.

From all over my district I am receiving letters calling attention to the labor problem. Farmers are working hard to meet the situation, but they are discouraged. Here is a letter from Mr. G. H. Brayton, of Jerome, Idaho, the chairman of the Lincoln County Farm Bureau, from which I quote:

There are many thousands of acres in this county that within the last 10 years have been reclaimed from the desert and put under cultivation, at the cost of from \$25 to \$50 per acre, that are going to be abandoned during 1918 for the want of labor or on account of the increased cost of the same.

This letter is one of many, and our Government must bend every energy to locate available labor and then to place it. An officer of the Department of Labor told me this morning of 3,000 men in one small city who have been thrown out of employment, but whom the department will place where they will be needed with little delay. He told me of another 200 men whose work terminated on Saturday night and who through the aid of the

department went to work the next Monday morning in another city.

I mention these two cases to show that already the Government is a clearing house for labor. It will become more important as such. In one region is a dearth of labor, in another are idle men. Let us provide an agency that will bring the two together, and that, in fact, is what is contemplated in the bill for the farmers of the country.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. There is one point which I do not believe has been brought out. Now, this is largely for the aid of wheat farmers. It does not cost but a trifle, so to speak, to furnish seed for a field of corn. But an ordinary wheat farmer in the western country may plant from 200 to 300 acres of wheat. It will cost from \$300 to \$500 to furnish seed for that crop, and when you are in a section where wheat is the chief crop and there has been a failure of wheat the local banks do not have the money to furnish the credit to buy the necessary seed wheat, because in a year when there has been a wheat failure that affects the credit of the local banks. A year ago we passed the food-survey bill. In the form in which that bill passed the House there was a provision which provided that the Secretary of Agriculture might furnish seed to farmers on credit and to any section of the Union when conditions made it necessary.

Mr. GORDON. For cash.

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; not for cash, but on credit. And when that bill went to the Senate for some reason unknown to me that provision was struck out of the bill. This House never had a right to vote on that proposition. I do not know who is responsible for taking that out. If that provision had been left in the bill whereby the Secretary of Agriculture could have helped the farmers of western Oklahoma and western Kansas and western Nebraska in purchasing seed wheat, we would have had several million additional acres of wheat growing to-day. I am surprised that some gentlemen in this House look upon this bill as merely a special favor to wheat farmers. It would aid some poor farmers, but the chief thing is it would aid the Nation; it would mean more wheat and more bread, and would strengthen us and our allies and aid us to win the war.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, supplementing what my colleague has said with reference to the needs of the farmers of Idaho in the dry-farm sections, I wish to read two telegrams, the first from R. J. Leth, the State seed commissioner, as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, March 22, 1918.

HON. ADDISON T. SMITH, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

How soon can relief for farmers unable to purchase seed wheat in northeast Idaho be expected? Wheat in given section too foul to pass State law.

That is, the seed which they have raised in the eastern part of the State can not be used because it is unfit for seed and it is necessary to purchase seed from outside. He says further:

Must buy elsewhere to insure passable seed. Farmers unable to pay cash. Immediate action imperative. Please wire reply.

R. J. LETH,
State Seed Commissioner.

I have also the following telegram from the chairman of the farm market bureau:

BOISE, IDAHO, March 14, 1918.

HON. ADDISON T. SMITH, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Two hundred thousand dollars now set aside by Idaho Bankers' Association to loan farmers for buying seed. Two counties alone have already called for \$250,000. Five hundred farmers or more would be benefited in wheat alone.

HARVEY ALLRED,
Chairman Farm Market Bureau.

I yield back the balance of my time. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that I may extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORFON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to this bill seemingly do not understand its purpose or the conditions which demand it. The purpose of the legislation proposed is to help the farmers throughout the country, to enable them to produce for the Nation more food-stuffs, to do the very thing that the Nation needs and wants done.

There is no man who has made any study of this question during the past few months but knows that in the Nation to-day and in the world there is a great shortage of wheat. We are not, in passing this legislation, doing more for the farmer than we are doing to-day for other industries. While we are supplying in the lumber regions money to lumbermen and contractors to build railroads and wagon roads, while we are advancing to them money sufficient to meet every expense connected with cutting down and getting out timber for aeroplane construction and shipbuilding, and while in addition we are furnishing enlisted men to do much of this work is it unreasonable to ask the Government to supply credit to needy farmers in the spring wheat growing section of the country to assist them to procure seed wheat so they may put in a maximum crop acreage of spring wheat during the next six or eight weeks? If we are to give credence to the official reports which reach us from our Food Administration and from the food administrators of France and England, an increased production of wheat during the coming season is not much less important than an increased production of aeroplanes and of ships. If the Secretary of Agriculture finds that there is no need to advance this money and no necessity to make these contracts with farmers for increased wheat production, then the money appropriated in the bill will not be used.

I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] that I quite agree with him in his suggestion that the appropriation here is not large enough. I believe the Secretary of Agriculture should have come into this House with a broad, comprehensive plan for increased food production throughout the Nation. I believe he should have come to Congress and asked for \$100,000,000 to be available to the Department of Agriculture to help every agricultural section of the country, and to encourage to the largest possible extent increased food production in every section of the country where the aid of the Agricultural Department would accomplish this. The Secretary of Agriculture has not yet awakened to the real needs of the Nation and of our allies in the war for greater food production this year. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon] that if this bill is soon enacted into law and it results in increasing the production of wheat even a few millions of bushels his constituents in Cleveland may not be so hungry next winter as they are likely to be if there is a shortage of food products in this country this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. GORDON. Would you lend this money without any security at all?

Mr. NORTON. I would lend it on the best security that can be given, and that is the security and the certain assurance that the farmers to whom it is advanced or loaned will cheerfully and patriotically invest their time, their labor, their skill, their experience, and the use of their lands and all their expensive farm machinery and equipment in an earnest endeavor, combined with nature, to produce for you and other citizens of the Nation more wheat, which is so greatly needed to be ground into flour, which experience has shown is the very staff of the Nation's life.

Mr. GORDON. But you would have to buy them in order to get them to do this. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORTON. That statement is gratuitous. It is unjust and unworthy of the gentleman. The farmers in the spring-wheat growing sections of the country do not have to be bought or subsidized by anyone to cooperate to the very maximum of their power, ability, and resources with the Government in this crucial time of our Nation's life. Without this aid that is being asked for they will do all that lies within their power and resources in the production of food products; with this aid given them they can and will be able to do more for the Nation. They want to do more. The President, the Food Administrator, and the Secretary of Agriculture tell them that more wheat is needed to be produced this year in this country than it appears now will be produced. The food administrators of Belgium, of France, of England, and of Italy are calling upon them to produce this year every possible bushel of wheat that can be produced. In the face of this will anyone in this House vote to deny them this pittance of assistance and encouragement which

will enable them to respond more fully to the demands for greater wheat production which is being made upon them by this Nation and by all the nations with which we are allied in this war? In view of the facts presented by the very able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in support of this measure it seems to me that the measure should have the immediate and unanimous support of this committee and of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Rubey] has five minutes remaining.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Ragsdale].

Mr. RAGSDALE. I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Shallenberger].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for one minute.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this measure because it is reported from the great Committee on Agriculture as a military measure, and I believe it to be such. The men at the front can not fight unless they are fed. I do not expect that we shall win this war with "dough," either wheat or financial, but I recognize that both are munitions of war, and because I believe the increased production of wheat is essential in the prosecution of the war and the chairman believes this bill will help in that direction I am for it. Because I believe that the labor engaged in agriculture and every other form of essential war industry is a vital factor in the situation that confronts the country and for the further reason that it is a bill that will affect all labor in the country in the gravest degree I am for it.

I ask unanimous consent to insert certain matter in the Record for the information of the House. As most of the Members know, a bill has been reported from the Military Committee which proposes to change fundamentally present law for determining the basis of obtaining the quotas called from draft districts under the draft law. The minority of the committee have directed me to prepare an amendment, which I will offer to that bill. When it is up for consideration before the House I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the change in present law proposed in the new legislation, and the amendment which I expect to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record the subject matter indicated in his statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT AS TO PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE DRAFT LAW.

S. J. Res. 123, which has passed the Senate and has been reported by the Military Affairs Committee of the House and referred to the House Calendar, providing for certain changes in the present draft law for calling men into the military service under the terms of the act of Congress of May 18, 1917, after defining the act to be amended upon the first page, provides, on page 2 of the resolution as printed, as follows:

"No provision of said act shall prevent the President from calling for immediate military service under regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President all or part of the persons in any class or classes except those exempt from draft under the provisions of said act, in proportion to the total number of persons placed in such class or classes in the various subdivisions of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the terms of said act; or from calling into immediate military service persons classed as skilled experts in industry or agriculture, however classified or wherever residing."

It will be noted that the resolution as reported changes the basis of the quotas from population as it is in existing law and bases it upon the number of persons placed in any class or classes. The amendment proposed by Mr. SHALLENBERGER and which is printed below for the information of Members of the House proposes to base the quotas upon the number of persons liable for military service in the draft districts as determined by the registration of persons so liable when the same has been completed by the War Department.

Amendment as proposed by Mr. SHALLENBERGER: On page 2, line 5, strike out all after the word "act," down to and including the word "act," at the end of line 8, and in line 11, after the period, at the end of the bill, add the following:

"Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, or subdivisions thereof, called under the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, shall hereafter be determined in proportion to the total number of persons registered and liable for military service therein, including resident aliens who have waived all claims for exemption, and credit shall be given on its quotas to any State Territory, District, or subdivision thereof for the number of men who have entered the military service of the United States from any such State, Territory, District, or subdivision thereof since April 1, 1917, including members of the National Guard who were in Federal service on that date."

The amendment proposed above continues the provisions of existing law, which allows credit for volunteers, which the Senate resolution, if enacted without amendment, will no longer permit.

Mr. RUBEX. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is just one more minute left of this general debate. I yield that minute to the chairman of the committee, the little giant from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER]. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in the minute remaining I desire to say that many Members, talking to me personally, have made objection to section 2 of this bill, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to secure the voluntary mobilization and distribution of farm labor. No one seems to object to the idea of mobilizing farm labor and utilizing it to the best advantage in this country, but there seems to be some fear that the Secretary of Agriculture might be given the power to go into a State and very largely take from that State labor that should be used in the State. My colleague [Mr. STEVENSON] has prepared an amendment which he has submitted to me, which I think makes it absolutely certain that that kind of thing can not happen. When the bill is read under the five-minute rule for amendment, if my colleague [Mr. STEVENSON] will offer that amendment, as I am sure he will, I shall have no objection to it, and I think that will relieve all objection to this section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

By unanimous consent Mr. LANGLEY, Mr. NORTON, Mr. McFADDEN, Mr. YOUNG of Texas, and Mr. RUBEX were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1918, to make advances or loans to farmers in spring-wheat areas of the United States where he shall find special need for such assistance for the purchase of wheat, oats, and barley for seed purposes, or, when necessary, to procure such seed and sell the same to such farmers. Such advances, loans, or sales shall be made upon such terms and conditions and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, including an agreement by each such farmer to use the seed thus to be obtained by him for the production of grain during the crop season of 1918. A first lien on the crop to be produced from seed obtained through a loan, advance, or sale made under this section shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be deemed sufficient security therefor. The total amount of such advances, loans, or sales to any one farmer shall not exceed \$450. All such advances or loans shall, as far as practicable, be made through the agency of State and National banks. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$7,500,000, available immediately.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in line 1, page 2, the words "spring wheat."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HELVERING offers an amendment, on page 2, line 1, to strike out the words "spring wheat."

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORGAN. Are we considering the resolution or the bill introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER]?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is considering the substitute bill, contained in House resolution 281.

Mr. NORTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORTON. Under the rule the bill H. R. 7795 is not being considered. The only bill being considered is the bill that is written in the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The text of the bill is contained in the rule.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this is an important amendment. I do not know how much time gentlemen may want on it, but I should like to sound out the committee to ascertain how much time is desired on this one amendment to strike out the words "spring wheat."

I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this pending amendment may be closed in 15 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. This is a matter about which there is a great deal of controversy.

Mr. LEVER. At the request of gentlemen around me, I will modify my request and ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the gentleman will not press that.

Mr. LEVER. Make it 45 minutes, then.

Mr. CANNON. There has been no discussion on this. It is too early to fix a limit.

Mr. ROBBINS. Some members of the committee have talked two or three times. I want five minutes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would like five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I will modify my request by asking that the debate on this pending amendment shall close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. There has been no consideration of the pending amendment. Let it run a while and see.

Mr. LEVER. I will modify my request further by asking unanimous consent that debate on this pending amendment, the importance of which I recognize, shall close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Does that cover other amendments?

Mr. LEVER. No; just this amendment.

Mr. NORTON. There has been no debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from South Carolina is made pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING], who is entitled to the floor for five minutes. Will the gentleman from South Carolina please state his request?

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] may close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Who is to control the time?

Mr. BAER. How is the time to be controlled?

Mr. LEVER. The Chair to control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. I object.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that we are considering the bill as printed or the resolution?

The CHAIRMAN. House resolution 281, reported by the Committee on Rules, contains the bill that is under consideration.

Mr. HELVERING. Therefore my statement of the page and line where my amendment occurs is correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Chairman, my object in offering this amendment is to make available this fund for the purpose of securing greater production of cereals necessary for the feeding of the people of this country. I realize that the greater part of this money undoubtedly will be used in the spring-wheat area, yet oats and barley as well as wheat are very necessary to be produced. It is very necessary that they be produced at this time.

There are large areas where spring wheat is not raised where this money might be used to advantage. I do not expect that any appreciable amount of money expended under the first provision of this bill will be expended in my State, yet I believe that if it becomes important that the people of that State may be furnished seed to produce oats, barley, or wheat, not being in the spring-wheat area, they should be given the same privilege as people who live in the spring-wheat area. Therefore I make the motion to strike out the words "spring wheat," so that this bill will provide that the loans may be made to the farmers in any area of the United States when the Secretary of Agriculture shall find special need for furnishing seed for agricultural purposes. I realize that it is necessary to stimulate production. I believe that without the necessary increase in production in this country one of the most important factors in winning the war will be eliminated; that is, the proper furnishing of foods for our people. I would like to see this bill with this amendment, and such other amendments as may be offered that the House decides will improve the bill, adopted at an early time.

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

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Would the gentleman object to modifying his amendment so as to strike out the word "areas"? That would provide wherever you can find a farmer that can make good or who ought to be given a chance, irrespective of an investigation, whether there is an area or not.

Mr. HELVERING. I would have no objection to that, except that I understand the department in administering this act wants it to be in areas sufficient to justify the Secretary of Agriculture in considering it. I do not think the Secretary would be justified in considering an isolated case of one farmer.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose a man furnishes the security, ought he not to have the right to have oats and barley for seed the same as those where there is a large area that is easily accessible?

Mr. HELVERING. I think the gentleman is correct, but whether it would be logical or practical I do not know.

Mr. RAKER. The Secretary is not going to send an expert to determine in advance whether he is going to make the loan, is he?

Mr. HELVERING. I do not know.

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

Mr. HELVERING. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. In the confusion I could not understand the gentleman's amendment. Does his amendment mean that this relief is applicable to any farmer in any part of the State that needs the relief?

Mr. HELVERING. Yes; in any part of the United States. Everyone concedes the necessity for increased production. There is no question about that. I do not think there is a man in the House who questions the advisability of facilitating production if we can possibly do it, but I believe this should be universal. Therefore I submit to your fair consideration that the Secretary of Agriculture should be allowed to furnish this help at any place in the United States where he thinks it is necessary.

From all sides we hear the cry that there is an urgent need for an increase in our wheat production, and wheat is needed not alone by our men in the Army and by the civilian population at home, but it is of vital necessity to the soldiers and to the civilians who are united with us in a gigantic struggle against a common enemy.

The resolution now before us seeks to increase production. It seeks to enable us to grow needed crops where the chances are that no crops will be grown unless this Congress takes action. The individual farmer may have all of the patriotism in the world, and he may be as anxious as you and I are to do his full share in behalf of the country, but the individual farmer is powerless if he has only the land and lacks the means to secure the seed and the labor to attend to the planting, to the care, and to the harvesting of a crop.

The need of seed on the part of those who are unable to buy it, either because of lack of finance or lack of supply, is a need which we should take care of now. Every agency of this Government should be utilized in seeing to it that the supply shall meet every demand, and if we can be so considerate of "big business" that we can afford to make financial advances on contracts for war material, surely we can show equal consideration for the little fellow by making a limited advance to enable him to utilize available land in the production of crops which are absolutely necessary in the successful conduct of the war.

But it will be a waste of money and a waste of our resources if we merely provide seed and make it impossible for the farmers to take care of the crop. I have been and am a firm believer in the selective draft as the fairest and the best method of raising an army; but in the operation of that law it is certain that essential farm labor will be taken. We know that this has been done, and no matter how careful we may be in administering the law hereafter along the lines now laid down, and I want to stop long enough to say that the method now adopted should have been put in force at the start, nevertheless what has already been done is certain to curtail production unless we extend needed aid in legislation here.

And what is it that we are asked to do? Merely to give authorization for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor and its distribution, to the end that essential farming activities may be aided. In order to do this we will have to advance railroad fares and other traveling expenses, but rules and regulations can be made so that this expense will be a loan and not a gift, and in the end it will not be a direct charge upon the Treasury.

Gentlemen, this is cheap insurance which we are called upon to buy. It is the insuring of our future agricultural production, and without that production we will paralyze all of our war work. The farmers of the country are not asking this Congress for charity. They have listened to our plea that an increase of production is necessary in order to win this war. They have given heed to that plea, and they are behind our Army and our Navy prepared to do everything that Americans can do to hold up the hands of the fighting forces and to supply the things which are so urgently called for. But they call attention to their limitations, physical limitations, for there can be no limitation of their spirit of patriotism or desire to help, and they ask us to aid them in securing the seed and the labor, without which they can do nothing. It is for us to answer them by our votes here and show to them that we will do all that human effort can do to aid them in this work, and thus with our cooperation they will be able to do their full part in the work of winning this war and in preserving all which America holds dear.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection; and the Clerk again reported the Helvering amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer to that amendment in the way of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 2, line 1, strike out the words "in spring-wheat areas."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the members of the committee that if they will send to the Clerk's desk and obtain a copy of House resolution 281, reported by the Committee on Rules, they will find therein the bill now being considered by the committee.

Mr. FERRIS. The clerks are distributing H. R. 7795, and the amendments do not fit.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. When this bill is passed and has been sent over to the Senate, will it be in the form of House resolution 281 or as H. R. 7795?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it will be sent as H. R. 7795.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then ought we not to consider H. R. 7795, as amended by the Committee on Agriculture? In offering amendments it strikes me they ought to be offered to the text of the bill as reported by the committee. The rule merely provided for considering the substitute, and the fact that it is set out fully in the rule does not change the rule that amendments ought to be offered to the bill as reported by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that amendments should be offered to H. R. 7795.

Mr. HELVERING. In that case I would have to modify my amendment and make it apply to line 15, page 3, of H. R. 7795.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the modification will be so made.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, the only difference between my amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] is that he wants to limit this by areas. My amendment, if adopted, would make the text read "to farmers of the United States." Then it would be available to any farmer anywhere in the United States, regardless of whether he was in a drought area or otherwise.

Mr. CANNON. Has the gentleman's amendment been reported?

Mr. WINGO. Yes. It is to line 16, on page 3, of the bill we are now considering. I will say that I am going to vote for this bill, although I do not think it is absolutely necessary, and I shall only vote for it because it is contended by some gentlemen that in their districts there are isolated cases where some farmers, by reason of some extraordinary distress or by reason of lack of ordinary credit facilities, as in homestead areas, for illustration, who can not get the ordinary accommodations now available to farmers in other parts of the country.

That they can not get the benefit of the provisions of the Federal reserve act, that they can not get the benefit of the provision which has been included in one of the appropriation bills by which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to spend millions for seed and sell them to farmers at cost. I am going to vote for it, because I can recognize there are some instances here and there of a peculiar character which the Secretary, through proper agencies, could give relief under this bill where he finds it. But, most of all, I am in favor of my amendment because the legislation is general and not sectional. Now, I am not going to vote for the bill for the same reason that 90 per cent of the gentlemen are going to vote for it. I regret argument made upon this floor by which continually the farmer is made, or tried to be made, to believe that we are taking care of everybody else under the sun except the farmer. There is a propaganda going over this country, as I stated the other day, to mislead the farmer into the belief that we are granting relief to everybody and we are not doing anything for him. I repeat what I said then. When we passed the Federal reserve act he was given better provision for his paper upon longer terms than the manufacturer or the merchant. In addition to that, we passed the farm-loan act to take care of his long-time capital needs. In one of the appropriation bills we gave to the Secretary of Agriculture millions of dollars to spend on seeds that may be needed to supply the farmers. In the great Agricultural appropriation bill, which the able gentleman from South Carolina brings into the House every session, we make extraordinary provisions, and there is not a desire by any man in this House, whether coming from a city district or a farming district, to neglect the farmer of the United States or not to do anything that is necessary, proper, practicable, and feasible to try to build up the farming industry of this country, and I, for one, decry the propaganda that is going around trying to make the farmer believe that we are not making earnest efforts to meet his needs.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute for the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, has debate been exhausted on this amendment? The substitute is not in order until the end of the 20 minutes' debate.

Mr. MORGAN. There is no time limit fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Oklahoma will withhold until the pending amendment is disposed of—

Mr. MORGAN. But this is a substitute for the pending amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. My amendment is an amendment in the nature of a substitute and the gentleman can not offer a substitute for a substitute.

Mr. MORGAN. I offered it as a substitute for the amendment, and I understood the gentleman to offer his amendment as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WINGO. I beg pardon; I offered it as an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the amendment reported to see whether it is in order or not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: Page 3, line 15, after the word "eighteen," insert the following words: "and nineteen and nineteen"; and in line 15 strike out the word "spring"; and in line 25 insert, after the word "eighteen," the following words: "and nineteen and nineteen."

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order that the amendment is not a substitute nor an amendment to a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say, as far as the Chair is concerned, every effort will be exerted to see that every proposition that is in order is fairly considered, and the fact that the Chair ruled on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma simply means that it is not in order at this time.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask for information. I have a right to know what the point of order against my substitute is. I wanted to know upon what grounds the gentleman raised the point of order, and I did not get the information.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have already stated, I regret the gentleman did not hear me, that the gentleman's amendment was not an amendment to a substitute. If the gentleman from Arkansas offers his amendment as a substitute, it is in order to offer an amendment to the substitute. There are four processes in different parliamentary stages that are all well known. An amendment may be offered as an amendment to that amendment; a substitute to the principal amendment, and an amendment to the substitute. Now, the gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment—

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not; I am addressing the Chair by the privilege of the Chair. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment. The gentleman from Arkansas offers, as he states, a substitute to the amendment. Now, it is in order to offer either an amendment to the original amendment of the gentleman from Kansas or an amendment to the substitute, but the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is not either.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment as a substitute for both the amendments. Now, I should think that would be in order. That is the way I offered it.

The CHAIRMAN. For the reasons stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the Chair was compelled to hold that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma was not in order at this stage of the proceedings. The Chair will endeavor to deal with every proposition as presented to the committee and see that it is acted upon at some stage of the proceedings.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment, then, to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING]—an amendment to his amendment.

Mr. CANNON. That is not in order. I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is compelled to sustain the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order it is not germane to that amendment at all. The gentleman will get his time later on on this proposition.

Mr. MORGAN. I will, if I insist on it, I suppose.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendments be closed in five minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LEVER. I move that the debate on the pending amendments be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that debate on the pending amendments close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the purport of the amendments of the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Arkansas is, in effect, to spread the area over which these purchases and advances may be made. Now, I want to say very frankly to the committee that if either of these amendments prevail I shall vote against this bill. The Committee on Agriculture did not bring this bill in here as a "pork-barrel" proposition. We brought it upon the theory that there was a section of the country, limited in area, where by doing certain things we might increase the acreage in wheat by 3,000,000 acres.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. LEVER. I can not yield.

Now, these gentlemen intend to take the bridle off. And while we in South Carolina raise a very limited amount of wheat, my South Carolina farmer will be coming here, probably, to ask for his share of the "swill." The Committee on Agriculture does not regard this appropriation as "swill" at all. We look upon it as something vital in the winning of this war, and if I thought that this House, thinking only of local conditions, was going to run away with this bill to the extent of taking the bridle off, increasing these appropriations regardless and only upon the theory that "my State wants its share," I would not be a party to that kind of legislation.

I want to beg the members of this committee as earnestly as I can to vote down these amendments, because it puts the Congress of the United States in an attitude which it can not afford to assume in the eyes of patriotic people in this country. I had hoped that these amendments would not be offered. I had hoped it for the reason that I know how strongly men feel when they have got to defend themselves in their district against the fact that they did not get "their share of it." Gentlemen, there is not any "share-of-it" proposition in this bill. [Applause.] If I thought there was, I would vote against it if I never got another vote in my district for Congress or any other position. I want to beg the men here to stand with the committee and limit this so that they can go to their constituents feeling that this is not a grab-bag proposition, but that it was regarded by the Congress of the United States as a vital proposition in the winning of this war. Will you do it? I hope you will. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. If this bill was limited to furnishing seed alone I might agree with the gentleman, but what reason is there for furnishing oats and barley seed to this area of spring wheat?

Mr. LEVER. For the reason that this area was struck by a drought and for the further reason that there is no more speculative section for farm purposes in the world than this country, and for the further reason that we can now at this moment sow oats and barley in this area. You can not do it practically anywhere else and get the best yield.

Mr. BLAND. The administration of this law, after all, is left to the Secretary of Agriculture, is it not?

Mr. LEVER. That is very true. But let me say this: I think this House has gone exceedingly far in trusting administrative officers. Are we not in a position to say how far we ought to go and how far we do not want to go in this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes?

Mr. CANNON. There is another amendment in the way of a substitute. Debate is not closed on the substitute to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. There is no substitute pending.

Mr. CANNON. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. LEVER. If the Chair will permit, I think I can straighten the situation out. My motion was to close debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Arkansas, and that was carried.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes; although I have not the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. Do I understand that to those gentlemen in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas all debate is cut off and that we have no time on that proposition?

Mr. LEVER. The committee did that. I was not responsible.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman made the motion.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in order to ask a question.

Mr. LEVER. I am satisfied that the gentleman will get opportunity to interrogate me a little later on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee voted to close debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas and the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. CANNON. I move to strike out the last word of the substitute for the second amendment.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VENABLE. Does the fact that the House has voted to close debate in five minutes preclude me from asking for time by unanimous consent of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. LEVER. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the debate on these two amendments is closed.

Mr. CANNON. But there is a substitute pending for the second amendment.

Mr. LEVER. A point of order was sustained on that. Later I made a point of order and it was sustained.

Mr. CANNON. Let us appeal to the Clerk and see what is pending.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for five minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] for one minute.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I couple with that a request to speak for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Let us find out the status at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING], and also the amendment in the way of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HELVERING: Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "spring wheat."

Substitute offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "in spring-wheat areas."

Mr. HELVERING. Upon those two amendments the debate was closed, as I understand, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the action of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Was it offered by way of a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. It was.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman from Illinois can amend the substitute by striking out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. That is what I propose to do. Does all debate close upon the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no desire to cut off anyone, but the Chair has no control over the action of the House.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will indulge me for a moment, I think the gentleman from Illinois realizes that I am endeavoring and trying to close the debate on these amendments which affect this particular proposition, not on the section.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. And the debate has been closed on the amendments and the substitute for the amendment. All debate has been closed on those. If the gentleman has an amendment which goes to one of these, I do not see how it could be in order because it would be a substitute, because there is a substitute pending, unless it might be an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. CANNON. I offer a pro forma amendment. The debate was not shut off by unanimous consent, as I understand it, to the substitute?

Mr. LEVER. The Chair differs, and I differ with the gentleman myself. The debate was closed on the amendment and the substitute, as I understand it.

Mr. SNELL. Regular order!

Mr. CANNON. This is a vital amendment, and I do not think the committee understands it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is there any amendment pending to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. Not that the Chair knows of.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then an amendment to the substitute is in order. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] shall have five minutes, within which to offer an amendment to the substitute and proceed in that time to discuss the same. That is in order. I ask unanimous consent that he shall have five minutes within which to offer an amendment to the substitute and discuss the same.

Mr. CANNON. I take it for five minutes; but I think your first proposition is correct, that an amendment to the substitute is in order.

Mr. LEVER. But the point is that the debate has been closed.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Even if the matter in debate has been closed, it is perfectly competent for this body, by unanimous consent, to give the gentleman from Illinois five minutes or any other time it chooses. The fact that the debate has been closed does not cut off the right from this body by unanimous consent to extend time. Of course, it is competent to anybody to object.

Mr. VENABLE. Does that apply to the gentleman from Mississippi as well as to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It applies to everybody.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may have five minutes and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE] five minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] five minutes.

Mr. SNELL. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The regular order is to put my request that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may have five minutes in which to offer an amendment to the substitute and discuss the same. That is the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] may have five minutes in which to offer a substitute and discuss it. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have sought recognition, but did not receive it, for which I have no complaint, because the members of a committee are always entitled to preference in the consideration of a bill, and, for that matter, preference in opportunity to offer amendments, and so forth. But I do want to talk a little about this bill. I do not know that I can say in five minutes what I want to say. But what is this proposition? This bill proposes at the expense of the United States Treasury to furnish wheat, oats, and barley for seed in spring-wheat territory for the crop of 1918.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. CANNON. I will have to ask for a further extension of time. I want to be courteous, and I will be. I think the House will give me five minutes more.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What is "the spring-wheat district"? That is what I want to know. What is "a spring-wheat district," "a spring-wheat area"?

Mr. CANNON. I suppose that is a matter of fact to be ascertained. I have an idea what it is, and the gentleman has an idea.

Now, the amendment to this bill is to make this appropriation available everywhere in the United States for these three favored articles—wheat, barley, and oats—for seed. I think I have it right, have I not?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Now, then, I want to call the attention of the committee to what has been done and what is the necessity for this appropriation. Nearly a year ago, under the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], \$2,500,000 was appropriated for use anywhere in the country for seed. I think I am correct in that. Now, that is a revolving fund. It has not been expended, except in part. Now, \$4,000,000 is appropriated in the urgent deficiency bill for the same purpose, a revolving fund, to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture. He goes to work, no doubt, and has organized and ascertained about the wants of the different parts of the country. Now, what is the use of appropriating this \$10,000,000?

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

Mr. CANNON. If I can get a little more time, I have no objection to yielding.

Mr. LEVER. I just want to ask a question.

Mr. CANNON. All right.

Mr. HELVERING. The gentleman says these appropriations were made under the direction of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CANNON. The first one was. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture advocated both of them.

Mr. HELVERING. And they were general in their nature—all over the country.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. HELVERING. And they were not pork barrel then, were they?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. They covered the whole country.

Mr. Chairman, I was a pioneer boy. I know something about the hardships of pioneering. I know the want of markets. I know it was worth a man's life to clear 80 acres of land of that heavy timber in the Wabash country. There never was better manhood in the same number of people on this earth than among the pioneers in the settlement of the West. They had good manhood. They never were debauched by getting something for nothing. They drank sassafras tea and spicewood tea, and ate corn bread, and lived in lean-tos, and they raised strong, healthy children, and they cut down the forest and founded a civilization. You may say, "Oh, they have had such droughts out in this western country!" Why, good God, they had too much rain in the early spring all over the northern section of the corn belt. But they planted the corn. There was not one-quarter of a crop raised in Michigan. There was not much of a crop raised in Minnesota or in northern Illinois. The corn was of poor quality and much of it of little value, and down in central Illinois, the best corn country on earth, 25 per cent of the corn was soft, and they could not make alcohol or whisky or beer out of it. The bad season came, and we could not get transportation, and the corn spoiled. Now let us be honest with each other. Is it necessary to relieve Montana? Then let us relieve her. There is plenty of money to relieve Montana, to furnish seed wheat, barley, and oats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think I shall talk again about this bill. I should like really to have 10 minutes.

Mr. NORTON. I make the request for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Now, what is the fact? Does Minnesota want anything from this proposed legislation? No. I speak with assured certainty. Does Michigan want anything? No. Does Wisconsin want anything? No. Does North Dakota want anything? No. Does South Dakota? No. Now, that is as far as I can go, but I have good authority so far as I have gone. Then there is by this bill an additional \$10,000,000 to be spent for seed wheat, oats, and barley for Montana and Idaho—anything else?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. North Dakota.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, North Dakota is cared for.

Mr. FERRIS. How?

Mr. CANNON. By an act of the legislature, and the money is substantially expended. I asked a North Dakotan about it, and he said North Dakota was cared for by action of their legislature. The same is true of South Dakota. I will tell you about this if you want to know. This is a competition among some of our people in two or three States, who are scared to death about this new organization that believes the farmers never get anything. It is farming the farmers for the benefit of self-constituted champions of the farmer for the political benefit of the champions. That is the truth about it. [Applause and laughter.] There is a revolving fund for the Secretary of Agriculture, with his force all organized, \$2,500,000 for a year. The money is not all spent. It is a revolving fund. It is back there still—\$2,500,000, and \$4,000,000 added by the vote of this House for the same purpose, a revolving fund. Yet we say, "The poor farmer!" My God, do you know that one-third of the farmers in this country own more than one-third of the wealth of the country? I am speaking by the book, of things whereof I know, if there is any truth in figures and statistics.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I will; but make it short.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman distinguish any difference between the appropriation of the \$2,500,000 that he speaks of and the \$4,000,000 which provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase seed and sell for cash, and this bill which authorizes him to make advances on time? Does the gentleman see any difference between those two propositions?

Mr. CANNON. That is a foolish question. If you want to give it to these people, most of those who want these advances can get them now. Nine-tenths of them can get them now.

Mr. NORTON. What are you going to do with the other tenth?

Mr. CANNON. If you want to pauperize nine-tenths of the people, or nineteen-twentieths of the people, give them something for nothing. [Applause.] You can increase the paupers. Oh, I defend the pioneer. I was one of the pioneers, from the time I was 4 years old until I grew up to manhood. They have got good stuff out West. I defend them against political demagoguery. [Applause.] Who introduced the bill? Why, our friend, wonderfully bright, wonderfully handsome. Why, good God, he does not belong to the Democratic Party. He does not belong to the Republican Party, although he sits on our side of the House. He introduced a \$50,000,000 bill. And so we go, competing with him and others like him. He is an estimable gentleman. Do not take it that I am speaking disrespectfully of him. I am calling by their right names political policies that I think are vicious. That is what I am doing. You appropriated \$20,000,000,000 in the last session of Congress—appropriations and authorizations. Now you are running at railroad speed, appropriating, appropriating, with \$4,000,000,000 to be collected by taxation by the 1st of July next, and the taxation comes from all sections of the country. Another liberty loan is just being started. Our boys are in the trenches. Eight hundred and forty million dollars for aeroplanes. It is claimed—God knows whether it is true or not; I do not know—that it has not resulted in aeroplanes. I am not saying that it has not so resulted. But here you come, with all these things coming upon us, with insurance of \$10,000 for every soldier at a nominal rate. That is all right. I voted for it. I believe in it. We doubled their pay. I voted for it. I believed in that.

Good God! Let us be practical, and let us stop playing these little peanut politics—everybody getting up and crying, "I am going to stand by the farmer; oh, yes!" Mr. Chairman, I have an agricultural district. Two-thirds of my district are farmers. I was a farmer when I was a boy myself.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Does the gentleman distinguish between the farmers living in Illinois, all of whom are probably wealthy, and homesteaders on the public domain?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the homesteader, in my judgment, is not asking for this, if it is a gift. I do not believe there is a homesteader in Montana, if he were to raise wheat and had to borrow the seed, who could not get that seed from the citizens of Montana or the Department of Agriculture if he possessed good manhood. You do not want to go through the form of giving something to somebody who will not utilize it. I am not speaking harshly of the people of Montana. I have every sympathy with them and with everyone else. A homesteader! Do you think he would want \$450 for seed wheat? A man settles on a homestead of 160 acres, and does he want \$450 for seed wheat? I want to say something further about this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I wish the gentleman would say something about these spring-wheat areas, including wheat and oats and barley.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, wheat and oats and barley are very important; cotton is very important; everything is very important that is raised on the farm. What I want to speak about is the provision in this bill that not to exceed \$100,000 shall be expended for the payment of administrative expenses. Mr. Chairman, the man in the trench, the man in the Army, the man on the railway, the man in the mine, the farmer on the farm, and the pioneer doing his part are all doing well; but, good heavens, think of the men whom you see in Washington, think of the men whom you see in New York, whom you see in Illinois, whom you see all over the country who are rushing here wanting to be employed to do something for the Government other than to go to war. If you keep on you will have so many people here and elsewhere employed by the Government that you will not have anybody to draft or to enlist. You will have less people to farm, you will have less people to build ships. The greatest industry that I know of is the industry that brings them here. The greatest industry that I know of is this, and it brings the least profit to the Government. Let us keep our heads, gentlemen. If the \$4,000,000 plus the two and a half million dollars' revolving fund are not enough now, when the spring planting commences in March in the spring-wheat belt, and March is almost over and April upon us, and the spring wheat is probably in large part in the ground, then what is to become of us or the farmers?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes in connection with that.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon these two amendments and the substitute close at the end of 15 minutes, 5 minutes to be occupied by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], and, if I deem it necessary, 5 minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, when the chairman of the committee was addressing the committee a few moments ago he made an appeal to the House to vote down the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING] upon the ground that this was not a "pork-barrel" bill, and in his remarks he stated that he thought we had gone far enough in conferring general powers on the Secretary of Agriculture in the disbursement of these funds. Yet in this bill, whose benefits are confined to a small area of the country, the gentleman himself and his committee, presumptively with his approval, has brought out a bill that provides for the laying out of \$7,500,000 under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate, himself giving the very widest and amplest powers conceivable.

In addition to this it is provided that a lien upon the crop shall be considered sufficient security, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. What is your lien? Under that language it is nothing. As far as the legal effect of it is concerned, your advances to these farmers are gifts unless the farmer wishes to pay them back or has property out of which a judgment can be satisfied. Why? Because your act does not provide for a positive lien. This crop will pass into the hands of purchasers free from the incumbrance of such a lien unless you specifically provide that the lien shall follow the crop into the hands of purchasers, which would defeat the very purpose of the bill. So there is only one way to enforce your security, and that is for the Government to demand payment before the sale of the crop, and if not paid, to enforce the lien; and there is no man here who believes that the Government will do any such thing. As a legal proposition, your provision for a so-called lien is without any effect, and as a practical proposition, in my opinion your bill provides, in substance, that the Secretary of Agriculture, if he will—and it is all left to him, though the committee is not in favor of conferring broad powers—may advance this money to the tune of \$7,500,000 without a bit of security on earth.

Is that all? No. This bill proposes furthermore to constitute your Secretary of Agriculture a labor agent to go out in all the sections of the country and drum up labor to go to work in the planting and harvesting of this wheat crop. They will come to the South, they will come to the East, to the North, and West with the boys gone from the farms into the Army, with your farm labor—I know it is true of the South, and I judge it is true in other parts of the country—gone to the great manufacturing centers to take advantage of the high wages. There is not a farming section of the United States that has enough labor now, and yet you are going practically to direct your Secretary of Agriculture to constitute himself a labor agent to go into sections of the country already depleted of labor and offer the inducement of railroad fare to take away their labor to this favored section of the country. And I prophesy what will be the result. You will have the greatest wave of discontent, the greatest wave of revolt against this thing all over the country that you ever saw. Every day I get letters from the South stating that the conditions are such that while the Government is calling upon the farmer to increase production that he can not do it because the boys are gone and the negroes that constitute the great body of labor in the South have gone to the industrial centers in the East.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. I would ask for one minute more in order to finish the sentence.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Would the Secretary of Agriculture in drumming up labor run into competition with the Secretary of Labor, also drumming up labor for the same purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request for one minute? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VENABLE. The answer to that is that when you provide \$7,500,000 to plant and harvest a particular crop in a particular section of the country and couple with that an appropriation to get labor, it is tantamount to a direction that the Secretary of Agriculture must go out and get this labor and plant and reap that particular crop.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. While the Secretary of Labor is also drumming up labor.

Mr. VENABLE. Not farm labor. They have not done it, and I hope will not do it. But you are directing—you are taking all discretion from the Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. VENABLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUBEY. Does not the gentleman know that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture together for the last eight months have been doing this very thing, and that the President of the United States gave to them \$800,000 from the sum which was given to him for the purpose of mobilizing labor, and they have been doing that all last summer?

Mr. VENABLE. Going into rural sections to get farm labor?

Mr. RUBEY. Doing the same thing we are authorizing to be done here.

Mr. VENABLE. Does the gentleman mean to say they are going to the rural sections of this country to get farm labor?

Mr. RUBEY. No; and I do not mean to say they will do it under this bill.

Mr. VENABLE. I do.

Mr. RUBEY. They will not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

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

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I say that the Secretary of Agriculture must necessarily go to the farming sections to get farm labor for the planting and reaping of this proposed crop in the favored section of the West for the reason that he must go either to the country or to the cities. Those in the cities who are familiar with or who will engage in farm labor are those who have left the country or rural communities because they have been attracted by the high wages paid in industrial trades and manufacturing plants. They have good places paying high wages. No one is idle who wishes to work. Do the gentlemen of this committee think that the wages offered by these wheat farmers in the spring-wheat area will be so attractive as to induce men who have already rejected similar wages to take more attractive places in the cities to again go to the country? Certainly not. Perforce, then, the Secretary of Agriculture must get his labor supply from those already in the country engaged in farm labor, and this is sought to be done by offering free transportation. If this reasoning be true, it comes to this: That the Secretary of Agriculture is practically directed to go into the farming communities of the country, already depleted of necessary labor, and induce this labor by the attraction of free transportation and the allurements of a promised land where homestead is possible, to leave other sections of the country to work for farmers of the so-called spring-wheat area who are, according to the confession of this bill, unable to obtain credit from local business men or financial institutions to the extent of the price of their seed wheat.

In every agricultural section of the country there is a scarcity of labor. The farmer boys have been taken into the Army. Thousands have gone to the cities to work in industrial plants, attracted there by the high wages offered.

Now, it is suggested to have the Government engage in the business of taking away the labor that remains in order to provide for one particular section of the country.

The growing of wheat is necessary. So is the growing of corn. We must eat either wheat or corn or some other substitute. It is necessary that corn be grown in order that we may substitute it for wheat so that the wheat may be sent abroad. What profits it if to grow wheat we destroy corn so that we are forced to eat the wheat and so will have none to sent abroad? Are we any better off than if we had not grown the wheat?

But the crass injustice of the thing! Here it is proposed to send the Government out on a mission of taking away the little labor that is left to the farmers of other sections of the country, producing products just as essential as wheat. Corn is as essential as wheat because it substitutes for wheat that we send abroad. Cotton is essential because it is necessary if we fight

this war at all. But more than this. Contrary to all theories heretofore held, it is proposed and the Secretary of Agriculture is practically instructed to advance \$450 to every man who says that he intends to plant wheat and whose standing in the community is such that his neighbors will not trust him for this amount. In short, lack of financial credit is made a sine qua non of governmental relief and the bill is careful to provide that no security may be taken if the Secretary of Agriculture so desires. What security is there that the man who gets the money will plant wheat? What security is there that he will not invest in oil of joy which maketh temporarily glad the heart of man and converteth him temporarily into an ass?

These proposed borrowers admittedly can not get credit in their local communities, else why the necessity of Government aid? If without credit, it must be because they either lack character or assets out of which a judgment can be enforced. If such is their condition, what security can the Government take which will insure either the planting of the crop, the repayment of the loan, or the payment of simply interest on the debt, which, by the way, a generous committee does not provide for in the bill?

It has been asked, What difference, if any, exists between this proposed gift and the appropriation for the purchase of seed carried in a former bill? I will answer, The greatest difference in the world.

The former bill provided for the purchase of seed by the Government which was to be sold to the farmer. This provides for the gift of seed, not for the purpose of introducing improved varieties in which the whole country will benefit, but any old seed for the purpose of getting a crop. In the first bill the Government furnishes a facility for getting a thing—a perfectly legitimate function. In the second the Government practically makes a gift. As I see it it is proper for the Government to make available a source of supply without loss to the Government and without taxing the citizens for the benefit of a particular class, furnishing facilities, in other words, for the doing of a thing. As I see it it is not proper to make a gift such as is proposed in this bill, as I construe it.

My colleague, Mr. JOHNSON, interpolated a remark the significance of which was that this bill proposed to have the Secretary of Agriculture go out in the country and solicit farm labor, while the Secretary of Labor was soliciting labor for other purposes, thus presenting the admirable spectacle of departments of Government competing with one another, with the Secretary of Agriculture having the advantage of a fund for holding forth the inducement of free transportation to the laborer that he may go out West and work for a farmer who can not get credit for enough money to buy his seed. I trust that this suggestion by my colleague of the effect of this bill will receive consideration at the hands of this committee.

I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but permit me to say to gentlemen of the committee who live in sections of the country other than the so-called spring-wheat belt, that when the Government in the guise of a labor agent comes into your communities where labor on the farms is already much too scarce, offering inducements of free transportation, appealing to the wanderlust in men, urging them to go to unseen countries, even though it be to work for men who admittedly can not raise \$450 or less, this measure is destined to be about as popular as a polecat at a nigger camp meeting, and its supporters will not be altogether in the odor of sanctity.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy extended to me by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in having this five minutes, although taking the opposite view from that which he takes. We all love the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and we have confidence in him and in his leadership. I regret that I can not follow him now and approve the position he takes on this bill. I am in favor of striking out this word "spring," so that the bill will not be confined to the spring-wheat area. I am in favor of making this a general proposition that will apply to Maine, Texas, California, or to Virginia, or every other State, and leave it to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine where it is necessary to use these funds or where these funds can be used to best advantage. That would make it a national proposition. In this form, in my judgment, it would be more acceptable to the people of the United States. In its present form it is sectional. Now, then, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture said, as I understood him, that he would vote against this bill if the word "spring" were stricken out and this bill was made to apply to every State. I wish to remind the gentleman that only last year, in April or May, he introduced what is known as the food-survey bill. As chairman

of the Committee on Agriculture, he reported the bill favorably. He conducted the measure through the House. And that bill as he introduced it and as it passed the House contained a provision appropriating about \$6,000,000 to be used by the Secretary of Agriculture in aiding farmers to purchase seeds. It authorized the sale of seeds to farmers on credit, and to farmers in any section of the United States. Now he says he can not support this bill if it is made to apply anywhere except in the spring-wheat area. It strikes me that the position the gentleman takes now is inconsistent with the position he held on the food-survey bill. In view of this fact, the argument the gentleman makes should not carry the weight which ordinarily goes with views which he always presents to the House with such clearness, candor, and force.

There are some distinguished gentlemen on both sides of the House opposing this measure, whether it applies to the spring-wheat area only or to the United States generally. I have great respect for their views, but they are clearly wrong. The trouble is they have no true conception of the wheat country of the West. Now, the fact is this: In the western half of Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota approximately one-third of the wheat of the United States is produced. This is in what is known as the semi-arid regions. Crop failures there are possibly more frequent than in some other sections. Nevertheless, one year after another these sections produce a large percentage of all our wheat. We can not supply ourselves and our allies with wheat without a liberal production from these sections. To aid the farmers out there to produce the largest amount of wheat is both wise and patriotic, for without the wheat produced by these farmers we would not have a bushel of wheat to export unless we took it from what our own people needed.

But the provisions of this bill as reported would confine the use of the money appropriated to the spring-wheat area. Suppose this bill passes as reported—we aid the spring-wheat States. Suppose that in certain sections of Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and other States there should be a failure this year in the wheat crop. The wheat farmers in these winter-wheat sections would be in exactly the same condition that the spring-wheat farmers are now. They would not be able to purchase seed wheat. The local banks could not furnish the necessary credit; but Congress might be adjourned. The Secretary of Agriculture could extend no assistance. The Government would be in the position of discriminating against one section of the country. This would be bad enough, but the worst of it would be the wheat acreage would be reduced millions of acres.

Now, this bill should be made general in its application to the country, and it should be made so as to apply to crops sown this season. Why legislate for a day? Why not look ahead? Why not plan for the future? Why not take a comprehensive view? Why not broaden our vision so as to include at least the war period? Why not pass an act that will enable the farmers to secure the necessary credit to purchase seed at any time during the war?

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think it unwise to have this lien in this bill to make the farmer give the first lien on his growing crop?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not.

Mr. HOWARD. Which will destroy his credit. Do you not think we ought to do away with that?

Mr. MORGAN. Many, many times in the West, in the home-stead districts, the railroads have furnished wheat by millions of bushels to the farmers. Can not the United States do what a railroad corporation can do?

Gentlemen, strike out "spring" and make this a national measure, and the people of the United States will approve it. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes of the time of the committee, and then I intend to ask for a vote on these two amendments and the substitute therefor, and then, if the committee is willing, we shall rise and go home.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] seems to think that the Committee on Agriculture, at least its chairman, is inconsistent because of the fact that last year in the food-production bill we brought in a proposition appropriating \$6,000,000 for seed to be furnished farmers for cash or on credit. I have not made any complaint about this bill, because it is a credit proposition, although as a peace proposition I would not vote for it for half a second. The complaint I am making now is against these two amendments which are endeavoring to take from this bill its real character and, to my mind, make it of a character smacking of "pork-barrel" legislation.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. No; I can not yield. As I said a moment ago, there is but one purpose in the mind of the committee, and that is to furnish this seed on credit to certain sections of the country where the evidence before the committee shows that the situation is critical and that by furnishing of these seeds we might possibly, and very probably, increase the production of wheat in this country in the spring-wheat area as much as from 30,000,000 to 40,000,000 bushels. The committee recognizes, of course, that the bread line of this country across to its own soldiers and the soldiers of its allies is as absolutely as important to be held intact as it is important for Haig and Pershing to hold their line intact in this great struggle which is going on.

Now, that is all the committee had in mind. And I want to repeat, that if I thought this committee was going to be unwise enough to throw this proposition wide open, and say to wheat growers here and there, in Virginia, in South Carolina, and in Oklahoma, and in other places, whence there is coming absolutely no demand for this legislation, and giving them the opportunity to run to the Treasury and buy a few bushels of wheat on credit, hamper the administration of this law, and make it almost impossible to administer it with anything like effectiveness, I would vote against this bill.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. RAKER. What particular territory now is involved and that would be included in this bill?

Mr. LEVER. The spring-wheat area of the United States; that would include North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, probably a portion of Washington, and Idaho.

Mr. RAKER. And with the language of the bill as it now stands, if it went through, the rest of the country would not be able to get any wheat?

Mr. LEVER. No; I would not say that. I will say that the rest of the country would not get the benefit of this bill. The rest of the country has all the wheat it wants and can have all it wants.

Mr. RAKER. I mean, to get the benefit of this bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he is in favor of limiting the operation of this bill to the particular section of the country where there is special need of this favor?

Mr. LEVER. Absolutely.

Mr. STEAGALL. Then let me ask the gentleman another question. The amendment now pending is to strike out the words "spring wheat areas," is it not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STEAGALL. With those words out, would not the bill read:

That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, for the crop of 1918, to make advances or loans to farmers of the United States where he shall find special need for such assistance?

Mr. LEVER. Exactly. And that is just the point.

Mr. STEAGALL. May I ask one other question? Then, if there is special need for this legislation in any part of the United States, ought not the Secretary of Agriculture to be permitted to grant the favors there as well as to a particularly limited section of the country where there is special need? [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman, of course, realizes that the time for the planting of fall wheat has gone by. The only area which can be sown to wheat now is the spring-wheat area in this section that I described. Now, if you throw this open and cut the bridle reins and turn the horse loose, every farmer in South Carolina that thinks he ought to buy wheat on credit, whether he ought to do it or not, every farmer in Pennsylvania who thinks that it is up to him to get wheat on credit from the Government next fall, will be coming in here, flooding the Department of Agriculture and hampering the administration of this law and defeating its purpose. I therefore hope the committee will vote it down.

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

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARKLEY. A few moments ago, in response to a question by myself, the gentleman stated that there had been a drought in this section which had cut down the crop of oats and barley, which are included in this bill.

Mr. LEVER. I think I said "wheat."

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the gentleman said "oats and barley." Now, referring to the record, Wisconsin last year produced 92,000,000 bushels, Minnesota 120,000,000 bushels, and North Dakota 61,000,000 bushels of oats. What became of those oats if they have no seed out there?

Mr. LEVER. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the average yield of wheat in these States—and if I

am wrong in these figures I hope the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] will correct me—this year was about 4½ bushels per acre. Is that right?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Five and a half bushels.

Mr. LEVER. As against 10 or 11 bushels to the acre heretofore.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. If they do what the gentleman seeks to prevent and you allow these other sections to get the benefit of this act, will it not result in increasing production?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman does not understand, because he is from Boston and does not know anything about farming [laughter], that the fall sowing of wheat has passed long ago, and we have 42,000,000 acres now in wheat. This is to take care of next year.

Mr. WALSH. Could they not do that in barley and oats?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And would there not be production of those products?

Mr. LEVER. Not so much as wheat.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman admits that the Pennsylvania farmer who does not need seed wheat might come to the Department of Agriculture and get it on credit. Is not that the vice of the bill?

Mr. LEVER. I admitted that in my opening statement—that this is not a bill that anybody would support in peace times. But I have tried to show that there is a situation existing that ought to attract the attention of this House.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be reported, as there seems to be some confusion in regard to it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is there not an amendment pending to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Just one amendment and a substitute pending? I understood that there was an amendment to the original amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute is spoken of as an amendment.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, may we have that reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HELVERING: On page 3, line 16, strike out the words "spring wheat."

Substitute offered by Mr. WINGO: Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "in spring-wheat areas."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 75, noes 43.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. LEVER and Mr. WINGO to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise. [Cries of "No!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not proper to vote upon the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HELVERING]? We only voted on the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] moves that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was the vote by tellers announced?

The CHAIRMAN. It was. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 69, noes 60.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. GARNER. I demand tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. LEVER and Mr. WINGO to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 53, noes 78.

So the committee refused to rise.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I move to strike out the enacting clause of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Texas moves to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. Is a motion in order to lay this motion on the table?

The CHAIRMAN. That motion would not be in order.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, is this motion debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. LUNN. Then I want to debate it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, my recollection is that the motion to strike out the enacting clause is not debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in error. As the Chair is advised, the motion is not debatable. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause.

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas, Mr. HOWARD, and others demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 65, noes 67.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas and Mr. SHERLEY demanded tellers. Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. RUBEX and Mr. YOUNG of Texas.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 74, noes 65.

A MEMBER. One more in the affirmative, Mr. Chairman.

ANOTHER MEMBER. One more in the negative, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is bound by the report of the tellers. On this vote the ayes are 74, the noes are 65. The motion of the gentleman from Texas to strike out the enacting clause is agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. POU, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill reported from the Committee on Agriculture as a committee substitute for H. R. 7795 to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food, by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers in certain areas for the production of grain through advances, loans, and otherwise, and by providing for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

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

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment in order to enable me to present a conference report?

Mr. LEVER. I will withhold the motion for a moment.

SOLDIERS' INSURANCE.

Mr. SIMS presented the following conference report, which was ordered to be printed under the rule:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 419).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of

a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House, and agree to the same.

T. W. SIMS,

SAM RAYBURN,

S. E. WINSLOW,

Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,

HOKE SMITH,

REED SMOOT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SEED GRAIN FOR FARMERS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONDON. What would be the effect of the adjournment upon the bill reported from the Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. None whatever. The first thing in the morning would be the vote on the report of the committee.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Record my speech on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. SHOUSE. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas objects. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. RUBEX) there were—ayes 69, noes 78.

Accordingly the motion to adjourn was rejected.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves the previous question. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken.

Mr. LEVER. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. RUBEX. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-one Members present, not a quorum.

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

Mr. SHERLEY. I make the point that that motion is not in order. The House has not transacted any business since that motion was voted down.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 120, nays 123, not voting 188, as follows:

YEAS—120.

Alexander	Dooling	Jones, Va.	Riordan
Almon	Doughton	Kincheo	Robinson
Ashbrook	Dupré	Larsen	Rogers
Bacharach	Eagan	Lazaro	Rubey
Bankhead	Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Sanford
Barkley	Elliott	Lehbach	Saunders, Va.
Bell	Fisher	Leshner	Sears
Black	Gallagher	Loneragan	Sherley
Blanton	Gallivan	Lufkin	Sherwood
Brand	Garner	McAndrews	Shouse
Erodbeck	Garrett, Tenn.	McKeown	Sisson
Browning	Glass	Maber	Stafford
Brumbaugh	Glynn	Mansfield	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Tague
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Merritt	Taylor, Ark.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gordon	Montague	Tillman
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, Ala.	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Oldfield	Venable
Cannon	Harrison, Va.	Oliver, Ala.	Vinson
Cantrill	Hastings	Overstreet	Walker
Carter, Okla.	Heflin	Park	Walsh
Chandler, Okla.	Helm	Parker, N. J.	Watkins
Church	Holland	Phelan	Watson, Pa.
Connally, Tex.	Howard	Porter	Wetly
Connelly, Kans.	Huddleston	Quin	Wilson, Tex.
Crisp	Hull, Tenn.	Ragsdale	Wingo
Dale, N. Y.	Husted	Raney	Winslow
Delaney	Hutchinson	Raker	Woodyard
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Ramsey	Wright
Domulick	Jones, Tex.	Rayburn	Young, Tex.

NAYS—123.

Ayres	Dyer	Kless, Pa.	Robbins
Baer	Edmonds	King	Romjue
Barnhart	Emerson	Kinkaid	Rowe
Beakes	Esch	Knutson	Rucker
Beshlin	Evans	Kraus	Russell
Bland	Fairfield	Kreider	Scott, Iowa
Bowers	Farr	Langley	Scott, Mich.
Carlin	Ferris	Lea, Cal.	Shackelford
Cary	Fields	Lever	Shanberger
Clark, Pa.	Focht	Little	Shinnott
Claypool	Fordney	Lobeck	Sloan
Clery	Foster	London	Smith, Idaho
Cooper, Wis.	French	Lundeen	Smith, Mich.
Cox	Graham, Ill.	Lunn	Snook
Cramton	Hadley	McArthur	Sterling, Ill.
Crosser	Hamilton, N. Y.	McFadden	Sumners
Currle, Mich.	Haskell	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sweet
Dale, Vt.	Haugen	Mapes	Swift
Dallinger	Hawley	Mason	Switzer
Davis	Hayden	Mays	Temple
Dempsey	Helvering	Morgan	Timberlake
Denison	Hicks	Neely	Vestal
Dickinson	Hilliard	Nichols, Mich.	Waldow
Dill	Ireland	Norton	Walton
Dillon	Jacoway	Oliver, N. Y.	Wason
Dixon	James	Osborne	Welling
Donovan	Johnson, Wash.	Pou	Wheeler
Doolittle	Keating	Pratt	Woods, Iowa
Dowell	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	Young, N. Dak.
Drane	Kelly, Pa.	Randall	Zihlman
Dunn	Kennedy, Iowa	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—188.

Anderson	Freeman	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Anthony	Fuller, Ill.	Longworth	Schall
Aswell	Fuller, Mass.	McClintic	Scully
Austin	Gandy	McCormick	Sells
Blackmon	Gard	McCulloch	Siegel
Booher	Garland	McKenzie	Sims
Borland	Garrett, Tex.	McKinley	Slayden
Britten	Gillett	McLaughlin, Pa.	Slemp
Browne	Good	McLemore	Snail
Burnett	Goodall	Mahlen	Smith, C. B.
Burrighs	Gould	Magee	Smith, T. F.
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Mann	Snell
Caldwell	Gray, N. J.	Meeker	Snyder
Campbell, Kans.	Green, Iowa	Miller, Minn.	Stegall
Caraway	Greene, Vt.	Miller, Wash.	Stedman
Carew	Gregg	Mondell	Steele
Carter, Mass.	Griest	Moon	Steenerson
Chandler, N. Y.	Griffin	Moore, Ind.	Stephens, Nebr.
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Merin	Sterling, Pa.
Classon	Hamilton, Mich.	Mott	Stevenson
Coady	Hamlin	Mudd	Stines
Collier	Hardy	Nelson	Strong
Cooper, Ohio	Harrison, Miss.	Nichols, S. C.	Sullivan
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayes	Nolan	Talbott
Copley	Heaton	Olney	Taylor, Colo.
Costello	Hintz	O'Shaunessy	Templeton
Crago	Hensley	Overmyer	Thomas
Curry, Cal.	Hersey	Padgett	Thompson
Darrow	Hollingsworth	Payre	Tinkham
Davidson	Hood	Parker, N. Y.	Towner
Decker	Houston	Peters	Treadway
Dent	Hull, Iowa	Platt	Van Dyke
Denton	Humphreys	Polk	Vare
Dies	Igoe	Powers	Voigt
Doremus	Johnson, S. Dak.	Price	Voitstead
Drunker	Junt	Purnell	Ward
Ellsworth	Kahn	Reavis	Watson, Va.
Elston	Kearns	Reed	Weaver
Estopinal	Kehoe	Roberts	Webb
Fairchild, B. L.	Kennedy, R. I.	Rosenberg	Whaley
Fairchild, G. W.	Kettner	Rose	White, Me.
Fess	Key, Ohio	Rouse	White, Ohio
Flood	Kitchin	Rowland	Williams
Flynn	La Follette	Sabath	Wilson, Ill.
Foss	LaGuardia	Sanders, Ind.	Wilson, La.
Francis	Lenroot	Sanders, La.	Wise
Frear	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.	Wood, Ind.

So the motion to order the previous question was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. STEELE (for) with Mr. LA FOLLETTE (against).

Mr. STEVENSON (for) with Mr. STEENERSON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.

Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas with Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. McCLINTIC with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. HULL of Iowa.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. VOIGT.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. McKENZIE.

Mr. COADY with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. DECKER with Mr. BROWNE.

Mr. DENT with Mr. McCORMICK.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. HARDY with Mr. DARROW.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. NELSON.

Mr. HOOD with Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. KETTNER with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. FULLER of Illinois.
 Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. IGOE with Mr. FRANCIS.
 Mr. McLEMORE with Mr. FREAR.
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. FREEMAN.
 Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. PAIGE.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. PADGETT with Mr. PURNELL.
 Mr. POLK with Mr. REAVIS.
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. MAGEE.
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. REED.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. RODENBERG.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. ROSE.
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana.
 Mr. STEAGALL with Mr. GILLET.
 Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. STINESS.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. TREADWAY.
 Mr. WEAVER with Mr. VOLSTEAD.
 Mr. WEALEY with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.
 Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. GARLAND.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. HEATON.
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union striking out the enacting clause.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The noes made the most noise. [Laughter.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Division, Mr. Speaker. The House again divided; and there were—ayes 100, noes 97.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the yeas and nays; evidently a sufficient number, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 106, nays 144, answered "present" 1, not voting 180, as follows:

YEAS—106.

Almon	Dupré	Larsen	Rogers
Ashbrook	Eagan	Lazaro	Sanford
Bacharach	Eagle	Lehbach	Saunders, Va.
Bankhead	Elliott	Lesher	Sears
Bell	Fisher	Loneragan	Sherley
Black	Gallagher	Lufkia	Sherwood
Brand	Gallivan	McAndrews	Shouse
Brodbeck	Garner	Maher	Sisson
Browning	Garrett, Tenn.	Mansfield	Stafford
Buchanan	Glass	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Byrnes, S. C.	Glynn	Merritt	Tague
Byrns, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	Montague	Taylor, Ark.
Candler, Miss.	Gordon	Moon	Tilson
Cannon	Gray, Ala.	Oldfield	Treadway
Carlin	Greene, Mass.	Oliver, Ala.	Venable
Chandler, Okla.	Harrison, Va.	Overstreet	Vinson
Church	Heflin	Park	Walker
Collier	Helm	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Connally, Tex.	Holland	Phelan	Watson, Pa.
Crisp	Howard	Quin	Welty
Dale, N. Y.	Huddleston	Ragsdale	Wilson, Tex.
Delaney	Hull, Tenn.	Rainey	Winslow
Dooling	Humphreys	Raker	Woodward
Doughton	Husted	Ramsey	Wright
	Hutchinson	Rayburn	Young, Tex.
	Jones, Va.	Rordan	
	Kincheloe	Robinson	

NAYS—144.

Alexander	Dallinger	Graham, Ill.	Knutson
ayres	Davis	Green, Iowa	Kraus
Baer	Dempsey	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kreider
Barkley	Denison	Haskell	Langley
Barnhart	Dickinson	Hastings	Lea, Cal.
Beakes	Dill	Haugen	Lee Ga.
Beshlin	Dillon	Hawley	Lever
Bland	Dixon	Hayden	Little
Blanton	Donovan	Helvering	Lobeck
Bowers	Doolittle	Hicks	Lundeen
Campbell, Pa.	Dunn	Hilliard	Lunn
Cantrill	Dyer	Ireland	McArthur
Carter, Mass.	Edmonds	Jacoway	McClintic
Carter, Okla.	Emerson	James	McFadden
Cary	Esch	Johnson, Ky.	McKown
Clark, Pa.	Evans	Johnson, Wash.	McLaughlin, Mich.
Claypool	Fairfield	Jones, Tex.	Mapes
Clery	Farr	Kelley, Mich.	Mason
Connelly, Kans.	Ferris	Kelley, Pa.	Mays
Cooper, Wis.	Fields	Kennedy, Iowa	Morgan
Cramton	Focht	Kless, Pa.	Nichols, Mich.
Crosser	Foster	King	Nolan
Currle, Mich.	French	Kinkaid	Norton
Dale, Vt.	Goodwin, Ark.		Oliver, N. Y.

Osborne	Rucker	Snell	Vestal
Parker, N. Y.	Russell	Snook	Voigt
Pratt	Scott, Iowa	Sterling, Ill.	Waldow
Purnell	Scott, Mich.	Summers	Walton
Ramseyer	Shackleford	Sweet	Welling
Randall	Shallenberger	Swift	Wheeler
Rankin	Sinnott	Switzler	White, Ohio
Robbins	Slemp	Taylor, Colo.	Wingo
Romjue	Sloan	Temple	Woods, Iowa
Rowe	Smith, Idaho	Tillman	Young, N. Dak.
Rubey	Smith, Mich.	Timberlake	Zihlman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Wason

NOT VOTING—180.

Anderson	Francis	Lenroot	Sanders, Ind.
Anthony	Frear	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Aswell	Freeman	Littlepage	Sanders, N. Y.
Anstin	Fuller, Ill.	Longworth	Schall
Blackmon	Fuller, Mass.	McCormick	Scott, Pa.
Booher	Gandy	McCulloch	Scully
Borland	Gard	McKenzie	Sells
Britten	Garland	McKinley	Siegel
Browne	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sims
Burnett	Gillett	McLemore	Slayden
Burroughs	Good	Madden	Small
Butler	Goodall	Magee	Smith, C. B.
Caldwell	Gould	Mann	Smith, T. F.
Campbell, Kans.	Graham, Pa.	Meeker	Snyder
Caraway	Gray, N. J.	Miller, Minn.	Steagall
Carew	Greene, Vt.	Miller, Wash.	Stedman
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	Mondell	Steele
Clark, Fla.	Griest	Moore, Pa.	Steenerson
Classon	Griffin	Moore, Ind.	Stephens, Nebr.
Coady	Hamill	Morin	Sterling, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Hamilton, Mich.	Mott	Stevenson
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamlin	Mudd	Stines
Copley	Harrison, Miss.	Neely	Strong
Costello	Hayes	Nicholls, S. C.	Sullivan
Crago	Heaton	Olney	Talbott
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	O'Shaunessy	Templeton
Darrow	Hensley	Overmyer	Thomas
Davidson	Hersey	Padgett	Thompson
Decker	Hollingsworth	Palge	Tinkham
Dent	Hood	Peters	Towner
Denton	Houston	Platt	Van Dyke
Dies	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Vare
Doremus	Igoe	Porter	Volstead
Drane	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pou	Ward
Drukker	Juhl	Powers	Watkins
Ellsworth	Kahn	Price	Watson, Va.
Elston	Kearns	Reavis	Weaver
Estopinal	Keboe	Reed	Webb
Fairchild, B. L.	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	Whaley
Fairchild, G. W.	Kettner	Rodenberg	White, Me.
Fess	Key, Ohio	Rose	Williams
Flood	Kitchin	Rouse	Wilson, Ill.
Flynn	La Follette	Rowland	Wilson, La.
Fordney	LaGuardia	Sabath	Wise
Foss			Wood, Ind.

So the motion to strike out the enacting clause was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. TINKHAM (for) with Mr. WASON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. DRANE with Mr. CLASSON.

Mr. MOON with Mr. FREEMAN.

Mr. NEELY with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. POU with Mr. HICKS.

Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. JUUL.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. WATSON of Virginia with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present in the Hall listening?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I was present, but I guess I was not listening very well or I would have heard my name called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already voted, and voted in the affirmative. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I did not vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will scratch his name off if he did not vote. Does the gentleman want to vote?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes; I did not vote and I want to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. No; I was not; if I was listening, I did not hear my name called, and I do not know whether I was listening or not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. BURNETT. No; I do not think I got here in time.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The report of the committee is not agreed to, and the bill is automatically referred back to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union [applause], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] will take the chair.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, pending that may I make a request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the pending bill?

The SPEAKER. Do it after we get through with this. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will take the chair until Mr. POU can return.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7795 with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7795) to appropriate \$50,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen, and to create boards in the respective States to assist in carrying out the provisions of this act, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7795) to appropriate \$50,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen, and to create boards in the respective States to assist in carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7795) to appropriate \$50,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain and feed for live stock, to be supplied to farmers and stockmen, and to create boards in the respective States to assist in carrying out the provisions of this act, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

H. R. 9867. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 28, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11047) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 418), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. SCHALL: A bill (H. R. 11085) to amend section 3 of an act approved June 25, 1910, amending paragraph 2 of section 4 of an act entitled "An act to establish a bureau of immigration and naturalization of the aliens throughout the United States," approved June 29, 1906; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 11086) to amend section 13 of the Federal reserve act so that maturity of paper drawn for

agricultural purposes or based on live-stock may extend to one year; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 11087) to prescribe the personnel of the Army Nurse Corps, the qualifications for appointment and the method of appointment therein, the pay, allowances, and leave of absence of members of said corps and the conditions under which they may be retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11088) providing for the construction of ice piers in the harbor of Louisa, Ky., on the Big Sandy River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BROWNING: Resolution (H. Res. 292) to pay to John E. Nicol, clerk to the late John H. Capstick, a Representative in Congress, \$166.66; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Resolution (H. Res. 293) providing for the immediate consideration of bills on the calendar from the Committee on Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 294) to pay Gardner Anthony, son of W. H. Anthony, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to six months' compensation; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MONDELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 269) to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the years 1918 and 1919; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 11089) granting an increase of pension to George C. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 11090) granting an increase of pension to James A. Bateman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 11091) granting an increase of pension to Stewart N. McGuire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11092) granting an increase of pension to Isaac N. Dysard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 11093) granting a pension to Edward B. Bangs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 11094) granting an increase of Pension to William Douglas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 11095) granting an increase of pension to William Mitchell, alias William Terow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11096) granting an increase of pension to John T. Axline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLK: A bill (H. R. 11097) granting an increase of pension to Edward Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 11098) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bevins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11099) granting a pension to Isabel B. Williamson; 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 Mr. CARY: Petition of the Milwaukee Association of Life Underwriters against tax in war revenue bill on certain life insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the faculty of Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant, Iowa, protesting against the second-class postage amendment to the war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. A. Roziene, president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, relative to unexpended balance of money granted the organization by the Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DARROW: Resolution of the Philadelphia Annual Conference pledging unswerving loyalty to the President and our country in the successful prosecution of the war; urging immediate war prohibition, the establishment of a dry zone in Philadelphia, and the enactment of laws meting out to German propagandists and traitorous Americans the full penalty of spies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Petition of the Shut-in Society of New York City, asking for the repeal of the periodical postage increase law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRENCH: Petition of Joel McCallister and C. A. Shank, of Clarkston, Wash., on maintaining chaplains in the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Devils Lake Journal of Devils Lake, N. Dak., favoring the zone system for second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Illinois Women's Clubs, favoring a kindergarten division in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of T. W. Fisher, of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Lowell Club, of Boone, Iowa, protesting against increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of D. Warnock & Sons, of Loveland, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. Dawn, Ida B. Thompson, Mrs. W. E. Mason, Joy L. Reichelt, Mrs. W. B. Floyd, Mrs. Etta K. Siple, and 11 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of W. W. Scott and 50 men of the Kirkwood Presbyterian Church, of Bridgeport, Ohio, favoring closing American saloons during the present war, and to prevent export of grains to foreign countries to be used in manufacture of distilled or malt liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of certain farmers of the Northwest through the Farm, Stock, and Home, of Minneapolis, asking that the price of 1918 wheat be raised to \$2.75 per bushel; also asking that the draft be revised to the end that farm labor be largely exempted; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 28, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, we lift up our souls unto Thee. In the midst of the world war we put our trust in Thee. At this critical hour in the awful conflict we look more steadfastly to Thee. O Thou God of battles, Thou God of Moses, and of Gideon, and of David in the battles of long ago, direct our cause, and let not our enemies triumph over us. O God, in Thy name we stand for the great principles which Thou hast projected in the world. We stand for justice and righteousness for all men and for all nations; and we look to Thee as the great Captain of our salvation to direct us aright.

O Thou, who art mighty in battle, save our cause. Give grace and wisdom and courage to all our leaders and lead on our armies to honor and to victory and to a lasting peace. Speed on the triumph of the day when wars shall cease to the ends of the earth and there shall be the resurrection of a new day, with peace on earth and good will to men. We ask it in the name of Christ, the Lord. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, March 26, 1918, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota in extra session, 1918, relative to the inclusion of the State of South Dakota in a list of certain States affected by legislation appropriating money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed, grain, and feed for stock. I ask that the resolution be printed in the Record and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The following concurrent resolution has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota assembled in extraordinary session at the State capital, the House of Representatives concurring:

"That whereas there has been a bill introduced in the Congress of the United States (H. R. 7795) to appropriate money for the relief of farmers in procuring seed grain and feed for stock in certain enumerated Northwestern States, of which South Dakota is specifically named, as one needing such Government aid;