

# Congressional Record.

## PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-FIFTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION.

### SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 29, 1918.

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

Almighty God, we come before Thee upon this day set apart and remembered by the whole Christian world as the day of supreme sacrifice, a day which touches the foundation of our civilization, a day that invites us into the immediate presence of God through an atonement acceptable in Thy sight. We pray that the spirit of the day may enter upon us, and that we may go forward in our work under its inspiration, bearing in mind that the success of our work must come through our sacrifice, and that service to mankind at the cost of suffering is the highest service that Thou dost permit Thy children to render to their kind. Hear us in this our prayer to-day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. THOMAS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Gerry	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Gronna	New	Sterling
Beckham	Henderson	Norris	Stone
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Thomas
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Polindexter	Thompson
Cuiberson	Kellogg	Reed	Tillman
Cummins	Kendrick	Saulsbury	Trammell
Curtis	Kenyon	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	Kirby	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Fall	Knox	Sherman	Warren
Fletcher	McKellar	Shields	Watson
France	McLean	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Smith, Md.	

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent due to illness in his family.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of 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.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3401. An act to authorize the President to reduce temporarily the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy; and

S. 3404. An act to authorize the President to drop from the rolls any naval or Marine Corps officer absent without leave for three months, or who has been convicted of any offense

punishable by confinement in the penitentiary by the civil authorities, and prohibiting such officer's reappointment.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President I send to the desk a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota touching the question of equal suffrage, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States has passed a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending equal suffrage to the women of our Nation; and Whereas the proposed amendment is now before the Senate of the United States for consideration; and

Whereas the Legislature of South Dakota at its last regular session passed a full suffrage amendment submitting the same to a vote of the people at the next regular election: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That we urge upon the Senate of the United States to pass at once the Federal amendment establishing at home that democracy for which the men of this country have been called to fight for abroad; be it also

Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be requested to vote for the equal-suffrage amendment.

Resolved, That the resolution be sent to the President, the Vice President, and to our Senators.

[SEAL.]

FRANK M. ROOD,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. STERLING. I simply want to say with reference to the resolution that I shall not occupy the time of the Senate now, but a little later I hope to have the opportunity of addressing the Senate briefly on the subject matter of the resolution.

Mr. KENYON presented the petition of Rev. F. B. Nixon, pastor of the Whitfield Methodist Episcopal Church of Sioux City, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Congregation of the Stone Presbyterian Church, of Brown City, Mich., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Local Grange No. 1566, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ann Arbor, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation fixing the prices on all commodities during the war, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. SHAFROTH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 1760) to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 337) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1889) revoking authority to lease Sibley Island, in the Missouri River, to the city of Bismarck, N. Dak. (Rept. No. 338); and

A bill (S. 3392) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects (Rept. No. 339).

#### LAND IN PORT ANGELES, WASH.

Mr. SHAFROTH. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 5351) providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32 in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, and I submit a report (No. 336) thereon. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to the bill, so that he can take such action as he desires in calling it up.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say that this is a bill of only about half a dozen lines. It is purely local and has been indorsed by all the departments. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That all lots in block 32 in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington, now reserved for Government purposes under an act entitled "An act providing for the reappraisal and sale of certain lands in the town site of Port Angeles, Wash., and for other purposes," approved March 16, 1912, except lots 1, 8, 9, 10, 16, and 17, shall be disposed of under and pursuant to the provisions of said act of March 16, 1912, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to proceed at once to carry out the provisions of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FALL:

A bill (S. 4213) to correct the record of John W. Braden, alias Harry Milford (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4214) granting a pension to Albert Grimes; and

A bill (S. 4215) granting a pension to Louis H. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 4216) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the validity of the expenditures of the appropriations from the principal trust fund of the Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4217) to provide for the redistribution of general taxes and special assessments due and payable on real estate in the District of Columbia, in cases of subdivision or sales of land therein; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 4218) for the relief of purchasers from the State of Utah of lands in sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 in said State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 4219) prescribing the manner in which laborers or mechanics to be engaged in work upon public contracts may be procured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4220) to provide identification tickets and to compel their issuance to street railway passengers within the District of Columbia under certain conditions; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### LIST OF NONCOMBATANT OFFICERS.

Mr. NELSON. I submit a resolution and ask that it be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 220), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to furnish to the Senate, as soon as practicable, a list of the men to whom commissions in the Army have been issued and who are not now and who have not heretofore been placed in command or had charge of any troops in the service of the United States either here or abroad; the branch of the service in which such men have been commissioned.

Mr. NELSON. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### STANDARDIZATION OF WAGES.

Mr. KING. I ask that Senate resolution 174, directing the Committee on Education and Labor to inquire into the subject of labor having to do, directly or indirectly, with Government work, and report upon the advisability of establishing standards of wages for laborers employed in such work, be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### PROSECUTION OF THE WAR.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on next Tuesday, April 2, at the close of the morning business, if it meets with the approval of the Senate, I shall submit certain observations upon the imperative necessity of a better organization of the Nation for the successful prosecution of the war.

#### WAR-RISK INSURANCE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted the following conference report:

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.

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,

HOKE SMITH,

REED SMOOT.

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

T. W. SIMS,

SAM RAYBURN,

A. E. WINSLOW,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator from Georgia if this report is a substitute for the resolution which the Senator submitted several days ago.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is a substitute for the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very well.

The report was agreed to.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on March 29, 1918, approved and signed the following acts:

S. 3129. An act to provide for the disposition of the effects of deceased persons in the naval service;

S. 3130. An act to amend section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3445. An act to authorize the payment of gun pointers and gun captains while temporarily absent from their regular stations, and for other purposes;

S. 1546. An act to permit the use of certain refined products of petroleum as stores on steam vessels carrying passengers; and

S. 3689. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, at Kansas City, Mo.

#### AIRCRAFT PHOTOGRAPHS—OFFICIAL BULLETIN.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a certain matter deserves being brought to the attention of the Senate, and by way of introducing it I send to the desk a copy of the Official Bulletin issued under date of Thursday, March 28, which reached the public this morning. I ask the Secretary to read the article marked upon the last page of the Bulletin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read. The Chair hears no objection.

The SECRETARY. From the Official Bulletin, Thursday, March 28, 1918, reading the last article in the Bulletin, on page 8:

#### WAR PHOTOGRAPHS FOR RELEASE.

A partial list of photographs, released March 30, by the division of pictures, Committee on Public Information, herewith is presented.

A complete list of all photographs may be had upon application. Copies of these pictures may be obtained for private-collection purposes, at 10 cents each, by application to Division of Pictures, Committee on Public Information, 10 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C. In writing, order by number and inclose coin well wrapped.

Stereopticon slides of photographs listed below may be obtained at 15 cents each.

6858. Aeroplane Bodies Ready for Shipment "Over There": These aeroplane bodies, the acme of engineering art, are ready for shipment to France. Though hundreds have already been shipped, our factories have reached quantity production, and thousands upon thousands will soon follow.

6859. The Result of Long Experiment: Scientists and engineers have worked long in our aeroplane factories before perfection was attained, and now that success has crowned their efforts, the factories have been put on a quantity-production basis, and many thousands of these efficient machines will be sent to France.

6860. Speeding up Aeroplane Production: These cylinders for our perfect aeroplane engine are the product of the best engineers and scientists in this country, and now that perfection finally has been attained, the engine factories have been placed on a quantity-production basis. Huge amounts will be turned out to supply our ever-increasing air fleet in France with motive power until victory is ours.

6861. Building Airplane Bodies: These carriages are models of efficiency and are built along the models furnished by the best engineers of this country. They are now being manufactured by the thousands and rushed to France to become a part of our ever-increasing air fleet.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it must be apparent to every Senator, as he listened to that article being read, that those captions which were attached to photographs fairly bristle with misinformation. Furthermore, the Committee on Public Information has been completely informed that those captions are utterly inaccurate, and still persists in publishing them to the American people under the seal of the Government.

On Wednesday morning last there came into my possession a copy of this release containing the four captions just read by the Secretary, each caption descriptive of a photograph to be sent to the press for publication and to be placed upon sale to private individuals or for collections.



I immediately called up the Committee on Public Information and discussed the matter with the director of the division of pictures, under whose charge this matter falls. I called his attention to the grossly misleading statements, particularly that hundreds of airplanes have already been shipped to France when we know that only one has gone. He admitted the information was misleading. He said his understanding was that these particular captions applied only to training planes. The Committee on Military Affairs looked that matter up and further corroborated the well-known fact that no training planes have been sent to France.

We then sent for the director of the division of pictures and had him before the Military Committee. We called his attention to this grossly inaccurate statement. He admitted before the committee in open session that it was misleading and flamboyant. This was on Wednesday afternoon. He laid a part of the blame upon one of his subordinates, a gentleman by the name of Maurice Strunsky, who he said wrote those captions. We had him, Strunsky, brought before us to find out where he got any such information as is contained in those captions, and he could give us no satisfactory explanation whatever.

The chief of the division of pictures informed the Military Affairs Committee that he would stop the publication of those captions. It was to be done at our request, and yet, Mr. President, here we are two days later witnessing the publication of these falsehoods in the Official Bulletin, upon which the people of the United States rely for correct information.

I do not know what the Senate can do about such things. We have no direct jurisdiction over the Committee on Public Information. That organization knew that those statements were misleading, to use the most charitable term, and yet they persist in giving this misinformation to the American public at a time like this.

I think it is well worthy of the attention of the Senate, and, as I have said on a former occasion, it is time that the Committee on Public Information was censured.

Mr. KNOX. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. Is it not a fact that the justification for the existence of the Official Bulletin is that the public is apt to be misinformed if it relies upon the secular press, and that they are entitled to the absolute facts, and hence the Official Bulletin?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course that is the theory upon which the Committee on Public Information was formed. I doubt if it is conducted in that spirit.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I was as much surprised this morning as was the Senator from New York when I saw on the last page of the Official Bulletin of March 28 this article. The Committee on Military Affairs had good reason to congratulate itself that by the merest accident one of its members secured a copy of these so-called bulletins in time to investigate their origin and to stop their general publication. Immediately upon his receipt of it, or very soon afterwards, the Committee on Military Affairs assembled and considered it, with the result as stated by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]. The two men who seem to have been responsible for it are a Mr. Rubel, the head of the division of pictures, and Mr. Maurice Strunsky, whose business is to write bulletins. These bulletins, generally speaking, after they have been composed by Mr. Strunsky, are submitted to Mr. Rubel for his inspection before they are sent upon their mission to the various newspapers of the country. In this instance Mr. Strunsky acted evidently upon his own responsibility, and prepared and mailed the bulletins without consulting his superior. Why, I do not know, unless it be that they were of such tremendous importance that it was necessary to get them into the mail and on their way upon the instant.

Mr. President, the characterization which the Senator from New York made of these bulletins was extremely mild. With the exception of some matters of detail which relate to the efforts of men to perfect the airplane engines and perhaps some parts of ships, they are absolute and unmitigated falsehoods. I might go further and use what was once known as "the shorter and uglier term." The only justification for them was the furnishing to Mr. Rubel by Col. Deeds, of the aviation section, four pictures, which were evidently taken in the factory rooms where machines are being manufactured and which disclose the assemblage of a large number of uncompleted and some completed training machines, engines, and parts of engines. The pictures make a very attractive showing and justify the assertion of the aviation section that it has an abundance of training planes. The rest is largely the work of the imagination.

Mr. Strunsky, 31 years of age, says that when these pictures were received by him—and I do not pretend to give his exact words—he drew partly from his imagination and partly from his construction of an announcement of the Secretary of War upon the 21st day of February the conclusions which he places here as facts. It is all imagination, showing that Mr. Strunsky has a very highly imaginative mentality, partly Oriental and partly American [laughter] the combination of which results in bulletins of this character.

My condemnation of this incident I want to concentrate upon its appearance in the Official Bulletin after the positive assurance of these gentlemen that it would not appear at all. If an "official bulletin" is good for anything, it should be because of its name and what the name implies. That which is official is generally considered to be reliable; it ought to be reliable under all circumstances. Those receiving this bulletin will very properly regard the statements made here as true, and very naturally their disappointment will be extremely great when they learn that they are not only untrue, but that the untruth is stated in an official document which they are taxed to support.

Mr. President, there can be no justification whatever for this. The Bulletin spreads, in this instance at least, among the people four statements upon an extraordinarily important subject which are not true. I think Congress should have something to say about publications of this character at this time. We are confronted at present with a crisis of extraordinary magnitude.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia and Mr. NEW addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. The subject of the statements is so interwoven with success or defeat, one upon which the sentiment and expectation of the people are so keen, that the communication of false information is bound to react upon the morale.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Did the Senator from Colorado bring out clearly the fact—I was diverted for a moment—that the man at the head of that bureau in the Signal Service went before the Committee on Military Affairs and admitted that this statement was untrue?

Mr. THOMAS. He is not in the Signal Service.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In what service is he?

Mr. THOMAS. He is in the Public Information Service.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But he was the agent of the Public Information Service over at the Signal Service Bureau, was he not?

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, who was it that had charge of this publication, who admitted that the description contained in this paper was untrue; apologized for it; and said he had never seen it, or else steps would have been taken to prevent it being sent out?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, this gentleman, Mr. Rubel, admitted that the accounts were flamboyant. I think perhaps he could have gone further—

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. THOMAS. Just a moment. But he disowned direct responsibility for their production. When we called his attention to the facts he admitted their untruth; gave us his word that the Bulletin should not be published; and that he would instruct every newspaper in the country to which they had been mailed not to publish them.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, the Senator has just, in effect, answered the question I rose to ask. I merely rose to ask him if he did not think that this was primarily a direct fraud upon the press of the country?

Mr. THOMAS. Primarily, secondarily, directly, and indirectly. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we asked Mr. Strunsky where he was born and what his business was. He was born and raised in the city of New York; he is 31 years of age; and his chief recommendation for the place was that he was connected with a magazine at one time. I can not state the name of it accurately, but I think it is the Universal Animated Weekly. [Laughter.] He also gave the names of a few of those who had recommended him, and stated that his application for employment was to Mr. Rubel. I asked him if he had any connection with Mr. Creel in the matter of his employment, and it seems that he has never met Mr. Creel, the head of the bureau, which discloses the fact that subordinates in the Bureau of Information are hiring other subordinates in the Bureau of Information and endowing them with authority of the most extraordinary character, without even so much as consulting the head of the bureau.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. REED. I want to ask the Senator if he does not think in this instance that that is an advantage rather than a disadvantage? [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. Well, I will not contend with the Senator very strenuously upon that subject; but the serious side of it is this: This man says that his business is to write bulletins, and that recently he has been writing hundreds of them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Twenty a day.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; some 20 a day; so that his output of bulletins may have had something to do with the processes of his imagination concerning the output of airplanes; in any event, if we could only have one airplane for every bulletin that this man grinds out on his own responsibility there would be no question about the result on the French front in this crisis.

Mr. President, he writes bulletins upon all subjects; and when written by this inexperienced young man they pass the supervision of one scarcely older than himself before finally going to the press, give to these two obscure and irresponsible individuals a power of disseminating information, both true and false, that seems to have no limitation whatever, in consequence of which, through the machinery of the Bureau of Information, it is difficult to place an estimate upon the extent to which the people can be deceived and deluded, whatever the motive inspiring the statements.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia and Mr. POINDEXTER addressed the Chair.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield, first, to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator criticizes the unknown or irresponsible men lower down for this work. What better could be expected from them when the Official Bulletin prints this story after it has been developed and admitted that it is utterly false?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator merely anticipated me. I was about to say that the indictment after all must be laid against those who are at the head of the bureau and who develop such almost unprecedented lack of organization and such a general loose system of operation of the affairs of the bureau.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Did the committee when this Mr. Maurice Strunsky was before it inquire of him whether or not it is German propaganda that he is getting out?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the committee did not ask him that.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It seems to me, Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, that it would have been an entirely relevant inquiry. The country is more or less familiar with the tremendous efforts that the Germans have made in spreading German propaganda among the people of their enemy countries. I can not myself for the moment imagine any German propaganda that would be of more benefit to Germany than to misinform and deceive the American people as to the extent and nature of their preparations for carrying on this conflict. If the American people are led to believe that we have airplanes when we have not any airplanes at all, it is manifestly crippling the power of this country, for the country is not going to make any effort where no effort seems to be necessary.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I may so term it, we tried to take Mr. Strunsky's pedigree; we inquired of him the names of those who had recommended him to the bureau, their place of residence, and their business, having in view the probability of going further in that direction. It is a very grave thing, Mr. President, to charge anybody at this time with inciting German propaganda. That there is a multitude of it every one knows; that it should be suppressed goes without saying; but to fasten, especially in an incomplete official investigation, the charge upon any citizen, however humble, would, in my judgment, be a mistake. We do not want to do injustice to anyone. We have the material for further investigation. I will say very frankly to the Senator that when I first read this bulletin—and I read it again and a third time—I suspected it was the work of German propaganda. I will say that very frankly.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. THOMAS. I am through, as a matter of fact; but I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I merely want to disclaim any purpose of making any charges against this young man. I do not know anything of him at all.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the disclaimer is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. But I do want to state, in order to make clear the point that the information which he is publishing, lulling the people into false security, is in the interest of Germany, and is the very kind of thing that Germany is trying to do and paying out a great deal of money to accomplish.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not misunderstand the Senator. I know that he had no such intention; but I quite agree with him that, whether designed for that purpose or not, it will have that effect, and hence the greater reason that something should be done to prevent its repetition.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. I hope to get up Senate joint resolution 124 as soon as the morning business is over.

#### EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC MONEYS FOR PROPAGANDA.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in connection with the criticism this morning of the expenditure of public moneys for the purpose of giving out information and conducting bureaus, I desire to call attention to the fact that we have another bureau that is engaged in carrying on propaganda at the expense of the Government, and doing it without the slightest authority of law.

I hold in my hand two bulletins that were sent to the press. I read the headlines:

Excerpts from the speech of the Hon. ANDRIEUS A. JONES, of New Mexico, in the United States Senate. Released for publication when delivered, probably on Friday afternoon, March 22.

It will be remembered that on Friday the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] delivered a very interesting address in which he defended the Fuel Administration. That he had a perfect right to do, and for the making of that speech I would be the very last to raise a single word of criticism; but I want to ask by what authority the Fuel Administration takes the money of the people of the United States to prepare bulletins to send to the newspapers advance copies of the speeches of Senators because those speeches happen to be pleasing to the Fuel Administration?

There is a CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that records what is said here; and if any individual, at his own expense, wants to furnish the newspapers with advance copies of what he desires to say here I make no complaint. I want to know, however, when it has happened in this Government that administrators and departments have been given authority to expend the people's money to conduct a newspaper propaganda in their defense, and to give out those things which they want given out?

If there are to be such bureaus, they ought to be run in the interest of all the Members of the Senate. In the interest of fairness they ought to state what is said upon both sides; and so the Government has provided such an instrumentality in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But Mr. Garfield's bureau, when something is said that suits them, take the public moneys and send out the speech or send out the information. It is utterly abominable, and it ought not to be tolerated.

The other publication or statement given to the press is:

Excerpts from the speech of the Hon. ANDRIEUS A. JONES, of New Mexico, in the United States Senate. Released for publication when delivered.

The opening line I read:

In discussing Senator LODGE's views of economics in his speech on the coal and sugar shortage investigation, Senator JONES said:

"Given that there was a shortage of sugar, the economic problem naturally arises. Is the distribution of sugar to be placed upon the basis of the highest bidder?"—

And so forth. Then follow excerpts from this very interesting speech.

I do not know whether the Food Administration prepared this and sent it out at the expense of the public, or whether it was done by the Fuel Administration, or whether it was done by the Creel bureau; but I have grown so familiar with this newspaper "dope" that I can tell the typewriting at the end of a city block. There are literally tons of information and misinformation being sent out in this way, but this is the first time that it has come to my attention that these bureaus are engaged in disseminating the speeches of Congressmen and Senators that happen to be on the side that suits them, and I suppose, of course, carefully refraining from disseminating any speech that might be upon the other side. Of that I make no complaint, although it does seem to me that if they were going to give out the speech of the Senator from New Mexico answering the Senator from Massachusetts they ought to have given to the public the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts. But the real point of the matter is that we have a lot of gen-



men down here who never were elected to an office in their lives, who were picked up and appointed to office, who are undertaking to conduct bureaus to control the public opinion of the United States. Some of these gentlemen came out of the night of obscurity, and will enter it again as soon as they are separated from the positions which at present they disfigure. Some of them, of course, are men of a different type and class, but I insist that the time has come in this body when, in making appropriations, we ought to specify the purposes for which the money is to be used, and that the millions and hundreds of millions and thousands of millions of dollars that are being wrung from the American people ought not to be indiscriminately thrown around by a lot of men who are responsible, apparently, to nobody.

It is high time this sort of thing was stopped. It is high time that the people knew the uses to which their money is put. I had occasion to call attention recently to some of the expenditures in the Food Administration. I shall not at this time go further into that question. I am calling attention to this speech in no spirit of criticism of the Senator who delivered it. I apprehend he was in no way responsible for the method of its giving out. He had a right to make the speech, and he had a right to give it out, but no bureau of the Government down here had the right to spend our money in preparing it for the press and in sending it out in this way.

#### REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might be able to take up this morning the Military Affairs Committee joint resolution providing for the registration of the young men coming of age since the last draft, and that we might go on and complete the organization of our Army. Instead of that, we have spent five or six days here in the sort of discussion that we have had this morning.

What difference does it make, when we need men on the western front, whether this representation here in the Official Bulletin about the air service is a trifle flamboyant and misleading or not? What difference does it make whether the speech of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has been published by an official bureau or not? The thing we need is men yonder on the western front in France.

The War Department has insisted day after day for a month and a half that this registration be proceeded with. The Military Affairs Committee reported this joint resolution more than a month ago, and we have stood insistently upon the floor of this body demanding attention, and it has not yet been accorded.

This Military Affairs Committee of ours has seemed to develop into a hypercritical body and association. They have insisted here this morning that we have no air service, and that we have nothing done, in effect, toward completing or perfecting one. I do not know what the fact may be exactly, but I do know what the report yesterday in executive session was, and I do know there is substantial basis for some of the publications and headlines which have been sent out; and if they are not absolutely true they do reflect a condition that is reasonably in prospect and has to some extent been developed.

What difference does it make about the actual fact whether we have 97 planes this month and 397 next month and 29 squadrons in July, and things of that kind? These things are all in prospect, reasonably so, in esse, almost in fact. Now, let us get down to this joint resolution, and let us have it passed here this morning. Let us get this Army completed—the organization of it, at least—and get it where we can use it effectively. The war is going to be over some of these days, and unless America shall bestir herself more than she has in the past, and unless the Senate gets down to business, the war will be over before we have gotten into it properly. Let us get up this joint resolution.

I ask unanimous consent now that Senate joint resolution 124 be taken up and either passed or defeated to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 124. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the regular order. We will be through with morning business in just a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made. Concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

#### OPENING OF STREETS AND ALLEYS IN THE DISTRICT.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I offer a Senate resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to advise the Senate what proceedings have been instituted for the opening, extension, widening, or straightening of alleys and minor streets in the city of Washington since the approval of the District appropriation act, March 3, 1917, in which additional authority was given in the matter of the condemnation and assessment of damages, and if no proceedings have been taken thereunder, why not; and if any proceedings are contemplated, what they are and when they are to be taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KIRBY. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the resolution will lie over under the rule. If there be no further morning business, the morning business is closed.

#### REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 124.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is that offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW].

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee two or three questions, for information.

I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy has recommended or urged the passage of the proposition embodied in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] as a war measure?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, there has not come down from the Commander in Chief to the committee any request or information whatsoever upon the subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether or not the Secretary of War has urged this proposition as a necessary war measure, or whether he has indicated to the committee any different opinion from that expressed in his report?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator now refers to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There has been no advice from the Secretary of War. If his last report can be applied to this joint resolution, I should infer that he is opposed to it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I want to ask the Senator, who is the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, whether or not the proposition embodied in this amendment was considered by the Military Affairs Committee in connection with the joint resolution that is now pending; and if so, what decision did the committee take with reference to the necessity, as a war measure, of embodying it in this joint resolution?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The question was not argued at great length in the committee. I do not think the merits of universal military training or other training were generally discussed or discussed in detail. Practically the only question considered by the committee in connection with this amendment which was offered before the committee was as to whether it was good policy at this time to attach it to the joint resolution in question. I think the majority of the committee, and even some of those who favor military training, were rather of opinion that it might retard the passage of the joint resolution, so that it left the individual members of the committee to do as they pleased.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But the committee apparently did not believe it was wise to attach it to this particular measure?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the majority of the committee felt that way. I have advocated military training so seriously and so ardently since I introduced the bill on the subject in 1915 that as an individual I could not vote against this amendment as it is to-day, not that it is universal military training but that it is a step in that direction. For that reason I have felt disposed to support the amendment. It may make some difficulties in the War Department in the way of training these young men, but, Mr. President, we are having difficult times,

and I do not think it will encumber the machinery of the War Department very much more than it has been encumbered.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the Senator another question. I asked the Senator if the Chief of Staff of the Army has recommended the incorporation of this amendment into the joint resolution as a war measure at this time?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think anyone connected with the Military Establishment has recommended it or urged it except possibly Gen. S. B. M. Young, who is a retired Army officer, but is a very capable officer. I believe he favors it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Does he favor it as an immediate essential war measure for the present war?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not know about that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I am trying to get at.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will yield for a question.

Mr. NEW. I should like to say, in further answer to the question the Senator from Washington addressed to the chairman of the committee, that there was no formal action of any character taken in the committee upon this amendment. The matter was generally discussed and authority was given me by the committee to present the matter on the floor of the Senate as it has been presented.

Further, as far as a recommendation from the Commander in Chief of the Army or the Secretary of War or the Chief of Staff is concerned, there have been no communications either for or against the amendment, so far as I know or have heard. In further answer, however, as to the opinion held by members of the Staff—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I did not ask for their opinion.

Mr. NEW. Will the Senator permit me to add, then, of my own motion, that I have talked to many of them and I have not found a single military man in the city of Washington who is not in favor of the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not extremely urgent and important that the joint resolution which is pending shall be passed without delay?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Judge Advocate General or Provost Marshal General is urging with a good deal of persistence that it ought to be acted on as speedily as possible in order that he may get the machinery of the War Department necessary to apply it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will ask the Senator, Is it not a fact that the proposition embodied in the amendment is not involved in any of the terms of the joint resolution that is pending?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. No; the amendment has nothing to do with the resolution itself. It could be attached with as much propriety to almost any other measure.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then, Mr. President—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Just a moment. Let me say to the Senator I think probably the Senator from Indiana stated what the committee did with greater accuracy than I. I was laboring under the impression that we had acted on it and possibly so stated. I do not remember now positively since the statement made by the Senator from Indiana whether we voted on it or not. I think probably the Senator is right. He announced then that he would introduce his amendment to the joint resolution in the Senate and the committee assented.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But he offers it not as a committee amendment but as an individual amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Not as a committee amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield for a question.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I simply want to make a statement. Mr. President, I think this amendment is both timely and appropriate in connection with this joint resolution. The joint resolution provides—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not want to yield for a discussion of the matter.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I will make it very brief if the Senator will bear with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The joint resolution provides that men who have become 21 years of age since the draft was imposed shall be included in the draft. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana provides that the men between 19 and

21, previous to their becoming subject to the draft, shall have a moderate military training. The importance of this is seen in the fact that the men who have come to the camps from private pursuits are more subject to illness by reason of the great amount of pneumonia that is found in the camps. Therefore, in connection with the joint resolution I consider it very timely and proper that the Senate at this time should consider and act upon the subject.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, regardless of what my views may be with reference to universal military training in time of peace, I want to say that I agree with many Senators who are in favor of universal military training; that it is very unwise to present this proposition at this time; that every effort that this country can bend toward the prosecution of the immediate war that we have on our hands should be exerted, and every measure that those in charge of the conduct of the war deem necessary ought to have, and I have no doubt will have, our earnest and hearty support. Every measure they deem essential will have my support, anyway.

This proposition ought to come up on its merits. It ought not to be forced through upon a measure to which there is absolutely no objection and which can be passed within one minute by the Senate, and if the amendment were out of the way it would be passed within one minute. All that may be said in behalf of military training may be admitted, and yet the injection of this amendment would not be justified. This is not a universal military training measure. It simply places all responsibility on the President to do this or not, without making any provision to carry it out. If we are for universal military training, let us do it. Let us make provision to carry it out in the proper way and let the President execute it. As a general rule, I am opposed to motions to lay on the table, but I think the conditions fully warrant such a motion. I shall be glad to consider a real measure providing for universal military training, but it ought to be considered on its own merits. It has no place here, even in this very imperfect form, and so, Mr. President, I move that the amendment be laid on the table, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Gerry	Knox	Sherman
Beckham	Harding	McKellar	Shields
Borah	Henderson	McLean	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	James	New	Sterling
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Sutherland
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Thomas
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Townsend
Fall	Kellogg	Page	Trammell
Fletcher	Kendrick	Poindexter	Vardaman
France	Kenyon	Saulsbury	Warren
Frelinghuysen	King	Shafroth	Warren
Gallinger	Kirby	Sheppard	Wolcott

Mr. GALLINGER. I will take the liberty of stating that the Committee on Finance is having an important hearing and certain members of that committee are detained in the committee room.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Washington to lay the pending amendment on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, having been detained in the room of the Committee on Finance, I am ignorant of what the amendment is, and I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the so-called New amendment, proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New].

Mr. GALLINGER. That is satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay the amendment of the Senator from Indiana on the table.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Has the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. WARREN. I withhold my vote, having a pair with him.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr.



BRANDEGEE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and let my vote stand.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSELL] and vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "yea."

Mr. WOLCOTT (after having voted in the affirmative). Has the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not voted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I transfer my general pair with that Senator to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and let my vote stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] and vote "nay."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. By an arrangement with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. Under the arrangement just announced I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING. I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LODGE. My colleague [Mr. WEEKS], if present, would vote "nay." He is paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. WARREN. I wish to announce my general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I have been unable to secure a transfer and so withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Bankhead	James	Shafroth	Thomas
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Sheppard	Thompson
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Shields	Tillman
Fletcher	Kirby	Simmons	Trammell
Gore	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Underwood
Gronna	Norris	Smith, Md.	Vardaman
Henderson	Nugent	Stone	Williams
Hitchcock	Reed	Swanson	Wolcott

NAYS—35.

Baird	Frelinghuysen	Knox	Saulsbury
Borah	Gallinger	Lodge	Sherman
Calder	Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Harding	McLean	Smoot
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Sterling
Curtis	Kellogg	Nelson	Sutherland
Dillingham	Kendrick	New	Townsend
Fall	Kenyon	Page	Wadsworth
France	King	Poindexter	

NOT VOTING—28.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Overman	Robinson
Brandegge	Hollis	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Smith, S. C.
Colt	La Follette	Phelan	Walsh
Fernald	Lewis	Pittman	Warren
Goff	McNary	Pomerene	Watson
Hale	Martin	Ransdell	Weeks

So the Senate refused to lay Mr. New's amendment on the table.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] the following:

*Provided further*, That attendance by those subject to the provisions of this section of not less than six months upon military schools, under regulations made by the Secretary of War, shall be deemed a compliance with the provisions of this section.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I listened with the most intense interest to the fervid appeal made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] during the morning hour for unanimous consent to take up this measure and for its passage. I agree with him, as I think the entire Senate does, that this measure should receive immediate consideration, and I congratulate him that within perhaps five minutes from the time that he pressed for unanimous consent, which was objected to only, as I understand, because we wanted the routine business of the Senate completed, the Senate is now considering that measure. But I do not wish to have it appear only as a matter that may be deducted from the reading of the Record that the Senate imme-

diately took up the measure, but I wish that it shall affirmatively appear that within that short period, after it was apparently turned down by the refusal of unanimous consent, the measure came up upon the motion of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], which motion preceded the motion of the Senator from Arkansas.

There is one thing, Mr. President, however, that I should like to say in addition, and that is in respect to one of the reasons assigned by the Senator from Arkansas as to why this measure should be taken up, or rather as to why we should not be indulging in any discussions which seem to temporarily impede the consideration of this measure. I shall only refer to one thing, and that is the reference made by the Senator from Arkansas to a matter brought to the attention of the Senate by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and elaborated to a much greater extent by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. I understood the Senator from Arkansas to ask, "What difference does it make in respect to those things," or, in referring to the article read from the Official Bulletin by the Senator from New York as being flamboyant, what difference does it make in respect to that matter in this great crisis?

Mr. President, the charge made by the Senator from New York, and which was repeated by the Senator from Colorado and sustained by the record that was read, makes this not a matter of flamboyancy—it makes it a matter of direct misrepresentation; and it seems to me that the question of what difference does it make whether the truth is told or not depends altogether upon the source from which it comes. Had it come from a publication for which certain gentlemen are individually responsible, I would say that it practically made no difference whatever; but coming, as it does, from the Official Bulletin of the Committee upon Public Information, I say, Mr. President, that it makes a very great and a very serious difference.

Mr. President, what is this Bureau of Information and what relation to the bureau does the Official Bulletin sustain? I hold in my hand a communication addressed to the President of the United States under date of January 7, 1918, and signed by George Creel, chairman, which purports to answer both those questions. It purports to lay before the President officially the nature of the activities of the Bureau of Information and the relation of the Official Bulletin to those activities. The first sentence in this letter is, Mr. President—

As will be seen by the accompanying report, the Committee on Public Information has grown to be a world organization.

"A world organization" for what purpose, Mr. President? Let us inquire into this official communication:

Not only does it touch every part of the great machinery that coordinates the forces of America for victory, but it carries the meanings and purposes of America to all peoples, making the fight for public opinion in every country.

"A world organization" for the purpose of creating worldwide public opinion; does it make no difference whether its statements are false or true?

Besides the daily war news—

He goes on to say—

which it issues for the whole press of the country, it supplies some 30,000 newspapers with feature articles, a weekly news service, and governmental publicity material of all sorts.

Does it make no difference whether the information that is furnished 30,000 newspapers and reaches every family in the land is true or untrue? In addition to this—

It sends to foreign countries motion-picture exhibits showing America's social, industrial, and war progress.

Does it make no difference as to whether foreign countries receive the truth as to these material matters, or whether it receives misrepresentation?

It issues an official daily newspaper—

And here the director states specifically the relation of the Official Bulletin to the Bureau of Public Information—

It issues an official daily newspaper for the Government with a circulation of 90,000 copies a day.

It prepares and distributes, advises upon, and censors photographs and moving pictures to the number of more than 700 a day.

And finally, Mr. President, he says:

From a thousand sources we hear of the wonders of German propaganda, but my original determination has never altered. Always do I try to find out what the Germans are doing, and then I don't do it. Even if the very loftiness of our war aims did not command honesty at every point, I have the conviction that corrupt methods work their own destruction.

Now, Mr. President, if I understand the statement made by the Senator from New York and affirmed by the Senator from Colorado, it amounts to this: That not only was there a timely pointing out of the errors and misrepresentations contained in these statements to those who are officially connected with the

Bulletin, but these officials were brought before the committee, and the committee advised them of the inaccuracy of these proposed statements; they admitted the inaccuracy of these proposed statements, and said that they would not appear, and yet, notwithstanding the committee's conception of the necessity for truth in the columns of the Official Bulletin, and notwithstanding the precautions taken by the committee to keep falsehoods out of its columns, they have appeared and appeared in all of their naked untruthfulness.

Mr. KIRBY and Mr. STERLING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not wish to be understood as saying—and I do not think my language is susceptible of any such construction—that it made no difference whether the American public was furnished true or false information. I asked, "What difference does it make about getting our men on the battle line in France that some of these statements about aeroplane service may possibly be flamboyant, optimistic, or a trifle exaggerated?" I repeat that question here and now, and I ask any Senator who has made complaint to stand up and say wherein this statement is not substantially true? Let the members of the committee stand up and say whether we have not all the aeroplanes that we can use in training; whether we have not 126,000 men in the Aeroplane Service—more than we can ever get the schools for. Let members of the committee stand up and say if we have not so many fighting planes already in France. Let some Senator on the other side get up and say that we have not three squadrons yonder on the American front of the best battle planes in the world.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not a member of the committee, but if the Senator will allow me to answer his question I will stand up and say that we have not thousands of fighting planes in France; we have not one fighting plane manufactured by the Aeroplane Construction Board, either in France or anywhere else, and the plans of the Aeroplane Construction Board are not to manufacture any fighting planes.

Mr. KIRBY. There is not a single word said in this statement about fighting planes being manufactured here. Read the statement as it stands. I do not appear as an apologist for Creel; I do not know him; and I do not think he is authorized, under any consideration, to deceive or to send out untrue information to the public.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know whether the Senator from Arkansas was present all the time when the committee investigated this matter, but the witness was compelled to admit that this statement was absolutely false. It says:

Though hundreds have already been shipped, our factories have reached quantity production, and thousands upon thousands will soon follow.

He was compelled to admit that only one airplane had been shipped to France.

Mr. KIRBY. How many engines did he say had been shipped?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am talking about airplanes; that is what this statement refers to.

Mr. KIRBY. The whole four statements are published together, and it is stated that the planes are being shipped separately and that the engines are being shipped separately.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; the Senator—

Mr. KIRBY. And we have three squadrons yonder.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken. Let me read the language, and I am sure the Senator will then recognize his mistake.

Mr. KIRBY. I do not care about quibbling over it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; there is no quibbling; it is an absolute plain fact.

6858—

That was the number of the caption—

Airplane bodies ready for shipment "over there." These airplane bodies, the acme of engineering art, are ready for shipment to France.

Mr. KIRBY. Is not that true?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They are not ready for shipment to France; and they are not going to ship them to France. They are the training planes.

Mr. KIRBY. Well, does the statement say they are not training planes?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The statement, furthermore, says:

Though hundreds have already been shipped—

Yet only one has been shipped. The witness admitted that this was an absolutely false statement calculated to deceive the American public. I am amazed that the Senator now raises any question here regarding it.

Mr. KIRBY. I say that it makes no difference about putting an army on the French front whether or not a hundred of those things have been shipped.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am talking about—

Mr. KIRBY. Here is what I am talking about myself. These engines have been manufactured in the quantity they say they have been manufactured, and no member of the committee denies it. I say that yonder in France we have bought so many planes, and others are to be constructed; the raw material has been furnished by us, and they are being constructed. I say that three squadrons are upon the American front now—battle planes—do you deny that?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is no statement to that effect here.

Mr. KIRBY. No; but the whole matter has been that the American people have been misled about the airplane service.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I rose in response to the Senator's invitation to any member of the committee to question his statement. Now, I say that the statements here made were admitted to be false by the witness before the committee. The statement did not relate to the airplanes that had been bought in France; it related to airplanes made in the United States, and falsely stated to have been shipped to France. The Senator will remember, if he was present, that when the committee demanded of this witness that he give his authority, he produced a statement, a prophecy, made by Secretary Baker last February as his authority for saying that the airplanes had been shipped, whereas it was only a prophecy that they would be shipped.

Mr. KIRBY. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. To be entirely fair, I think it should be stated that 16,000 tons of material for building airplanes, and foremen, superintendents, and mechanics have been sent to France to construct airplanes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is not the issue. Of course, material has been sent to France; but this bureau was sending out pictures of completed airplane bodies, and it is declared in the caption of the statement that hundreds had been sent to France. That statement was false, and it was calculated to deceive the American people; and for that reason the committee thought the Government should not send out that statement with the Government stamp.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, there seems to be some difference about whether the committee understood when airplanes were mentioned whether they were fighting planes or were not fighting planes. As I understand it, we have shipped engines—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is not the question. The Senator is in error. We have not shipped any fighting planes nor training planes to France—not one of them—

Mr. KIRBY. We have sent engines to France.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I was talking about airplanes.

Mr. KIRBY. We have sent the planes to France to be attached to the engines. No; they have not been shipped complete, and they never will be shipped complete.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. This is not a question of engines, Mr. President. It is a question of fighting-airplane bodies.

Mr. KIRBY. I will concede, if the Senator insists upon it, although I did not hear the witness say it, that they have not shipped hundreds of the completed machines to France; but that has got nothing to do with the question as I see it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is a witness who stated how many engines had been sent.

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; I heard the witness, and I heard how many squadrons we had and how many would be supplied.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We have shipped 10 engines to France, That is the number.

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; and how many to England?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Six to England and four to—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair suggest that Senators must address the Chair and receive permission to interrupt from the speaker.

Mr. KIRBY. Very well.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—



The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. With the permission of the Senator, I just want to put in the Record three or four lines of a statement on this subject.

Mr. KIRBY. Very well.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The other day there was a debate here as to whether or not the Aircraft Production Board, notwithstanding the lapse of a year since we became engaged in this war, had manufactured a battle plane; also, as to whether or not they intended to manufacture any, or expected to rely upon our allies to produce battle planes for us. On the following day there appeared in the New York Evening Post an article by Mr. David Lawrence, an apologist and defender of the Aircraft Production Board, so I assume that what he says certainly does no injustice in any way to the administration. Here is what he says on that subject:

Indeed, it was on Gen. Pershing's recommendation that the manufacture of single-seated planes—

That is, the battle plane—

was discontinued, because he believed he could get enough of these from the French. So America concentrated on two and three seated combat planes.

I am not going again into the discussion of the misleading term that is given to these bombing planes—why they are called combat planes, or whether or not it is with the intention of deceiving the public. They are not battle planes.

This writer goes on to say as follows:

It turns out, however, that there is more need of the single-seated machines. All these facts will come out when the board appointed recently by President Wilson to investigate the air-production program completes its inquiry.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I have no objection to that being read into the Record. I am not apologizing for the Aircraft Production Board, although I believe it would be good for the public to know of the statement that was made by the head of the Aircraft Production Board in executive session yesterday. I am not going to state it here, because it was made in executive session. I do not care anything especially about this particular production here. You are criticizing and delaying the legislation because you complain of a certain thing having been done by a bureau that you say is unauthorized. Why not fix it so that the bureau can not make this sort of a statement, or say that the bureau is not authorized, and suppress it?

Now, let us get down to the point that is at issue here. Here is a joint resolution the necessity for which has been recognized by the War Department. Here is a joint resolution the necessity for which has been recognized by the Military Affairs Committee. Here is a joint resolution which has been unanimously favorably reported by the Military Affairs Committee, after the amendment was offered and refused to be considered in the committee, on the suggestion that it would confuse the matter and ought to be presented here, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] was given permission to present it here.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. NEW. I think the Senator is in error in saying that the Military Affairs Committee refused to consider the amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. I mean it was withdrawn. The Senator knows he withdrew it after objection was made to it.

Mr. NEW. No; I beg the pardon of the Senator; I think he is again in error. I did not withdraw it from consideration there.

Mr. KIRBY. The committee recommended the joint resolution for passage without it.

Mr. NEW. It was simply taken by unanimous consent of the committee that I should present it on the floor here without any recommendation from the committee. I think the other members of the committee will sustain me in that statement.

Mr. KIRBY. I do not want to have any dispute with the Senator, but the committee recommended the joint resolution without the amendment, and gave the Senator from Indiana permission to introduce his amendment here. That is exactly the condition, and I understand that nothing more is expected here. What I want to do is to have the Senate pass upon this matter one way or the other, and I say if it is necessary to increase the age limit it ought to go above 31 instead of down below 21.

I say there is no necessity on earth for the present amendment being attached to this joint resolution. If you are going to train the soldiers to fight that are so imperatively needed on

the battle front, if the Government is straining its resources both in money and in places for training and in officers for training to actually take care of the men who are to be soldiers when the training period is finished, then why bother about registering boys 19 years of age, and requiring them to be trained two years before they can be put into battle, when they are to be drafted only after they are 21?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. NEW. The amendment does not require that they shall be trained for two years. I think the Senator is again in error in his statement of the facts.

Mr. KIRBY. I understood that it provided that we should register boys 19 years of age, and that we should train them at least six months of the year until they became 21 years old, and that they could not be drafted and put into the fighting front until after they were 21 years old.

Mr. NEW. Why, Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas further yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. NEW. For the better information of the Senator, I will state that the amendment reads as follows:

That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President.

Nothing is said as to time. Under an amendment which was offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] six months in the aggregate was required for the two years.

Mr. KIRBY. If the Senator had gone on with the amendment, he would have come to these words:

But shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

Mr. NEW. Oh, yes.

Mr. KIRBY. Here is another amendment providing that they shall be trained six months, at least, a year in those two years. That is the condition. We have over 3,000,000 men already registered, as I understand, that have been accepted. We have a million and a half men in training now, and it is thought that we will need these other men who have come of age since last June—another 670,000 to 1,000,000 men. The War Department says this amendment will confuse the plans. Every man knows that if we have only room enough to train the man who is necessary for fighting, we do not need to waste time in training the man who may be called on to fight two years after he is trained, and can not be called sooner.

Why spend money on such a man now, why take a place in the camp for him, and why waste the time of the officers who are needed for the other purpose of training soldiers on this particular man? Why take him out of the industries, why take him out of school, until he can be used, when the Government demands that he shall be used?

You say it is necessary to have universal training that we may have an army. When we have finished this organization for training and the perfection of it, we will have, in my opinion, at least 5,000,000 men in the Army, and probably 10,000,000 in camps before the war is over; and certainly that will be a sufficient army to protect the interests of the United States until you can institute this universal military training, if it is regarded necessary to do it.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. NEW. I should like to ask the Senator where he is going to get the 10,000,000 men of whom he speaks?

Mr. KIRBY. There are a good many million men between 30 and 45 years of age, and the Germans have them up to 54 in their army.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, those men certainly are not included in the draft age.

Mr. KIRBY. They are not—certainly not.

Mr. NEW. The total number of those who are included in the enumeration made under the supervision of the Provost Marshal General was ten million, from which must be deducted all exemptions.

Mr. KIRBY. That is true; but, I presume, there is no incapacity on the part of Congress for lack of power to increase the age and extend it up to 45 years. My judgment is that you are going to have something like that done before the war is over, and if it is found necessary to go down to 19 years of age, that, too, may be done. But if it is found necessary to go down

to 19 years of age, then when the man is trained he ought to be made a soldier and put into the battle front like the other soldiers. The necessity has not yet come for that, and I do not believe that any man should be drafted and put into the Army and sent yonder across the sea until he has at least had the right to have a voice in his own affairs at home, until he is recognized as a man.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. NEW. The necessity for soldiers was not recognized until after the 6th day of April, 1917. Had it been recognized earlier and provision made for providing those soldiers, our condition to-day would not be what it is.

Mr. KIRBY. I am not taking issue with any statement of that kind, but this joint resolution has been here, recommended for passage, more than a month and a half, and it is time that it is fought out and passed or defeated, one way or the other. I insist that we ought not to confuse our system of raising our army with this universal military training idea, which will be ineffective for any purpose under existing conditions.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, a word in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] and the amendment which I proposed to his amendment, and which he so graciously accepted.

I am thoroughly in accord with the principle involved in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana—the principle of universal military training—and if this amendment of the Senator from Indiana, standing alone, were nothing more than a declaration of a policy, I should favor it. I should favor it whether we were in war or not. I should favor it if the chances of war were never so remote. I should favor universal military training because of its relation to the moral welfare, because of its relation to the physical welfare of our young men, and because of its educational value. I should favor universal military training because of the spirit of national unity and of patriotism which it would inculcate. I should favor it because of its great value in doing away with all sectional feeling and all sectional interests in the United States and making a thoroughly united American people. I think that universal military training would be the very triumph of democracy itself, and so I shall favor the proposition of the Senator from Indiana.

But, Mr. President, I introduced an amendment providing that the period of training during the two years between 19 and 21 should, in the aggregate, be not less than six months. I am not sure, Mr. President, that that amendment should be adopted under the present conditions and circumstances. A period of six months during those two years may, under present conditions, be too great a drain on certain industries in the land, and especially on the industry of agriculture, which, of course, we all recognize now as one of the most important and one, too, greatly in need of men. Hence, on reflection and because of the division of opinion in regard to this matter, I have concluded to ask leave to withdraw my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota has been accepted by the mover of the amendment.

Mr. STERLING. With the consent of the mover of the amendment, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], I ask leave to withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can not be done, because the Senate has agreed to the amendment to the amendment, as the Chair is informed. The Senator from Indiana can modify his amendment before a vote is taken on it.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Would not a motion to reconsider be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. How was the amendment modified?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will have to ask the Secretary to read the modification.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I wish—to have it read as modified.

The SECRETARY. The original amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] reads as follows:

SEC. 5. That in addition to the persons subject to registration and selective draft under the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, all male persons between the ages of 19 and 30, both inclusive, shall be subject to registration and draft in accordance with the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, but shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

Then comes the portion accepted by the Senator from Indiana, as follows:

*Provided further*, That the period of training between the ages of 19 and 21 years shall be in the aggregate not less than six months.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I move that the vote whereby my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana was adopted be reconsidered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a motion to amend already before the Senate. The Chair will recognize the Senator from South Dakota, but will say that the Senator from Indiana may modify his amendment, if he desires, before a vote is taken on it. The Chair possibly did not clearly express himself before. The question now pending is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a motion to amend his amendment, as it stands now, by eliminating therefrom the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will take it by unanimous consent that that is agreed to, unless there is objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to say a few words upon the point at issue.

I think it very unfortunate, indeed, that the Senator from Indiana should have offered this amendment at this time. This is, in essence, a question which must be determined upon the battle field, which ought not to be determined now by us. If we lose this war, if Germany wins this war, or if a patched-up peace is made, amounting simply to an armistice, and not a lasting and enduring peace, then it goes without saying that we as a nation must become and must remain armed cap-a-pie indefinitely. We will have had full notice of Germany's intention to make a world conquest and to exercise world dominion, and we would be fools, indeed, if we did not prepare to prevent that when "the next war" breaks out—"the next war" concerning which the Prussian junkerthum and the military caste are already talking in Germany, and for which they are already making their plans. I have seen some right extensive plans advocated for "the next war." Prussia has made up her mind that unless she is whipped she will regard the next peace as an armistice for further preparation for further world-conquest lust.

Now, Mr. President, if she wins, of course, we must remain in arms, cap-a-pie, no matter what it costs the people in the subtraction of money from education and progress and industry. If we have self-respect we must remain armed. But if upon the other hand we win the war, as I rather imagine we will sooner or later, then we will hope to rid the American people of the menace of universal military conscription, a curse, although it may at times be the less of two evils, but in itself a curse to civilization, to nationality, to progress, to humanity, and to education. Speaking for myself, one of the reasons why I am so ardently in favor of waging this war to a successful termination is that I hope to put an end not only to the menace and threat of universal military compulsory service in the United States but to put an end to it all over the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi will suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate the executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government.

Mr. KIRBY. I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the unfinished business temporarily until we finish this joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumes the consideration of Senate joint resolution 124. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if we win this war, it will be a most unfortunate thing to have upon the statute books a national pledge for universal military compulsory service, for which we are neither prepared by our past history nor invited by our ideals as to the future. A nation which lives in peace times under universal military compulsory service is a nation of slaves to exactly that extent.

Now, there are two ways of having peace. One is to let Germany dominate the world and give us instead of the old Pax Romana a new Pax Teutonica, where none of us dare complain, and where all that any of us dare to do will be efficient in making a living for himself. That is one way.



Another way is to whip Germany, to whip the Teutonic junker-bund, to whip the military caste and the House of Hohenzollern, if possible; and then to be able to say to the entire world, "The world is not only safe for democracy but it is safe for liberty; it is safe for progress; it is safe for individual initiative; and not only is it safe for democracy but we have made democracy safe for the world, which is a bigger job than making the world safe for democracy."

Mr. President, to put upon the statute books a sort of a pledge that no matter how this war comes out we people of these United States are going to sink to the level of Prussians and Austrians and Bulgarians, to the level of the condition of the continent of Europe, living in armed camps, one against the other, suspecting one another every day, prepared to pounce upon one another every week, I say is going too far.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WILLIAMS. One word and I will. I repeat, it is a very unfortunate thing that this great question which must be left to be determined upon the battle field, if we win to be determined in one way and if we lose to be determined in another way, should now be presented to this body with the danger and peril of misunderstanding in every vote that is cast.

I for one am not prepared to pledge myself that these United States will become an armed camp with universal compulsory military service, subtracting the resources and the money and the manhood of the Nation from progress and peace and civilization for all time to come. Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator if he does not think that instead of sinking to the level of the Prussians and Austrians we might well rise to the level of America and prepare to defend our existence and our national honor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if that question were worthy of an extended reply, I might make it, but it hardly is. America does not have to rise. She has already risen years ago. She already stands upon a plane of civilization and progress and enlightenment and liberty unequaled by any other part of this world in the past or now. She has very largely risen to that level because she has in peace prepared for more peace rather than spending her energies in peace preparing for war. We have, like our English cousins across the water, found that our past policies left us unprepared for Prussian efficiency when the war came, but like them we too may say, as they ought to say, that we are glad of the fact that hitherto during the ages that have gone ringing down toward eternity we have devoted our energies to peace and civilization and humanity and progress, and not to war.

We have thus far up to date in France and Flanders proven that in spite of our unpreparedness, in spite of the fact that we had to muddle through as best we could, we are still the peers, if not the superiors, of men who have been raised under a military caste, who have had no thought except for "the next war."

The Senator may think that America would "rise." If America went to the platform that she was going to spend the balance of her existence thinking about the next war, I rather imagine she would "fall" and that her future would be unworthy of her past.

The thing to do now is to win this war and, if we win this war, to put an end, not only here but all over the world, even in Prussia itself, to universal compulsory military service, to make mankind recognize the common fatherhood of God and the common brotherhood of man, and to quit thinking about cutting one another's throats and begin to think about helping one another as the common children of God, entitled to the heritage which God has given us. America fall! The Senator asks me. Shall America rise to this great Prussian opportunity? He reminds me of something I heard some years ago. Somebody said in the House one day that if certain New England mechanics down in Florida could not get away they might fall to the level of "the common white trash by whom they were surrounded," and I said, "Mr. Speaker, if they fall, they will violate all the laws of gravitation, because in order to reach that level they would have to rise." So when the Senator asks me whether we shall rise to the level of supporting American honor and the balance of it my answer is we have already risen to it. We have been rising to it all the time and we have risen to it lately.

We have had a new Easter of American patriotism. The god of justice and of righteousness and of American patriotism has been resurrected once more. Shall we rise to the level indicated by the Senator from Indiana? What level? The level of barbarians; the level of war seekers; the level of institutions and societies founded upon a military caste, seeking throughout all

the years of peace to prepare itself for war provoked by itself. Whenever you turn a people into an armed camp, you at once give them the ambition to provoke war in order to show how well prepared they are for it.

Fight this war out; resort to compulsory universal military service in order to defeat compulsory military universal service all over the world forever. Resort to war in order to put an end to war. As far as we can see, between a universal law Teutonic, while living forever in a state of suspicion and hatred and hostility toward the whole world, thinking about somebody's throat that you want to cut and national disaster, there is, to my mind, very little choice.

Shall you rise to the level of Americanism? Have not those boys risen to it "over there"? Have not these boys in the training camps risen to it?

All we have got to do, Mr. President, is to obey the injunction of Charles Kingsley—those of us who are not fit for service—and that is "to hold our hearts up higher for those who are fighting afar," and not to forget while we are doing this, under the strain of circumstance, the traditions and ideals of the American Republic and of American democracy—a republic and a democracy whose every salient, keystone strength has consisted in the fact that they were constantly and always preparing during peace for still better and more enduring peace.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, to find myself in perfect accord with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He has said what I should like to say much better than I could hope to say it. To say that America should rise above its present condition in military efficiency would simply seem to me to mean that we indorse Prussian military autocracy and acknowledge our own inefficiency and inability to win against an organized military force consisting of a comparatively small number of people.

Mr. President, I have talked with many people who came from Prussia. I have talked with a great number who were subjected to military service in that country, and I never have found a single one of those people who did not say that the Prussian military autocracy ought to be dispensed with.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that to acknowledge that it is necessary for the American people to establish a compulsory military system is to acknowledge that Christianity is a failure.

After this war shall have been concluded, and after a victory shall have been won by the lovers of peace, by the people of America and their allies, to say that we shall fasten upon the people of this country and other nations a compulsory military system is simply to indorse the system which we are now fighting.

Mr. President, I will be glad to sacrifice my own life at any time in order to crush any autocratic military system, no matter where it may be found. I acknowledge that we must fight fire with fire. I know that under present conditions we must train our boys in order to meet the enemy, but let us hope that this will be a victory for humanity. Let us hope that when this war shall have ended it will mean that the people of the country will not be compelled to keep their young men in compulsory military training and service, but that they may be engaged in other pursuits or other business.

I indorse what the Senator from Mississippi said, that if the Prussian military system shall prevail, if it should so happen that they should be the victors, then, of course, we must see to it that our young men are trained until such a time that it is possible for us to do away with that system. But I do not believe, sir, that we should at this time place upon the statute books laws which we do not wish to enforce after peace shall have been concluded.

We are hoping now, Mr. President, that we shall win the war. We believe that we shall win this war in the hope that this system of military autocracy shall be crushed and that every nation on the face of the globe shall subscribe to certain rules, regulations, and agreements that they will disarm to a minimum. If that shall not be done, we can not say that we have won a real victory, as the Senator from Mississippi said, a victory that will not only be safe for democracy but a victory that will mean liberty to all people.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], because I do not believe that this is an opportune time for such legislation. Let us pass such laws as are necessary to meet the needs of the hour. Let us subdue the enemy as quickly as possible. Let us crush this foe of all humanity, the military, autocratic system. Unless we do that I do not believe we can say that we have won a real victory.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution in charge of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] provides that all men who have become 21 years since the

draft was imposed shall be registered for military service. I think there are about 600,000 men who have become of age since the draft was imposed and who have come into the zone of eligibility. It is perfectly proper that those men should be included in the registration.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] has introduced an amendment which provides that all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training up to 21 years of age. It is not mandatory. It provides that the President shall prescribe regulations if he believes that these men should have this preliminary military training.

I am in favor of this amendment. When it was introduced the other day I doubted the advisability of putting it on this joint resolution, because it is highly important that immediately this draft shall be completed so that we can perfect the call and provide the man power to make up the wastage that is now being caused by reason of our men going to the other side and by reason of sickness here. Three thousand men died in cantonments here on this side previous to the shipment on the other side of our troops. Since the troops have been sent over the casualties, according to the roll of honor of the Evening Star, now amount to some 2,100 or 2,200 men. When we hear of the result of the engagement of American troops—and I understand that American troops are engaged over there, although the reports at the present time are very meager—undoubtedly that casualty list will be greatly increased.

The problem that we have now is to fill the wastage that will naturally come by reason of the fact that our Army must take part in the attack and is, or will be, one of the important factors in the months to come on the other side.

Now, what does this amendment provide? A simple method of training these men preliminary to their call for the draft, that from 19 to 21 these men shall have a preliminary training—not an expensive system, but an economical system—that will enable them to learn the elementary military principles to prepare them for the draft.

I am told that the loss in one camp alone from pneumonia amounts to three or five men a day. The reason for that is that the men come directly from their homes, from their business, from the factories, and they are not in a physical condition to stand the exposure of this training. If they had the manual training under some universal military system, undoubtedly those men would be more physically fit for the exposure and for the extensive training necessary to make them American soldiers.

Gen. Wood said the other day that by reason of the fact that these men came from all walks of life it was a democratic Army, and that the National Army would give an account of itself which would be probably equal if not superior to that of the trained troops of Europe.

Mr. President, there is another reason why I believe this is a wise provision. Many of the Senators remember a statement that I think was sent to all the Senators by the Secretary of the Interior, showing that in the registration under the conscription act of the 10,000,000 men there were 700,000 men who were illiterate, and I think that in the draft which followed there were 200,000 men who could not read or write, and that in all the cantonments, in addition to the military training, they were holding night schools to teach the men to read and write, to teach them how to perform the ordinary duties of the soldier, the duties of a sentry, to read the bulletin boards and the orders, on the theory that an intelligent soldier makes a good soldier. What a reflection on our educational system in this country is the fact that there are so many illiterates in our National Army! Have we not neglected our duty in this country? We have boasted of America as the melting pot of nations and yet the fires of patriotism have been burning low. These men have come from European countries, and we have allowed them to retain their ideas, their customs, and national instincts; in fact, we have allowed them to continue the use of their own language and to print their own papers, instead of forcing them into night schools and under a compulsory system of training. As a result, there is a German propaganda in this country the extent of which we can not estimate. In my State we have had casualty after casualty resulting in great catastrophes and causing the loss of life and of property. The time has come when these men must be dealt with severely. Taking German propagandists and pro-German sympathizers in our laps and feeding them sugar plums is not a good national policy. If we had a blank wall and a shooting squad, such depredations would soon stop.

Mr. President, as an educational advantage for our young men, the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] will be a great benefit.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLETCHER in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to say that two days ago I received a short letter from a colonel in the United States Army, a man who was educated at West Point, who went through the Philippine war, and who is now in command of a camp in the South. In that letter he wrote as follows:

I wish you could take a few days off and visit this place and see the work we are doing with these men. As I look back on the conditions as they were when troops began to arrive and look at these wonderful husky youngsters now, the improvement in physique, morale, discipline, and bearing, I feel that, even if we were never to use them in the great cause, the work put on them would be of the utmost value to the country and to themselves.

Mr. President, those young men, coming from all parts of the country and from all walks of life, have been in camp but a few months. We know exactly what kind of soldiers they were at that time, but a few months' training has put them in the condition which this distinguished soldier describes to me in the letter which I have read.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, that is only one instance of thousands of instances of which I have heard.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator yield to me to ask a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. How many boys are there between 19 and 21 years of age in the country who would be subject to this registration?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Taking the estimate that there will be five or six hundred thousand men who have come into the draft age during the past year, if this bill passes I should say that the number who would be subject to registration would be from 750,000 to a million.

Mr. OVERMAN. That number would be registered?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That number would be registered.

Mr. OVERMAN. Has the Senator from New Jersey any estimate of how much it would cost?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the military history of this country shows that we have fought our wars and maintained our Military Establishment at great cost. We were not ready in the Spanish-American War, and it therefore probably cost us twice as much to fight that war as it would have done if we had then had some simple system of military training.

Take the shipping question alone. We were short of ships at the beginning of the Spanish-American War. Both political parties in this country had pledged themselves to a merchant marine. Up to 1865 the American merchant marine carried 90 per cent of the exports and imports of this country, but from that date the commerce of the seas was taken away from us; our commerce stopped at the water's edge. When the Spanish-American War broke out we had no ships, and we went out into the highways and the byways and bought them, paying for them twice as much as they were worth. I remember one old vessel, the *Vigilancia*, for which we paid \$67,000, and she was sold to a Chicago junk company for \$3,000 after the war. We spent \$18,000,000 for our merchant fleet with which to transport troops, and at the end of the war we sold the vessels of which it was composed for \$307,000. That is what failing to have some military policy in this country has cost us.

When Villa crossed the border at Columbus we were unprepared; we refused to accept the lesson of an invasion by a Mexican bandit; and when Germany declared war we made no preparation, although there were then men in this country with wisdom and with vision who advised us at that time to prepare. However, we failed to do so. I attribute that to the fact that we were a great peace-loving Nation, and war was repugnant to us. Had we prepared at that time, or had we had a universal system of military training, we would not now be preparing for war at inflated prices.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not disagree with the Senator on that question; but I merely wanted to be informed of the fact about what it would cost the Government to train these boys, if he has any estimate of it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, Mr. President, all I can say in regard to that is that Switzerland, which has a system of universal military training and a population, I believe, of only 4,000,000, trains and maintains an army of 500,000 men, with only 230 paid instructors, at an annual cost of \$9,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to inquire of the Senator from New Jersey whether, if this amendment passes and takes effect now, the Government will not be obliged to build additional canton-



ments for the men, to furnish them with uniforms and arms for training, food supplies in sufficient quantity—which will, of course, be enormous—and, in addition, require the services of some forty or fifty thousand officers, none of whom we can at present spare, plus transportation, which at present is so congested as to demand the use of all of the rolling stock we have, while at the same time we must go on with the training of the drafted men with which to increase our Army and repair its wastage, and whether he has considered what the enormous cost of such an undertaking would be?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I have considered the money cost; but I am also considering the tremendous cost that we are now paying by reason of our unpreparedness. I believe that some simple plan can be formulated which will provide for the training of these men in the localities where they will be registered, so that a limited training, probably of a month or two weeks a year, may be afforded them, so that during this period they may be trained by officers who, unfortunately, will be wounded or maimed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he thinks a military training of two weeks or of a month a year will go very far toward making a soldier?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, answering the Senator from Delaware, I can only say that the military training at Plattsburg for a month in a year has worked wonders; and, as the records show, in the officers' training camps one of the questions that was first asked was whether the man had had any military training at any military camp; and men that had such training were always preferred over the men who had not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield further to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand the New amendment, this training is to last only during the war. I take it, therefore, that the New amendment is designed to assist in the contribution of men to the Army in this war. I want to ask the Senator if he thinks that a training of anything short of three or four months will be of material assistance in the making of soldiers for this war?

I quite agree that two weeks' or a month's training in a military training camp, such as they had at Plattsburg, would be of great benefit to men; but would it go far toward making a soldier? If the New amendment is of any value at all, it must be in the way of making soldiers for this war, because its operation ends with the war.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, a young man who is ordered to a training point at 19 years of age for one month's training will during his time of training have at least three months' training previous to his being subject to the draft. I firmly believe that three months' training will be of great benefit to any man and make him better mentally, physically, and morally than if he had had no training; he will be a better soldier when the draft is imposed upon him.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. What effect would the adoption of this amendment have upon the military schools of the country? According to my information the number of schools and the attendance upon those schools has been increased very largely in the last year or two, and it is very natural that that should be the case. What effect would the passage of a bill like this have upon such schools? Does not the Senator from New Jersey think—to come down to what I want to know—that there ought to be a provision in the amendment, if it should be adopted, to the effect that those in attendance or who may be in attendance upon the military schools of the country should be excused from such training?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think some such amendment might be a very wise one.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. FALL. Is not what the Senator from Tennessee suggests provided for in this amendment?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; it is not. I have, however, offered an amendment to the amendment providing for it in terms.

Mr. FALL. As I read this amendment, Mr. President, the matter of the exemption of the young men who are in attendance on military schools, or failing to call them, would be entirely in the hands of the President. I frankly say to you that I object to the amendment as it stands, because it does not go far enough, in my judgment, in providing the rules and regulations which I think it is the constitutional duty of Congress to provide.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I also think that is an objection, and I so stated. I offered the amendment, if the Senator is referring to me.

Mr. FALL. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that now, under this amendment, the rules with reference to military training are to be entirely prescribed by the President, so that these men may not be called from their schools unless the President sees fit to call them.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not think it is broad enough in its scope to permit that kind of exemption.

Mr. FALL. I am afraid that it will prove to be so.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am merely submitting the suggestion to the Senator for his consideration. I hope he will vote for the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I am for universal military training. Undoubtedly military training in schools and colleges is of great benefit; but that kind of training only reaches a certain class of men. The pending proposal is for universal compulsory training, not compulsory service; that all men in every walk of life, after they reach a certain age, shall for a certain period be trained by the Government in military tactics. The men attending military schools and colleges are men whose parents can afford to send them there. Such training no doubt has been of benefit, as demonstrated by the fact that the men who were at the second training camp at Fort Myer coming from a famous southern military academy, proved by their experience in military knowledge and science to be far better equipped than the men who had simply been trained in the National Guard or elsewhere. I believe that an amendment exempting those men who take military training in schools and colleges would be wise. The spirit, however, of this proposal is to make military training universal, so that if America calls on these men they will have sufficient preliminary training, and we will not have to go to the expense of drilling them and training them in the primary grades of military knowledge before they are called upon to undergo more intensive training and discipline.

Mr. President, I think for the Senate at this time to go on record against universal military service is unwise. Pass this amendment to-day, and it will be a message to the boys in the camps and the boys "over there" that America intends to supply from the young men of the country the reserves to take the place, when necessary, of the boys who have gone to the other side. It will be a message to the allies that we mean business and that all the young men of America will be ready for the call to the colors. The only source we have for our Army in this country are the men who will become of age in the next 16 years; they must fight the battles of the future. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] some days ago said that this war would be over in six months. If he is right and the war should terminate in six months, it is going to be a German victory, and we must fight on; and if it is not terminated in six months we will fight for two or three years, because we will not stop until German militarism has been beaten down.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. KING. I understood the Senator from New Jersey to state a moment ago that the defeat of this amendment would be construed as a disapproval of universal military service. Does not the Senator think that he states the proposition a little too baldly in making that statement? Speaking for myself, I am in favor of military service, but I am not quite satisfied, in view of the immense drafts that are to be made upon the Government in men and in treasure within the next few months and years, that it would be the part of wisdom to adopt this amendment. We have no place for the training of the young men; the cantonments will be required to take care of the thousands and hundreds of thousands, and even millions, in my judgment, that must be called into military service; and there are many other objections which will readily occur to the

able Senator. Does not he think, in view of those facts, that the statement is too strong, that to defeat this amendment is a registering of opposition to military service?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think it would be very unwise at this time to defeat any measure that provides for universal military service or training in this country. I will say to the Senator from Utah that when we passed the conscription act there were grave doubts in the minds of many whether it could be imposed and whether it would be successful. It has created one of the greatest armies—limited, it is true, to a million and a half of men—that has ever been raised; and there is no question about the success of the draft.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will yield further—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KING. I want, speaking for myself, to say that I never had any doubt about the success of the draft law.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the Senator will permit me to finish my sentence, I will be very glad to suffer an interruption. Since we passed the conscription act and raised our Army the situation has changed. Russia has broken down, Germany has advanced far into France, and the allies' lines are threatened. It is up to America now to consider future military preparation.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. NEW. I will ask the Senator if he does not know from the news of this morning that the present Government of Russia is advocating immediate universal military training for that country?

Mr. BORAH. That must be encouraging news for the whole world.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand that such a statement was in the papers this morning. All that I can say is that Russia is beginning a little late.

Mr. President, I certainly believe that it is our duty, as a Senate, to say to the country that the young men of 19, 20, and 21 years shall be trained preliminary to the draft. I believe it is our duty at this time to pass this measure. It will be a message to Germany that the limit of our Army is not a million and a half men; that we have other resources.

Mr. President, in closing, I simply want to cite a little incident that happened to me. When about to vote for the declaration of war there came into my office a number of worthy women who were pacifists and who urged me to vote for preparedness, but against the declaration of war. They said, "Do not send our boys to be cannon fodder," and I must say that their appeal made an impression upon me. I came over to the Senate, and as I entered the Chamber a message was handed to me which contained a letter from a patriotic woman of New Jersey 70 years old. In that letter were three verses which give, I think, the most eloquent description of America's position in this war that I have since read. I have long wanted to put those three verses in the RECORD, and in my closing remarks and in my appeal to the Senate to vote for this amendment I am going to recite them to the Senate:

There came to us this edict, "Ye must not sail the sea  
Except as I shall order and in the path prescribed by me."  
Then, like a fire that smouldered and at a touch outblazed,  
The deep voice of the Nation in protest loud was raised.

We want no conflict; we have seen its horror from afar,  
Stripped of all the nakedness of a ruthless, cruel war.  
But a united Nation sends answer back to-day,  
"The sea is free and we shall go un hindered on our way."

From North and South and East and West rings out the same refrain—  
The heritage our fathers gave to us we will maintain.  
Be steady, oh, my country, for the men you bred will stand  
A bulwark firm forever to guard the sea and land.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Jersey takes his seat I should like to ask a few questions, thinking, inasmuch as he is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, that he can give me the information I want. Will the Senator advise me how many men are yet available under the present draft law for field service?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand that the first draft was about 175,000 short, and that 75,000 additional men have been called, and that there are about 100,000 more to be called.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think perhaps the Senator misunderstands my question. How many men are there subject to the present draft liable to be called for active service if desired?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The draft act provides for about 1,500,000 men. I understand in the first draft about 687,000 were called. So I presume that the next draft will contain over 600,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Still I have not made myself clear. I want to know how many men are embraced in the terms of the present draft law and what percentage of them are fit for fighting? That is putting my question in another way.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I understand, the Senator's question means, How many men are now registered between the ages of 21 and 31?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right; and not in active service.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand the estimate is about 10,000,000 men.

Mr. NEW. It is short of that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, over 9,000,000. I understand.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Can the Senator tell me the estimate of the number of men the Chamberlain resolution, now pending, will produce per year?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The draft at the present time classifies the men into four classes, and it will call, it is estimated, between 500,000 and 700,000 men, divided into the four classes provided by the registration. I should estimate probably 250,000 or 300,000, as a guess.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the first class, does the Senator mean?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The first class—less, rather than more.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And about 600,000 in all classes?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. From 500,000 to 600,000; yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator tell me how many men are available under the present law registered in class 1?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not know.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the Senator know, or have any of the advocates of this bill estimated, how many men the present cantonments of the country will accommodate?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, Mr. President, answering that question, I think that I can satisfy the Senator that there will be plenty of accommodations for the entire drafted army that we may choose to train.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are sending men out of the country very rapidly and there is plenty of capacity in the cantonments. There are also, of course, many large encampments where tentage could be used.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not questioning that the number of men required for training to fight this war can be accommodated in the training camps and cantonments; but, still, I should like to know how many men can be accommodated in these cantonments?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. KIRBY. About a million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Not yet; I intend to answer the question of the Senator from Delaware, if I can. At the present time there are, as I understand, in the camps and cantonments of the country about 1,200,000 men, less the number of men who will be transported to the other side. The capacity of the cantonments probably in the next six months will be largely increased, because 400,000 or 500,000 men will be transported.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The capacity of the cantonments will not be increased unless more are built. Their capacity, as I understand the Senator to say, is about 1,200,000.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We are sending men to the other side and some of them are being transported to camps where tents are used.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I understand that; but the capacity of the cantonments remains the same whether men are in them and whether men have been moved out or not.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Not necessarily so. There are some cantonments capable of housing 60,000 men, which are now accommodating only 20,000 or 30,000 men.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The capacity of that cantonment would be 60,000 men.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Possibly, or it might be 80,000 with additional tentage. Will the Senator tell me what he is driving at, and I will try to answer his question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I have, Mr. President, made it as plain as I can make it. I asked the question of the Senator, who is a member of the Military Affairs Committee. What is the capacity of the cantonments of the United States? I do not care how many are in them. "Capacity" is a very well-defined term.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I should say the capacity was about a million and a half men.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I think I may be able to throw a little light on the subject of the cantonments. No one of the cantonments is at present taxed to its capacity. My understanding, my information, is that they



could accommodate now about 40 per cent more men than they have. I do not state that as an absolute fact, but that is my understanding of the situation, and as I believe it to be. Now, Mr. President, it is also a fact that a large number of men—I think substantially all of them—are to be withdrawn from those cantonments in the very near future, leaving them comparatively open to new occupants.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Still the Senator who rose to answer the question has not as yet answered it. What is the maximum capacity of the cantonments?

Mr. NEW. I tried to answer that question by saying that the cantonments now had about 40 per cent more capacity than they are called upon to provide, and they are now housing something like 1,250,000 men.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then the total capacity would be 40 per cent more than that, would it?

Mr. NEW. That is what I meant to say—about 40 per cent more than that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator another question in that connection? Does the Senator from Indiana propose to use any of these military cantonments, that are now used for the training of the actual soldiers, for training these boys within the next two years?

Mr. NEW. That will be entirely at the option of the War Department. I should think they would be used in part, at least.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should certainly think so.

Mr. NEW. Now, Mr. President, in further explanation of the amendment, I should like to call attention to the fact that the amendment provides that these men may be called under regulations to be prescribed by the President. No definite time is fixed for it; and many men could be taken care of at auspicious seasons of the year, under canvas, if necessary, without detriment to their health or anything of the sort, if the time of year is properly selected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NEW. Certainly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Has not one of the complaints been that these tent camps have been productive of disease in the Army, more so than the cantonments?

Mr. NEW. I think the complaint has been that the tent camps were used at a time of year when they were not suited for the occupancy of troops.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I ask the Senator another question? I profess to no particular knowledge of military questions; but is it not true that a cantonment is far superior to a canvas camp as a place in which to accommodate soldiers?

Mr. NEW. I certainly think it is; and, in addition to that, Mr. President, I will state that if additional cantonment accommodations are necessary for the care of these troops they should be built, and would be built, I take it. I do not mean to say for a moment that it is contemplated to take care of these men under canvas. I say that it can be done in part without detriment to the health of the men, provided the element of season and locality is taken into account, as it may be under the wording of this joint resolution.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator, who is the author of this amendment, undertake to answer another question? In the Senator's judgment, how many officers will be needed to train these men from 19 to 21 years of age?

Mr. NEW. That would depend entirely upon the rapidity with which those men were called, and it is impossible to answer that question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Senator who is the author of the amendment, I suppose, has a general outline of the plan in his mind. According to the Senator's notion, how many officers would be required to train these men in the fashion in which he thinks they should be trained?

Mr. NEW. Oh, Mr. President, that is a question that I could not definitely answer, and I do not think anybody else could; but that it would require a large number of officers goes without saying.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. NEW. I do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if he believes that in the event this amendment should be adopted the President should use any discrimination as between the young men who would be subject to this draft? Does he believe that the President should have the right to select a few, and such few as he might designate, to take this training and exempt the others?

Mr. NEW. No. I never have thought and never intended that there should be discrimination in the mere matter of taking the men. I have intended that all should be made subject

to military training, but that the time of year and the conditions under which they may be trained shall be left to the option of the President.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Then, Mr. President, does not the Senator realize that if this amendment be adopted it will be necessary, in the interest of fairness to all, to make such a provision as will provide for equal training of all the young men within the respective ages?

Mr. NEW. I think the amendment does make provision for that, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. And does the Senator believe that at this time we should provide facilities for training this large number of men, in addition to the enormous task which we already have upon our hands?

Mr. NEW. That is just exactly what I mean, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. As I take it, between these ages we will find somewhere between twelve and fifteen hundred thousand men.

Mr. NEW. I think that is approximately correct.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. And these men will be coming of age every day, some of them, reaching the point where they are not subject to training under this amendment, and, of course, then they become subject to the general draft; but others will be coming in all the time. I should like to know whether or not any estimates have been made as to the cost of assembling all of these young men, the cost of equipping them, and the cost of giving them this instruction? Has there been any estimate made of the cost of the operation of this amendment, assuming that it shall be fairly and generally applied?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I have made no estimate as applied to these men. I take it that the cost of training these men will be comparatively small. It will cost no more and no less, perhaps, to train a boy between 19 and 21 than to train one between 21 and 23.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. NEW. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Did the committee take any evidence on this proposition?

Mr. NEW. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Did they call anyone from the department to give them an estimate as to how many men there are in the country between the ages of 19 and 21?

Mr. NEW. No. They called no one for that particular purpose, but the committee had the benefit of estimates.

Mr. NORRIS. What were those estimates of the total number of men in the country between the ages of 19 and 21?

Mr. NEW. It is estimated that something less—not a great deal less—than 1,000,000 men reach the age of 21 years in this country each year. I take it that about as many reach the ages of 20 and 19. From them, of course, must be deducted those who are exempted for various causes.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but the exemptions would not be as great as the exemptions that take men out of the regular military service, because one of the objects would be to fix up men who are not in good shape.

Mr. NEW. That, I think, is one of the strong arguments for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; probably. Now, I want to ask the Senator if anyone gave an estimate of the cost based on a service of six months in the year of all these men?

Mr. NEW. Not with direct reference to this amendment. As I say, it has been assumed—and I think the assumption a fair one—that the cost of training men between the ages of 19 and 21 will not materially differ from the cost of training men of any other age.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. FALL. I think possibly the question asked by my colleague, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], was directed at the question which I asked first, and which provoked the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee and myself.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that if we take it one at a time, probably the debate will last longer. We can not hear what is said.

Mr. FALL. I am talking by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is talking, the Senator from Indiana having yielded to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. The Senator yielded for a question, which I am putting to him, with reference directly to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. NEW. The Senator desired to ask me a question.



Mr. FALL. I stated that, in my judgment, the amendment would allow the President of the United States to exempt from immediate draft boys who are in attendance upon military schools. My colleague [Mr. Jones of New Mexico] has asked if, in the opinion of the Senator who introduces the amendment, there should be any discrimination. Now, is it not within the knowledge of the Senator that there have been exemptions, perfectly proper exemptions, from the general operation of the rules and regulations in the matter of students in attendance at colleges and schools?

Mr. NEW. Yes.

Mr. FALL. Is it not in the discretion of the President now, and would it not remain in his discretion, for example, to do as the Secretary of the Navy did with reference to enlistments in the Marine Corps and in the Navy—to notify the boys that, while they had been accepted, they would not be called, if they chose to remain in school, until the next six months, or the expiration of their term?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, by way of a general answer to that question, I think that very broad latitude is given to the President under the language of the amendment.

Mr. FALL. Is he not pursuing and has he not been pursuing that course with reference to the present law?

Mr. NEW. Exactly.

Mr. FALL. That is all that I wished to ask.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I voted this morning against laying this amendment on the table; but I did so for the reason that I did not think it was the parliamentary way, in fairness, to dispose of the amendment. It seemed to me that it was fair to have some expression of opinion more than had been had in regard to the amendment before it was finally disposed of. I did not, however, vote against laying it on the table because I was in favor of the amendment; and very briefly I desire to state why I am opposed to it at this juncture of affairs.

I do not propose to discuss the merits or demerits of universal military training. I doubt very much if that question is before us, when we consider the form and the meager provisions of the amendment. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the system, to my mind it should be disposed of in a different way and at a different time by the Senate. I do not conclude myself therefore on the question of universal military training by my opposition to this amendment. It seems to me that all our policies at this time must necessarily be controlled to some extent by the supreme exigency which now confronts us. Our policies must necessarily take into consideration the fact that there is an immediate situation to meet, and that anything which subtracts from our efforts in any particular line in the meeting of that situation should be considered in shaping our policies.

We have at this time, according to the information which I have been able to gather from supposedly reliable sources, some 300,000 men in the Navy, some 250,000 men in the Regular Army, some 650,000 men in the National Army, and available under the present draft law as it now exists two and a quarter million men. This resolution, if adopted, will make available for training a million more of the young men of the country. It is the belief of those who have investigated the matter that about a million boys come of age each year. Then if we adopt the New amendment we will take out of our industries and agricultural life about 2,000,000 more for at least a portion of the year. By such a program we will break down our productive industries, both agricultural and manufacturing.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does it not really classify the men between 19 and 21, under the language used, just as the balance, except that they can not be sent to active service? Does it not, therefore, justify their being sent to cantonments and kept in cantonments at once? That is my serious objection to it.

Mr. BORAH. That is one of the objections; but I was going to say that we have this army, or available army, the figures of which I have just given; and if this amendment should be adopted we would draw from the industries and the agricultural interests of the country two million more, provided and assuming that the law is going to be executed.

Mr. President, the first objection that I have to this amendment, assuming now that one favors universal training, is that the Congress is not doing its duty in regard to the measure by leaving the entire matter to the discretion of one who has already declared himself against it. The Secretary of War in his report has stated plainly that in his judgment this is not the time to invoke universal military training; and yet we would be engaged in passing a measure which would leave it

entirely to his discretion—as I assume that his discretion in this respect is the discretion of the President, and his judgment is that of the President—one who thinks it is unwise at this time to adopt universal military training, or to call these boys into the cantonments for the purpose of putting them in condition to meet their future obligations as soldiers. The amendment is wholly inadequate. It provides no machinery, makes no provisions for the carrying out of this most important program, and finally leaves the whole thing to be executed or not to one who is entirely against the plan. Congress is not meeting the situation at all.

This amendment says:

*Provided*, That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, but shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

If universal military training is worthy of the consideration of the Congress of the United States at this time certainly the Congress should go far enough to prescribe the manner in which this training should be had, and make it obligatory. I would not want, myself, to deal with so important a matter by leaving it entirely to the discretion of one who has been frank enough to state that he is opposed to its execution at this time. So, Mr. President, whether you view it as an advocate of universal military training or whether you are opposed to it, to my mind the amendment wholly fails to meet the situation as it should be met.

The able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] stated that he thought the passage of this amendment would be notice to Germany of which Germany would have to take consideration; that it would notify the German people that we were preparing to meet this situation in accordance with the best rules of military preparation. Now, no doubt it would be a matter of great disturbance to Germany, and to Hindenburg particularly, to know that the Congress had passed a joint resolution leaving the training of its young men to a Secretary of War who has declared against the proposition in advance of the passage of the joint resolution. Viewing it from this standpoint, it seems to me that we ought to meet the situation as becomes the Senate in regard to such a matter, if we are going to take it up at all.

But to my mind, Mr. President, that is not the most serious objection to the adoption of this amendment at this time. If we shall assume the statute would be executed, let us look at the matter from another standpoint. There is very much in this war aside from getting men in uniform or sending them to the cantonments and training them. We have got to take care of our industrial and agricultural interests as we go along, and we have already drained those two walks of life far beyond the point of safety. I see no reason why we should take the young men of 19 and 20, in this exigency, under these circumstances, away from the industries of life where they are absolutely needed in order to sustain the war quite as much as they are in the cantonments.

A few days ago the President issued an address asking the young men of the cities and those who were not already engaged upon the farm to volunteer to go out upon the farm and to assist in raising the food which is absolutely essential to the maintenance of our part in this struggle. I think it is absolutely essential, and I think if that call is not properly answered other steps will have to be taken to meet the exigency. I presume that I am in no different position from that of many other Senators upon the floor, perhaps all Senators; but our mail is deluged with letters from those in the agricultural regions, stating that they are compelled to cut out their acreage, reduce their acreage, and reduce their crops, because of the want of labor. I know that so far as the State is concerned which I represent here in part, the only help left upon the farm is the boys 19 or 20 years of age. The others, of course, are subject to draft and subject to call; and the only ones left upon whom you can rely, who are there as permanent factors, whom you can depend upon throughout the year, are the ones who will be called under this amendment.

Does the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] believe that it would be wise, even if we could, to go into the agricultural regions of Indiana, onto the farms of Indiana, and draw away the boys of 19 and 20 from the farms and put them into a training camp? I do not think it is a wise thing to do; and that is the supreme reason why I could not support his amendment, even if I were in favor of universal military training.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. NEW. In answer to the question put to me by the Senator from Idaho, I will say that I have tried to obviate that



objection as far as possible by giving the President as much latitude as has been given him in prescribing the time of the year when these men may be taken. It has been my thought that the men who come from the farms may be taken at one time of the year and that the men in Idaho may be taken at a different time of year from the men in Florida, under such regulations as the President may prescribe. I recognize as well as the Senator from Idaho or as anybody else that farmers are short of help, just as everybody else is short of help; and I would go just as far as it is possible to go in meeting that objection.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the proposition as stated by the Senator shows the impossibility of putting into execution at this time universal military training without interfering with the efficient conduct of the war—that is, if you are going to have universal military training, if you are going to have anything except theory and the most scanty and inadequate enforcement of it, you must necessarily invade the domain of the farmer and the industries of the country generally.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. Let me say to the Senator, Mr. President, that it may be a little different in his State, where a particular crop is raised and disposed of. It might be possible there to draw away boys at a certain time of year, but it is not possible at this time to take the boy of 19 and 20 from the farm in diversified farming at any time of year without interfering with the production of food.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, you must invade somebody's domain every time you make a soldier.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly, Mr. President; but we must have due regard to the supply of labor which is necessary. For instance, the Senator would not be willing to draw all labor from the industries and all labor from the farm. We must take that into consideration. Now, when you take into consideration the fact that we have made subject to draft every boy between 21 and 31, and when you take into consideration the fact that by this joint resolution you are adding a million more, are you not overstepping reason when you undertake to go further and take 2,000,000 more boys from these same industries and from these sources of supply? In other words, Mr. President, it seems to me you are giving too much consideration to the mere question of equipping men, and not enough consideration to the feeding of these men after they are equipped, which in my judgment is going to be the supreme question in this war before it shall be finally decided.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. NEW. I think that if you are to take the boys from 19 to 21 it will allow the exemption of more men than would otherwise be allowed to be exempted of ages beyond, say, 29 to 31. It would permit the exemption of a greater number of older men, skilled mechanics, trained farm laborers, and so on, than could be permitted if the younger men were to be left out of all account.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me apparent, Mr. President, that the able Senator from Indiana, while very much in favor of the principle, and with that I am not arguing with him at all, has overlooked the practical operation of the amendment at this time.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment I will yield. I have on my desk here, which I shall not take the time of the Senate to read—I had intended to do so, but I do not wish to delay this measure—a great number of letters from all parts of the country which I have culled out with reference to the situation upon the farm, and I am sure that this amendment would only create additional disturbance and disconcert additionally the men who are striving to meet the President's call and the country's call to produce in order to feed the men who have already been drafted. Does the Senator from Indiana expect to see the army which is now available under the draft law in place in their training camps in this country?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I think that all the army that is provided for by the draft, and possibly many more, may be required before much time has elapsed for the prosecution of the war on the part of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. The question occurs to me whether there are not two or three months in every year when farm help will not be engaged in the planting and sowing of crops or cultivating crops, of the thrashing or caring for crops, which two or three months might be spent in military training. If the Senator will bear with me, I have in my mind, of course, the farm-

ing region of the Northern and of the Northwestern States. It simply occurred to me that there were those months during which there is little demand for farm labor, and the boys from the farm might spend that time in military training.

It might, if the Senator will permit me, cause some inconvenience during the winter season, but we can hardly put this upon the ground of simple convenience. It will require some sacrifice in some cases, but as a general proposition there will in the farm region of the North Temperate Zone be two or three months during the year, or, I should say, from two to four months during which there is little farm work being done.

Mr. BORAH. My observation and my experience with reference to northwestern farming would lead me to say that if the Secretary of War or the administration at Washington should undertake to conform its rules and regulations to the desires and needs of the farmer as to when he would particularly need his help or his boy upon the farm, you would find that the farmer would lose out in the contest every time.

Mr. STERLING. If the—

Mr. BORAH. Just a word. The Senator is well acquainted with the fact that there has been a special request from all over the country that the next draft except those who are on the farm, and there seems to be a disposition to do that. In fact, it has been stated upon the floor of the Senate that that would be the policy. In view of the fact that we have reached a point where the farm is already depleted of its labor to such an extent that the law now upon the statute books can not be put in operation, is it wise to call for additional men from the farms and to put them in a position where they can not be of service to those who are engaged in agricultural interests?

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. NEW. I think objection is made by every man engaged in the industry of agriculture or of any other description to have men taken by the draft. I get letters every day from manufacturers in the State which I in part represent, who complain of the shortage of labor, and they are pleading for all sorts of congressional enactments which would leave their men free from military service, which would prevent them from being drawn from the particular towns in which the manufacturing industries are located to be sent to other places for other forms of labor, and all that sort of thing. I think we will find objection from the manufacturer who is depending upon men just as much as the farmer to about as great an extent as we will from the farmer.

I recognize fully that there are many objections to taking men, but—

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator accentuates the strength of my argument. I am not so familiar with the manufacturing interests, and therefore I have spoken with reference to the farm; but I have no doubt that the same depletion of labor forces exists in the manufacturing industries. It is one of the serious questions now with reference to railroading. One of the causes of the embarrassment in railroading is the scarcity of labor, and this will draw away from railroads, it will draw away from the manufacturing industries, it will draw away from the farms.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. So I say, Mr. President, this policy of universal military training must necessarily conform at this time to the exigency which confronts us. We can not declare ourselves in favor of universal military training outright and put it into effect without taking into consideration at this particular time in this particular emergency that there is need for these boys in other places. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was going to call the Senator's attention to the fact that whereas the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] may with some plausibility, though not with any merit, argue that there are times in the year when farm labor can be taken from the farm without prejudicing the work going on upon the farm, the fact, nevertheless, remains that there is not a day in the year when labor can be taken from the manufacturing industry without doing it an injury. Therefore, if the farmer only will be taken because there are certain months in the year when he will not have to work and be subjected to this training and the industries left every day at work, will we not come to a pass two years hence when the young men undergoing training under the New amendment will reach the draft age, and is it not the logical thing to do, if the policy of the amendment is carried out, to call the men to train who are on the farm and leave the men in the industries to work in the industries from day to day?

Mr. BORAH. I referred a moment ago to the fact that the President had made a special plea to the young men of the country to take up work upon the farms, and I notice in a paper that came to me this morning a statement from ex-President Roosevelt to the same effect. He, I understand, is very earnestly in favor of universal military training, and has been for some time. He says:

I wish to express my hearty and unreserved support of the boys' working reserve to include the boys between the ages of 16 and 21 who ordinarily would not be in productive labor and who can be turned into workers on the farm. The farmer has been prompt to recognize that the strong, healthy boy is a tremendous help at this time. One of the great benefits conferred is that of making the boy realize that he is a part of Uncle Sam's team, that he is doing his share in this great war, and that he holds his services in trust for the Nation.

Now, what we would do if we put this into effect is to turn the boy back who has started for the farm and send him to the camp and train him. It is to direct his attention to another point, and that is to military training, instead of helping in the industries of the country.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. NEW. If the Senator will yield further, recognizing as I do the shortness of labor on the farm, but at the same time realizing what I feel is the necessity for training soldiers in this country in the present tremendous emergency, I wish to say that I think it is high time there should be enacted here some kind of a draft measure that would take every loafer in this country—and by that I mean a man who is not actually and actively employed in some way that contributes to the public good—and send that man to the farm, to send every man who is not engaged in some useful enterprise to the farm, and draft men for that purpose exactly as men are drafted to go as soldiers. I think the first industry that should be regarded in the enactment of that form of draft should be the agricultural interests.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator and I are very apart on this proposition. The Senator seems to think there will be a practical way to put it into operation without interfering with the industries or the farm. I do not think so, and that is the difference between us. I think it would render the situation so uncertain and hazardous that it would reduce the acreage in this country and reduce the farmer's efforts tremendously just to know that his boy was subject to a call at any time if the administration here would see fit to call him.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. I have no desire to make a speech myself, but I want to ask the Senator a question. The Senator's objection, as I understand it, which he is now urging is based upon the assumption that the present rules and regulations with reference to drilling and training will prevail if this amendment passes, and that of the men whom it is sought now to place in semimilitary service will be subject to draft under the present rules and regulations. I think that is the base of the Senator's objection.

Mr. BORAH. I assume they will be called into training.

Mr. FALL. Would not the same objection apply if it is left in the discretion of the President of the United States? I do not think that should be allowed. I think Congress should perform its constitutional duty. Would not the same objection apply if the old National Guard system were adopted? We are told that half the troops now available of the force are of the National Guard. They were trained at night, one day a week possibly, and yet practically half the men we have in France are National Guardsmen.

Mr. BORAH. I do not understand, although I may be in error, that the training which the National Guard received at the night training was regarded as very much of an asset.

Mr. FALL. I simply point to the newspaper reports of the very gallant fight the Sixty-ninth New York recently made in France.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; but the Sixty-ninth New York had a vast amount of training on the Mexican border.

Mr. FALL. They were on the Mexican line, undoubtedly.

Mr. BORAH. My understanding is that the National Guard was rendered effective by the training upon the Mexican border or the training which came along after the call to arms.

Mr. FALL. This is the point I wish to direct the Senator's attention. Suppose, for instance, that upon a farm in his State it was the policy of the Government to send a private or non-commissioned officer to that farm to train the men who are subject to the draft, and right there one afternoon in the week or one day in the week train them. Make the farmer pay the ex-

pense. The Government is not to bear the expense. The only way we should give military training to those men is to train them in squads. It is the modern system to train in squads and platoons. A great advantage of German soldiers, we are now told by the newspapers, in the battle which is now being fought is that they are under the leadership of noncommissioned officers.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we then come to the proposition of getting officers by which to conduct these training schools, which would be a tremendous strain, it seems to me, upon our official life in the Army.

Mr. FALL. I do not think we should take the officers. As a matter of fact, we could let them go and take privates or non-commissioned officers for the purpose of training the squads.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I revert back for a minute to the amendment because I want to ask the Senator from Indiana if he will enlighten me as to the proviso. I understand the Senator from South Dakota has now withdrawn his amendment.

Mr. STERLING. It was understood that it was withdrawn.

Mr. BORAH. This proviso reads:

That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, but shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

Does not the Senator know that the administration is, whatever may be its ultimate view with reference to universal military training, opposed to putting it into effect during the war?

Mr. NEW. I do not know that positively. I apprehend that it is true.

Mr. BORAH. Does not the Senator think, in view of the fact that the President is being constantly deluged from all parts of the country to secure labor, to bring labor to this locality and that locality, and in view of the predilection which he entertains with reference to this matter, that undoubtedly this never would be put into effect during the war?

Mr. NEW. I do not know that.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, the Senator does not know it, but there is sufficient information upon which he might base his judgment, in my opinion.

Mr. NEW. Under this provision, at least, the President may use his discretion; and I fear, Mr. President, that the occasion will arise when the President will have to exercise that discretion in carrying out the terms of the amendment.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have occupied more time than I expected. I shall simply conclude by saying that regardless of the merits or demerits of universal military training I am opposed to putting it into effect or attempting to put it into effect either in this way or at this time. I do not believe the amendment would aid the prosecution of the war, but hinder it. There is no more serious problem connected with this whole vast war program than that of feeding our soldiers and our allies. We must not call a single man from the farm or from the industries of the country who is not being trained for immediate service. The merits of this great question will be taken up when this exigency is past, and then Congress can dispose of it with detail and with a fullness commensurate with the importance of the subject.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I shall not at this time discuss the question of compulsory universal military training. That is a question which has two sides, and a great deal can be said on both sides. To my mind, important as that question is, the particular proposition before the Senate does not properly involve it. Of course, if we adopt the amendment it will be assumed by its adoption that we are in favor of it, but if we do not vote for it, it does not follow by any means that at the proper time and under the proper circumstances Senators who vote against it now would vote against it then. Personally I do not see how I can tell which way I want to vote on that question until I know what kind of a peace is the result of the present great conflict. It is to be hoped that when peace comes it may be such a peace that the world will not, under the treaty that will be agreed on then, be permitted to hold itself under arms during all the years that will follow. It is to be hoped that we will have a peace that will make universal training, large navies, and large standing armies absolutely useless. If there should be a peace that does not settle that question I should favor, and I presume we would be under the necessity of favoring, a large standing army and a continual preparation for war. If as a result of this conflict there must be armed troops and preparation immediately begun for the next conflict that must follow, then compulsory universal training may be necessary. I hope that may not be.

But we are in a struggle now, Mr. President, where we want to exert and are exerting every power to bring about success and victory. It is not contended very seriously at least that this



amendment if adopted will add anything in our efforts to bring victory to our arms in the present struggle. Very few people believe that the war is going to last for two years more, but even conceding that we have a long struggle, to get very much benefit out of the amendment the war would have to last longer than two years.

Now, we are in a struggle. We are told every day that food will win the war, that fuel will win the war; and we know that food and fuel are necessities in order that we may win it. We know that a great many of the industries must go on. We must manufacture ammunition, guns, and cannon and other things necessary to keep our Army at the front. We must make clothing and we must produce food in greater abundance than we are producing it at the present time unless we ourselves go with less to eat and less to wear.

That is the condition confronting us, and here we come with a proposition that will not materially aid the war; but what will it do? It will take out of the industries and off the farms of this country 2,000,000 men in the prime of life. Various estimates have been given, but I think it can be said that around a million men become 21 years old every year, another million become 19, and another million become 20. So if we take two years we are taking in round numbers 2,000,000 men now engaged in all the industries of the country to keep our Army in line and to supply them with food and material necessary to carry on the war.

We are taking the men out of these industries without being able to put them in the trenches. If we took them out and put them in the Army it would be a different thing. We are only going to train them for use two years hence or three or four or five years hence. That is the proposition which confronts the Senate. I think when the country understands it, no man who favors, for instance, universal military training would be censured if he voted against this amendment under the circumstances.

To my mind, Mr. President, we injure our Army, we take away our resources, we deprive ourselves of one of the material methods by which we can bring victory if we pass this amendment. I know it is said the men will not be taken away all the time, but suppose they are taken away six months in the year or three months in the year.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. STERLING. If the Senator will permit me to correct his statement, in all probability they would not be taken for six months in the year.

Mr. NORRIS. I am coming to that a little later on. Nobody knows what the period will be.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. Does not the Senator think it would be a good plan if the farmer's boy in the North got off four months in the wintertime and was sent down to a southern cantonment and given military drill for that period? They would come back in the spring better fitted to work on the farm and do spring work than if they stayed at home hanging around stoves during the winter, especially in a prairie country, where they have not any work to do in the winter on the farm.

Mr. NORRIS. After the draft has been supplied there are mighty few farms in this country from which you can take the boys from 19 to 21, even in the wintertime, without injuring the agricultural production of the country.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. FALL. I should like to ask the Senator by what process of reasoning he arrives at the conclusion that there will be a greater proportion of the boys selected under this amendment than have been taken out under the draft?

Mr. NORRIS. That is a fair question and I will answer the Senator. When we select the men to go into the Army under the draft there are a great many exemptions. Certain rules and regulations are provided, and if a drafted man does not come up to those in all respects he is rejected.

I understand all those who have here advocated universal compulsory military training have always claimed—and I think there is something in it, I am not saying it is not true—that one of the benefits which will come from universal training will be that men who are deficient in many respects will be cured of the disability by this training. So when we are selecting these men for training undoubtedly we will not apply the same rule that was applied when we were selecting men to go into service in the Army. So there will not be as many exemptions from this class as there were from those who were selected under the draft.

Mr. FALL. I think the Senator has answered frankly the question as he understood it. I do not think, however, he exactly caught my point. We have now approximately in a year 600,000 men out of 10,000,000 men, and out of 2,000,000 that may be taken, if the same percentage were selected for training under this measure, I see nothing to prevent calling 122,000 out of the total of 2,000,000; in other words, about 61,000 out of a million.

Mr. NORRIS. That is, taking everybody out, as is done in the draft.

Mr. FALL. As we do now.

Mr. NORRIS. I did not have any idea that that would be done. I do not think it ought to be done. As the Senator from Washington suggests, it would not be universal military training.

Mr. FALL. That is largely my objection to the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the proposal is objectionable not only as it affects the farmer—for there might be seasons in the year, as the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, when the farmer could be taken away without so much damage to him—but as it affects the man in the factory who is making munitions, the man who is making clothing for the soldier, and men in a hundred other occupations that are necessary to be kept up. You can not take those men out for military training in the winter time or the summer time or the autumn or the spring without interfering with their work. Suppose you take a man out for three months. What does it mean to the industry in which he is employed? It is not only the loss of that man for three months, but it interferes with the whole machinery; it interferes with the whole plan. If 2,000,000 men in this country are taken out of necessary industries and off the farms of the country, I want to tell you that we shall be short of food, we shall be short of ammunition, short of guns, and short of everything that is necessary to win this war—

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. KING. I want to make a suggestion for the consideration of the Senator, because as he has been speaking a thought or two combatting his view, arose in my mind. The Senator knows that in the wintertime there are high schools, universities, colleges, and other educational institutions which are then being conducted as well as at other periods of the year. In those universities, schools, colleges, and other institutions of learning are a great many thousands and hundreds of thousands of young men. Suppose that this amendment were so amended as to permit the President to designate institutions of learning or schools or colleges as the places where military training might be given, provided they adopted such standards of training as might be prescribed, why could not the requisite military training be obtained in those institutions of learning at the same time that the boys were at school?

Mr. NORRIS. I rather think that to a great extent it could. Of course it is not by any means the proposition which is now pending before us, but, as it seems to me, a plan of that kind would do less damage to our war activities than this would do.

Mr. KING. And, if the Senator will pardon me further, might not some of the evils, which unquestionably this amendment would produce, be mitigated and ameliorated by regulations that would authorize local training—training at night? There will be unquestionably—and we, of course, deplore it—many officers wounded and returning from beyond the sea. They might be utilized in training the boys at home, in these colleges and schools, and thus meet, to some degree, the objection which is made to the lack of officers.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that would meet the objection in some degree, although it would not entirely meet it.

Mr. NEW. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has concluded, I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KING. I have finished.

Mr. NEW. The Senator from Utah, I think, has gone a long way by his suggestion toward meeting the objection that we shall not have sufficient officers for training purposes. Mr. President, I understand that before this recent drive there were more than 60,000 English officers who had been invalided back home during this war. In time to come, and to come shortly, I fear, we shall find large numbers of our officers being invalided back to this country. Those officers, while no longer able to take their place at the front, would be available for service in the training of these young men, as has been suggested by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I think we could probably utilize the services of those officers, and to the extent that it is possible it ought to be done, perhaps. Although that would not relieve the proposition of its great expense, it would partially do so. But, Mr. President, 2,000,000 men must be paid while they are in training; we must provide places for them; we should have to spend many millions and hundreds of millions of dollars in preparing those places and pay hundreds of millions of dollars for transportation. Even if you only trained them for a month those things would have to be done. We should have to provide, or we ought to provide at least, guns for their training. We ought to make provision to provide uniforms for the men while they are engaged in training; and has anybody figured out how much that would cost?

I offer this argument now, but not as one of the main arguments against the amendment, for if it would accomplish anything in the war the cost would be a secondary consideration, I concede; but if it is not going to do something toward putting men in the trenches and keeping them there and sustaining them there, then we ought to consider the cost as one of the important items, because the cost of the war is one of the burdens which, if the war continues long enough, will break down civilization. Civilization can not continue against the increasing cost and sustain it indefinitely, and everybody knows that. So we ought to consider the cost. This amendment, in my judgment, means not merely millions or hundreds of millions of dollars in expenditure but billions of dollars if it is to be carried on very long.

Mr. President, I want to come to the amendment itself and discuss it very briefly. I am not complaining against the man who claims that we ought now to have universal military training. But it seems to me that it is not right to put it on this joint resolution. It is not a joint resolution that anybody objects to, but everybody wants to see it passed; the administration wants it passed; it is a military measure which should be expeditiously passed. But here it is proposed to put on this amendment, which was never considered in committee, which has no committee report behind it. When the author of the amendment was asked on the floor of the Senate about the items of expense, the men, and so forth, he could only give estimates. The experts have not been called upon to give us the information. The amendment was offered first in the committee, and if not formally rejected, at least it was found that it could not pass the committee, not because the committee was not in favor of the principle involved but because they saw what I am trying to show here, that this is not an opportune time to do it, and so the proposition was offered on the floor of the Senate and comes before us in this way. It is as important a proposition as any that can ever come before Congress, and we are asked to put it on a joint resolution without any other consideration than it has had here in the Senate.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. As to the matter of estimates, Mr. President, no estimate was made—

Mr. NORRIS. I so stated.

Mr. NEW. My recollection is that no estimate was made of the expenditures which would be involved in putting the draft law into effect. I do not think that any estimate which could have been made would have been at all accurate and worthy of consideration as to that law, and I think no estimate can be made as to this proposed amendment, except such an estimate as is based upon the experience we have had in the last year in training the men who have been brought in under the draft law.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the fact that there has been no estimate—and the Senator himself admits it—is one of the objections to the amendment; it is one of the reasons why it is immature and has not received proper consideration. Because there was no estimate made as to the draft law is no reason why there should not be one made about this amendment. As the Senator from Indiana says—

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to finish the sentence first, and then I will yield to the Senator.

As the Senator from Indiana says, the experience under the draft law would enable the officers to make an estimate—I think a rather accurate estimate—so that we could have been told all about it. If the amendment would take the regular course that legislation usually takes, all that would have come out in the hearings before the committee, which would have been printed and Senators could have read them here.

Now I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I was just about to say what the Senator from Nebraska has in substance himself said, that the

experience we have had in training men during the last year is better than any estimate that could have been made in advance, and I think we can tell with substantial accuracy what this will cost by simply taking into account what it has cost within the last year to train an equal number of men who have been brought in under the draft law.

Mr. NORRIS. I fully agree with the Senator from Indiana, but that has not been done. This amendment has come in here with such little consideration that nobody has even tried to make the estimate. That is another illustration of why, it seems to me, the amendment should not be put on now. A great proposition of this kind, affecting all of the country and affecting everybody in it, ought at least to have had sufficient consideration so that there could have been an estimate made, when one could have been made so easily. The officials of the department, if called upon, could have undoubtedly given, as the Senator says, rather accurate information in the way of estimates about its cost; but they did not suppose this was going to be tried here. The military men realize that this will accomplish practically nothing so far as putting soldiers into this war is concerned, unless the war lasts more than two or three years.

Mr. President, let us see whether this amendment is fair. That is another reason why, in my judgment, it should not be adopted now. If we had passed a law for universal military training Congress ought to take upon its shoulders the responsibility that properly belongs to Congress and ought to provide by statute just how the training should be brought about, how much it should be, when it should be, how the Army should be officered, and as much detail as to that Army as of the Army that we have raised by the draft or the Regular Army. But what does this amendment say?

*Provided*, That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, but shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

In my humble judgment, if we adopt that kind of a proposition we have abrogated our duty and turned the responsibility over to the President. We give the President full power to say whether the training shall be for 1 day or 2 days, 1 month, 6 months, 9 months, or 12 months. The Congress ought not to do that; it seems to me we ought not to do that far either in shifting responsibility from our shoulders or in giving power to the President that properly belongs to the legislative department of our Government. Not only can the President fix the time of training, but he can fix everything else; he can fix the pay; he can say that the men shall serve for 10 cents a day or that they shall receive a hundred dollars a month; he can do anything that is necessary to carry out the purpose of the amendment. I take it that he would carry it out in some way, and if he did he would have, as every one must concede, an enormous task on his hands.

I understood the Senator from Indiana to say that we have about 1,500,000 now in the cantonments. Is that right?

Mr. NEW. About 1,200,000.

Mr. NORRIS. About 1,200,000. Well, we would have that many in round numbers in the additional army which it is proposed to train, and we would pretty nearly have to duplicate the facilities we have now. Mr. President, if we are going to do that we ought to provide by law how it shall be done. If we are going to have universal military service, either now or at any other time, I am sure that we ought to provided by the law just how it shall proceed, instead of turning all our powers over to the President and saying nothing whatever with regard to any of the details or any of the arrangements for carrying out the provisions of the law.

Then, Mr. President, under the terms of the amendment the training is to cease with the termination of the war. I thought the other day, when I asked some questions about it, that it was the intention to have this as a permanent provision of law, but I find the amendment tacked on to a joint resolution that by its terms is to terminate when the war is over.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It is my firm conviction that it is the purpose of the proponents of this measure to make it the beginning—

Mr. NORRIS. I understood so; yes.

Mr. VARDAMAN. To make it the beginning of a permanent system of universal military training. I think this is the entering wedge, from which I fear no good will come.

Mr. NORRIS. It is intended to be the entering wedge. I will ask those who believe in that policy, and believe in it earnestly, as I concede they do, is it fair to put it on a joint resolu-



tion which by its terms is to expire when the war is over? If it is to be the entering wedge is not that a sort of legislative camouflage, as a Senator suggests? Ought we not to meet the question fairly and squarely, and let it be passed on its merits?

If it is a good thing, if we want to have universal military service, why confine it to the war when the soldiers who will be trained will in all probability not be used in this war? It seems to me, Mr. President, that tacking the proposal on to a proposed law that is going to expire when the war is ended is worse than camouflage.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think the merit of the system of universal military training is not the question of paramount importance in the consideration of this measure. I realize as every other Senator must realize that the United States Government is confronted with a stupendous problem. It will test the metal of our men and try the endurance of our people. We do not know when the end will come; we do not know how many men it will require to finish the terrible undertaking, but we do know that the work itself can not be successfully accomplished without adequate food and clothing for our people at home, our soldiers abroad and our allies in foreign lands. There is scarcely a mail that does not bring to my office dozens of letters complaining of the scarcity of labor—labor for the farms and for other industrial enterprises. A Senator asked me a few moments ago how many months of the year it required to raise a cotton and corn crop in the South. My answer to him was, That it takes about 13 months of the year. If we take these men away from the industrial pursuits we will find ourselves short of foodstuffs and material with which to clothe and feed our people.

I will tell you, Mr. President, that the war can not be won with bullets alone. There must be the combined use of both bullets and bread. Battles can not be fought and won on empty stomachs. Men will find their courage failing when they know their wives and mothers and daughters and sons are at home starving, and when they themselves are suffering from the pinch of hunger. I beseech Senators to think on this phase of the problem. The world is crazed with a blood lust and the spirit of war has warped our judgment. We have more men, and will raise more men for service at the front under the present law, together with the amendment which the Senator from Oregon has proposed to the present law, than we will have ships to carry to the front in the next three years. If I had my way about it, I should send every bona fide farmer now in the Army back to his farm with the commission to raise a crop to sustain our women and children and our allies across the seas. I trust the Senate will see the importance of this suggestion and act favorably upon it before it is everlastingly too late.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and if we take—

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will indulge me further, I wish to say that if we take these men away from their farms and put them in cantonments and permit the land to lie fallow, we will find ourselves at the end of the year in desperate straits for the necessaries of life.

Mr. NORRIS. And while we are doing everything we can and straining every muscle and every nerve to build more ships, if we take away from shipbuilding activities all the young men between 19 and 21, even though we take them away for only three months in a year—and military training to be of any account, it seems to me, would have to extend over at least that length of time, and most people think the period ought to be six months—we would not only lose the time during which they are taken away, but we would have to have producers to support them when they become consumers instead of producers, and we would disarrange the entire shipbuilding program. Perhaps the men who will be taken may not be engaged directly in shipbuilding, but they will be located where they are supporting men and keeping men who are employed in shipbuilding. They can not be taken away without the whole superstructure being affected. It seems to me that it is a dangerous thing to do.

Mr. President, I am sorry that this amendment is pending. I know the time may come—I hope it will not, but it may come—when I would feel as though I were required to vote for this kind of a proposition; but that time is not here yet. I hope that the time will come—and come at the close of this war—when such a peace will prevail that such a proposition as that now under consideration will be unnecessary in any civilized country in the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, when this amendment was offered some days ago by my friend Senator New I was a little inclined to think that it would be a proper piece of legislation, and I had expected to vote for it. I am rather inclined to think that this country will come to universal military training when

this war is over and we get our bearings again, but just now I do not think that our energies ought to be diverted from the main purpose of defeating our enemies, and upon somewhat more mature reflection I believe this amendment will unquestionably have that effect.

In the first place, it would take out of our industrial, commercial, and agricultural life about 2,000,000 of our young men. Those 2,000,000 men would be taken out of the producing class and put into the consuming class. Ought we not to go a little slow about it under those circumstances? A serious situation confronts us. At one step to take 2,000,000 men from the class of producers and turn them into the class of consumers is a matter that should be very carefully weighed before it is enacted into law.

Another reason why this legislation should not be adopted at this time is that it has not had that careful consideration which a measure of such scope and possibilities ought to have. The Military Affairs Committee has not reported it; it has not considered it during this session. It ought to be carefully considered by that committee. Every question that arises in connection with it should be carefully weighed; the cost should be carefully considered; the effect upon the production of the country should be carefully weighed and considered before we step off, as it were, into this new venture.

I am not arguing against universal military training, because I believe it is to come. The events of the last few years have shown us that in the future we must take a different course than that which this Nation has followed in the past in reference to military training; but this amendment does not provide for universal military training; it merely provides for universal military training of boys between 19 and 21 during the years of this war and no longer. That is all it does.

What effect is it going to have? What is the situation that confronts us? Do we need man power? Senators, we have now available all the man power, and more man power, than any other nation in the world. We have several million young men who are already subject to draft into the Army and who are ready to be trained at any moment. There is no reason in the world why the young men who have already been drafted can not be trained for our Army. Why are they not now inducted into service if we intended to have a larger Army for the protection of our country. It is because we have not the officers to train them; we have not the arms with which to equip them, and we have not the materials with which to clothe them while they are being trained.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If we have not the officers to train them, and if they ought to be trained, I desire to ask the Senator what legislation has been brought to our attention through which we may hope provision will at once be made for the training of a large additional force of officers?

Mr. McKELLAR. We are training officers now in large numbers under the legislation that has already been provided by Congress at this session and at the last session.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Progress seems to be very slow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it has been slow. In the last year we have added to our officers more largely than any other nation. We are training them as rapidly as they can be trained; we have training camps for officers in almost every State in the Union. We are training by scores of thousands. We are training them quite as rapidly as we can equip them, and faster than we can ship them to France.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make a suggestion—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. We are training and we have men now ready for service at the front far beyond our capacity to send them there.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course—

Mr. VARDAMAN. And what is the necessity for sending men to cantonments and taking them away from the fields of industry, where they can produce something to support our people at home and our allies? What is the necessity for doing that when, under the present system, we will have more men ready for service at the front for the next two years than we will be able to get ships to carry? It is more ships that we need just now, not more men.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct about that. It is estimated that we have between 3,000,000 and 4,000,000 young men in this country to-day already drafted and subject to be inducted into the service at any time, and whom we can train whenever we have the necessary equipment, arms, and officers with which to train them. We are going forward in that matter



and making gigantic strides toward mobilizing our man power. It is not man power that we need, but we need materials of war; we need the officers with which to train the men; we need ships to carry our armies to the seat of war, and our energies should not be diverted to securing greater man power in the Army when it is not power that we are lacking. Additional men are not necessary now; we all know that. Why should we divert our energies and our money to prepare men that we can not use and whom it is not proposed to use for two years?

Have Senators thought about the cost of this matter? Has any estimate of cost been made? Can any Senator say whether this proposed amendment will cost \$100,000,000 or \$1,000,000,000 or even \$2,000,000,000? The plan proposed can be put into operation in such a way as to cost this country at this time when we are at war \$2,000,000,000 annually, because everyone knows that a soldier never costs less than \$1,000 a year, taking all of the elements of cost into consideration.

This is a serious matter, serious not only because of the item of cost, but serious because at this time, at all events, it is necessary that we should have greater production, because the purpose to be accomplished does not justify the outlay, because this is not where our lack is, because our every energy and our every resource should be devoted to winning this war. What will it do? Senators representing farming States of the Union have told us what the adoption of this amendment is going to do for the farming interests, how many men it will take from their States who ought to be producers, and who are our best producers. Other Senators from industrial States have pointed out how many men it is going to take from industry, and others from commercial States have indicated how many men it will take from the commercial pursuits of life. We need men to-day, Senators, a great deal more in agriculture, in commerce, and in industry than we need to have these youngsters drafted into our Army, because we have not actually inducted into the service more than one-third, nay, not more than one-fourth or one-fifth of the men who are now on the rolls and subject to draft, and it is proposed to draft another million under this joint resolution even without the amendment.

I am quite sure, as I have said heretofore, that we have got to come to a system of universal military training, and my present intention is to favor a proper system; but we ought not to allow ourselves to be diverted at this time to any other purpose than the purpose of winning this war and preparing our men—not merely training them in schools—but preparing them as fast as we can get the officers, as fast as we can get the guns, as fast as we can get the materials of war with which to train them.

Notice the wording of the amendment. I want to call the attention of the Senate to it:

That all registered male persons—

That means all of them, Senators. It means the maimed and the halt, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb, the physically fit and unfit; it means everyone between those ages, whether we can use them in war in the future or not; whatever we may do with them, it means all of them. Why should we spend this immense amount of money for the purpose simply of training them in this kind of a way? That is why I say, Senators, that before we adopt or even think of adopting a measure like this it ought to be given the most careful consideration by a proper committee.

We do not even know what this amendment means. No one can tell, if we adopt it just as it is, what it will do. For instance, suppose we had adopted it without an amendment? I have just offered an amendment that will permit our boys in the military schools, in colleges where military training is given, in our universities where military training is given, to be exempted from this particular kind of training. Without such an amendment, what would the new amendment do? Why, it would break up all our military schools and our universities, or a large number of them, and absolutely put them out of business. Would you want to do that? It is just an illustration of what will sometimes be done by legislation that has not been carefully considered and gone over time and again.

For these reasons, I am constrained to believe that this body ought not to pass this amendment just as it is without chart or compass, without limitation or direction, merely a blanket instruction to the Executive to put it in force, without an estimate of cost, without a knowledge of what is going to be the result of it, without the arms or equipment necessary to make it effectual. Where will we get the arms to train these young men—even rifles? We need every rifle that we can manufacture for the training of our troops who are going to fight the enemy or for actual fighting. Where are we going to get the

rifles to train these boys? Are we going to train them with broomsticks? If so, what will it amount to? Are we to spend vast sums of money, perhaps thousands of millions of dollars, in an attempt at military training of young boys who will most likely not be used in this war, when we have not the guns, or camps, or uniforms, or other equipment with which to train them? How would they be trained with pistols when we are short of pistols already? How would they be trained with artillery when we are short of artillery already? Or with machine guns when we are straining every nerve to get our machine guns to train the men that are already drafted in the Army?

Sensors, I ask you not to adopt this amendment. If we are to adopt it, let it come later, when we can consider all these matters, consider what it means, consider what its effect will be, consider where we are going when we undertake to adopt it. It is not necessary. There is nothing that requires that it should be done now. We are training our men as fast as we can get the materials and the officers with which to train them. Why go off chasing rabbits, so to speak, at such a time as this?

Now, Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the amendment, which I wish to perfect. I can not believe that we are going to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] at this time, but I offer this amendment to it in order to save one of the bad situations which I have pointed out should the New amendment carry, and which is just one that has occurred to me. Probably other amendments have occurred to other Senators which are absolutely essential. I see here my friend from an agricultural State, Mr. GRONNA. There ought to be some provision there by which the producers on the farms can be exempted in some way. Other Senators are here from industrial States. There ought to be some provision to protect young men engaged in industry.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. Surely we ought not to pass this legislation. But if we are going to pass it, before we vote on it I want to submit this amendment. I have corrected it, and I will ask the Secretary to take it as I have corrected it:

*Provided further*, That attendance by those subject to the provisions of this section under 21 years of age upon military schools, colleges, or other educational institutions where military instruction is given under standards, rules, and regulations prescribed by the President shall be deemed a compliance by such students with the provisions of this section.

I offer that amendment for this reason: I do not think we ought to adopt such an amendment as that offered by the Senator from Indiana with only a few hours' consideration, with no committee report, with no examination, with no attempt to get the effect or the cost of it. I think we ought not to disturb the great educational institutions of this country as this will disturb them. At almost every State university they have military training to-day. Why, you are just going to cut them down at one fell swoop by the passage of this amendment. Almost every college in this country has military training. Many of our high schools have military training. You are just going to cut them down—put them out of business, to use a slang expression—by the adoption of this amendment unless further amendment is had.

I now take pleasure in yielding to my friend from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the argument the Senator makes, and in the main I agree with him. I said this morning that I do not believe we should fasten a military system upon our Government unless we shall find that it is necessary to keep large military forces in order to protect ourselves; but what I wanted to call attention to was this:

I think it is generally conceded that a large percentage of the young men on the farms have been drafted, and that many of them have already been taken away, and many more are to follow. Practically the only help that the farmers have is the boys between the ages of 19 and 21. If we are to take away those boys now, the result will be that we will starve the boys whom we already have in the camps.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not know that I agree that we will starve them; but I will say to the Senator that in my judgment production on the farms in this country will be immeasurably lessened by the adoption of this amendment, and I do not think we ought to do it. I am willing at any time to join Senators in considering such a bill if it is brought before the committee of which I have the honor to be a member. I shall be glad to give it consideration at any time if it is the will of the Senate to have such a measure passed at this time. I am not opposed to universal military training. Under present conditions or under anything like present conditions we will have to adopt



some such measure. As I stated in the beginning, I am rather inclined to favor it. But just now, it seems to me, is not the time to embark on a scheme like this temporary makeshift when we are using our every energy to make real soldiers with the means that we have at hand.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, before voting on the pending proposition, with all due deference to the venerable Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], I desire to make a brief statement in order that my vote may not be misunderstood.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not make the same request of the Senator from Kansas, if his statement is to be brief.

Mr. THOMPSON. I assure the Senator that all my statements in this body are brief; and usually I try, at least, to make them to the point.

I am in favor of the joint resolution presented by the Military Affairs Committee, requiring the young men of this country, when they become of age, to register under the selective-draft system which we have invoked during this war; but I am opposed to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] providing for the registration of all the young men of the country when they attain the age of 19 years, and subjecting them to the provisions of the selective-draft law except active military service.

Mr. President, I have believed for some time, in view of recent events which have transpired, that some kind of universal military training for the young men of the country has become necessary; but as to just the exact system required for this country I have not yet fully made up my mind, and I do not believe that we can come to any well-established policy until the close of the war. I know that during the war it is impracticable to enter upon any settled plan. I know we all hope that when the war ends it will result in universal peace and disarmament of all nations, but our wish may be the father of the thought. I have felt that some plan should be devised by which the young men of the country should receive the necessary military training for the purposes of our Government in connection with their general education. I am opposed, except as a last resort, to taking the young men of this country from the schools and colleges and from the varied business and productive pursuits of life—minors who have no voice in the Government and no legal right to speak for themselves—and forcing them into active military service for a long period of time; for I believe that such a system would tend to lead to the very militarism against which we are fighting to-day. If a change should be necessary in order to secure more men, I would increase the maximum age to 45 years rather than reduce the minimum a single year. The young men of the country who are not born with silver spoons in their mouths have enough difficulty to get started in life without adding any additional burden.

I recognize the fact that in this day and age and under existing conditions some better system of preparation is necessary. A thorough course in military tactics should be added to the courses of study in the schools and colleges of the country, and each young man should be required to take the course, not only for his own good but for the good of the country. During the summer, commonly called the vacation season, all young men between the ages of 16 and 21 should be required to devote a few weeks' time to outdoor military training and receive instruction and actual experience in army camp life. This would give them a vacation from their regular pursuits in life and at the same time teach them that they owe something to their Government and give them an opportunity to render some service to that Government. This would permit the young men of the country to receive a course in military training without interfering with their educational or business pursuits.

Military training for young men now seems essential, not alone that they may be better prepared to defend themselves and the country in a great crisis like the present, but in order to conserve their health and to secure proper physical development, that they may be better enabled to fight the battles of civil life in times of peace. There is no better exercise or means for physical development, which all young men require, than military training. It is better than baseball, football, golf, tennis, or any other outdoor sport, and it serves a better purpose, because it not only gives the young man the necessary physical exercise but also an experience and a knowledge which may become most useful to himself and to the country at some future time.

As I view it, at least for the present, there is no need in this country for taking the young men out of the schools and col-

leges and the business and productive pursuits for any great length of time for the purpose of devoting all their time and energy simply to military training. I can not agree to take from the farm the boys of the ages of 19 and 20 at this time, when the outcome of this war is to depend largely upon the products of the farm, especially when I can see no good to be accomplished by taking them from the ranks of labor. Neither can I agree to taking them from the shops, where skilled labor is doing so much toward winning the war. Therefore I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW], for it proposes to do this for at least two years. It also subjects every young man in the country over 19 years of age to the provisions of the selective-draft law except that of active service, and is a long step in that direction, for under the circumstances it would, no doubt, lead eventually to that very end, for there are but few young men in the country who, after receiving some military instruction and being led from their usual avocations in life, would hesitate to enlist and go to the front even before they attain the age of 21; and once in the service at the age of 19, they are their own masters. There is scarcely a young man now 18 years old but who wants to go to the front, regardless of his immaturity, but his parents and older people know it is not best for him or the country. While it is true that they make good fighters, yet they also make good workers at home, and while minors they need the home influence, guidance, and protection of their parents.

There is a practical reason why this amendment should not be adopted. The training camps are full of young men of draft age, waiting for the necessary training before proceeding to the front. If all the young men of the country of the ages of 19 and 20 were put into the camps, estimated at about 2,000,000, as proposed by this amendment, it would necessarily force out the young men already there before they are really prepared, and would prevent many new young men of draft age entering the camps for some time, and thereby cause great delay in getting our men to the front, expedition in which is becoming more and more necessary every day. It would also take the time of the officers to train these young men who should give all their time to training men who are ready to fight. Therefore it seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is out of place at this time, and should not become a part of this bill. It is not matured legislation on the subject of universal training, which should be carefully treated in a separate bill. I feel that under the present situation of affairs it would result in more harm than good, by causing great confusion and delay, and would defeat the real objects of the legislation.

There are in this country 1,000,000 young men who reach the age of 21 years every year, which, with our present facilities, is all that we can possibly take care of, especially in view of the fact that there are over two and a half million young men now of draft age anxiously waiting for the proper training to go to the front, where they are most needed. I will therefore vote against the amendment, but will vote for the bill requiring registration year by year as the war proceeds when the young men become of age.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I voted against laying this amendment upon the table; but up to that time I had not carefully read the amendment, and I hoped it was in different shape than I find it to be.

I think it would be eminently wise to undertake as thorough training as possible of all the young men under 21 in schools and colleges. Also, I would be gratified to see even those at home organized and trained there. I am entirely opposed to taking them to the cantonments before they are 21. They are not to serve until they are 21. There are ample men who are 21 to fill all the cantonments and receive the training we can give there.

This amendment will treat the men under 21 just as the men under 31 and over 21, so far as the draft is concerned. They are placed in the same class for draft. The proviso leaves it to the President to determine the extent to which they shall be subject to drill, or subject to be sent to cantonments, and limits their service in the field to that period of life after they reach the age of 21. I object to that broad plan of handling these young men. I am unwilling to vote for a measure which would go further than train them, as I said before, in schools and colleges and at home.

The suggestion was made that we had not the officers even for this training. Mr. President, I believe we should make our plans now for an Army of 5,000,000 men. To make an Army it is first necessary to have trained officers. To prepare munitions it is first necessary to have factories erected and properly

equipped and ready to manufacture the munitions. It is necessary to have experts in those factories.

I think a proper vision of the work of the War Department required that before the declaration of war was made, with the condition of the world at war, the General Staff should have been ready to draw from their desks complete plans for the organization of an army, complete plans for the immediate construction of fighting airships, complete plans for the erection of buildings, and the construction of the character of guns that would have been needed for 2,000,000 or more men, as we might need them, complete plans for the erection of plants to manufacture powder for an army of that size. I think, Mr. President, to have taken almost 12 months to find out what we need to organize the Army is not evidence of that forethought, of that broad preparation, which an able General Staff, or whatever constitutes the organizing force for our Army, ought to have shown.

I mention this, Mr. President, not to criticize the past, but in the interest of our future. I would have the General Staff now, if they have charge, work out a plan for the immediate training of officers sufficient to command 5,000,000 men. I would have them work out a plan for the completion of factories in which to manufacture all the ammunition required to arm 5,000,000 men, and I would have the preliminary machinery completed so that when we call the additional men to the colors we will be ready to put them in shape in the shortest possible time to use them if the necessity arises; for, if it does arise, time will be of the utmost importance, and its waste inexcusable. No civilian can do this work intelligently, be he Secretary of War or chairman of a war industries board. A civilian can act as merchant to buy, but military experts must do the planning. I hope we may rely upon the President to see that intelligent plans are made at once and no new occasion disclose a lack of forethought, a lack of that complete preparation which the President and the Secretary of War should require from military experts.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I can not say that I am very enthusiastically in favor of the adoption of this amendment. At the same time, I can not agree with very many of the objections which have been directed to it, or directed to what apparently some of the objectors thought it meant.

As I understand the amendment, it simply adds to those who are subject to registration now the boys 19 and 20 years of age. That is the second proposition involved, the first being that, instead of the draft law being directed solely to citizens of the United States, this applies the draft law to all parties. The second provision, as I have said, simply decreases the age limit and provides for the registration of the boys 19 and 20 years of age in addition to those from 21 to 31. By the proviso it is distinctly stated that these boys, until they reach the age of 21, shall not be subject to the provisions of the draft law. Then it is provided that the President of the United States, in his discretion, may provide rules and regulations for the training of every man who is not drafted, not in the cantonments, not drafted as a soldier; that he may provide for the training of every man, not only those of 19, 20, and 21, but of all those who are not drafted but who are registered, the entire nine or ten million; that they are subject to the orders of the President of the United States as to training. That is all that the amendment provides, as I understand it.

All this alarm that the President may or will take these men from their occupations and put them in cantonments, where we say there is no place for them, is rather premature. It is assuming that the President of the United States will simply disorganize all the industry of the country—to my mind, rather a violent assumption. I do not think any sensible man would undertake to do it. I would rather assume that the President of the United States would take some advice from some men who knew something about military affairs and as to the necessities of preliminary training, and, in issuing his rules and regulations providing for the training of these men between 19 and 31 who are not in the draft, he would have due respect for what he recognizes as strongly as anyone else does—the necessity of producing foodstuffs and carrying on the business of the country.

It may be a violent assumption, but I indulge in it, that the President would take, as I have said, the advice of those who could best advise him as to how we could best train these men without interfering in any way whatsoever with the business of the country. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Georgia.

I think that to-day the Military Committee, with due respect to that great committee, should be engaged in formulating plans

immediately for getting 5,000,000 fighting men ready. I have heard or read the call of Lloyd-George, as has every other Senator here, for reinforcements on the fighting line. Some of us know something about the number of men who are going to France now and recently and something of the transportation system which is conveying them to France. We are only sorry that that transportation has not been availed of before to get these men to France. All the exclamations of alarm directed, as I said, to the provisions of this joint resolution, to my mind, are entirely misdirected, unless the Senator from Tennessee and others who agree with him think that the President of the United States is going deliberately to interfere with all the business of the United States. As I said, I do not engage in any such violent assumption.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. If the Senator will pardon me, the President of the United States, as I said in the first place, can do exactly what the Senator provides that he must do in the event the joint resolution passes by the amendment which he offers. There is nothing in the world to prevent his doing it, and the presumption is he will do just as he has done with the men actually drafted in the military service of the United States. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can only say to the Senator that my understanding of the President's position, but I have had no talk with him, is that he does not think this legislation is necessary at this time.

Mr. FALL. And one of the objections that I have to it is that it does not compel the President of the United States to act. It is true, as the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] said, he and the Secretary of War may not choose to avail themselves of it. This fear is based upon exactly the same ground, I presume, as that of some of us, which proved to be verified, when the Congress of the United States provided for volunteers in the draft. The President of the United States did not choose to avail himself of the provision. It may very well be that he will not choose to put the men between 19 and 21 who are not drafted under any system of military training. The responsibility then is his. Congress at least has provided that he could do so, and I have no doubt the President will assume the responsibility. He does not seem inclined to shirk it at all.

Mr. President, I would very much prefer seeing a bill drafted and brought from the Military Committee to provide for fighting men, and 5,000,000 of them at once. In my judgment, it is a perfectly simple proposition. I know, of course, I will be laughed at by many of the military experts in this body, and also that what I may say will be the subject of very much greater amusement, possibly, in the War Department.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If I may interrupt the Senator, it becomes an administrative matter rather than a legislative matter; and I am in thorough accord with the Senator. I think the greatest mistake Congress is making now and has made for the past two years is in assuming that this is going to be a short war. If I had my way, 5,000,000 men would be in the course of training now.

Mr. FALL. The reason why I make the statement is that I think the Military Committee should make such a provision, because it is the duty of Congress under the Constitution, as I read it, not only to provide for raising an army but to provide rules to govern them and for their training and not to leave it to the executive department of the Government. Under the constitutional provisions, as I read them, it is the duty of Congress, and Congress should not leave it simply to the Military Department. It is the duty of Congress—

To raise and support armies.

I read section 8, the general clause:

To provide and maintain a navy.

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States.

I think under those provisions of the Constitution it was and is clearly the duty of the Congress of the United States to provide an army and to provide it immediately. I know to say it is a simple matter to begin necessary training at once, and not a costly matter, will be a subject of amusement. My military experience has been very limited in character, Mr. President, but there is not an Army officer who will not, I think, vouch for the truth of the statement that I am now going to make.

The soldier in the Army is made by the noncommissioned officer. The fighting man is made in the squad. The squad leader is the leader upon the gory battle field to-day in Europe.



During the almost four years, while the great generals may have outlined the plans of campaign, the soldiers in the field—at least in the German service—have been led not by their commissioned officers but by their squad and their platoon leaders. Yesterday we had the news from England that the victorious onslaught of the German soldiers in the field has been due to the magnificent leadership of their noncommissioned officers. The captain of a company or the lieutenant of a company does not undertake to drill the soldier in the matter of the step and the command nor in the matter of the manual of arms and handling of the rifle. Sir, I may say to you that my experience is limited, but in my company I had a first sergeant who was better equipped to handle men and to lick them into shape and do actual fighting than was any officer in the entire regiment, including the Regular Army officer. I say this knowingly. In making fighting men the squad leaders, the corporals, the sergeants, and the noncommissioned officers are the men who teach the men and make soldiers of them.

You do not need a cantonment until you order the men into companies of 250 or into battalions or into regiments. You can go to the ranches in New Mexico. I am a farmer, and I may enlighten the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] by saying I am also a cotton farmer in the State of Texas. I am employing labor not only in actual farming operations but in producing meat stuffs. There are now 15 men in my employ subject to the draft. One noncommissioned officer sent to my ranch in New Mexico could within two or three months, drilling one day a week or half an hour a day during the week, make soldiers of those men, make them perfectly competent to go into any extended drill of company, battalion, regiment, or army. He can teach them with one rifle the use of the rifle. He can teach them the manual of arms. He can teach them the use of the bayonet. He can teach them all the rudiments of military training. He can give them the setting-up exercise exactly as well as a major or a lieutenant colonel or a colonel, and he need not interfere with my business at all. I am perfectly willing, as any other farmer would be willing to see that his men, within the time which he pays for, shall have an opportunity one day in the week or a portion of every day in the week to have this training brought to them by some noncommissioned officer or some private who understands the rudiments of military training.

In my judgment, some such plan as that should be adopted, because we will never get the necessary number of men through the cantonments here to win the war in Europe. Plans such as I have suggested have heretofore been the military policy of the United States. I objected to a change when the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the Military Committee, brought in the draft bill. I said to him and to all Senators then that it was not intended as an emergency measure, that there was not an emergency provision in it except the word "emergency" written in the preamble. I stated to you then, Senator, that France was being bled white, and you needed troops there, and that the measure was neither a sufficient measure nor was it intended to be a measure to provide for an immediate and an effective offensive upon the part of the United States in joining its allies. Whether I was correct in that assumption, I leave the result to you gentlemen to judge. You know how many men you have in France. You know how many you had there just before the great German drive took place. You have hundreds of thousands of them yet drilling, and what have they learned aside from the trench warfare which Gen. Bridges, of the British Army, said to certain Senators, myself included, required 11 weeks' drill? Aside from that everything they learn there could have been learned on the farm or at the factory from a noncommissioned officer. It is unnecessary to disorganize the great business of the country.

If I had my way, I would go further. I would pass a military draft law drafting into the service of the United States Government every able-bodied male and female citizen in the United States between the ages of 18 and 45, and assigning them to their place in winning this war, so many of them to military duty and so many to semimilitary duties within this country; and until you do something of this kind you are not going to render effective assistance, in my judgment, to the allies, who so greatly need it.

Mark my prediction, gentlemen, and I am no military expert. Halt this great onrush now as it will be halted, in my judgment, and then look to Italy and look to Salonica. Look there for your next break and your next drive. The great military power of the United States Government, in my judgment, is not used, and almost entirely Great Britain will be compelled to depend upon her fleet in a very short time for the defense of her own territory.

In my judgment every British or allied soldier will be driven from Palestine and Persia back to the borders of India. Yet we are wasting time in cantonment drill when we have at our service the English and the French soldier transports through which millions of men have been transported from the far corners of the earth to the blood-stained soil of France.

Mr. President, the measure here pending is comparatively of an unimportant nature. I do not agree with any of the objections which have been offered to it except the fundamental objection that it is the duty of Congress to provide for the training of these men rather than to shirk the duty and hand the power to the President of the United States. I do not oppose it except that I fear that under the advice which the President of the United States has been receiving at second or third hand he will not avail himself of the authority which is vested in him by this amendment if it becomes a law.

Mr. MYERS obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator from Montana for just a moment?

Mr. MYERS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I was in hopes that we would get a vote on this amendment and on the joint resolution itself this evening, but if we are unable to do it I am going to ask for a recess until to-morrow at noon. If we could vote on it to-night, I would move an adjournment until Monday.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator if he will not give the Senate a little more time. I believe we will get a vote on the amendment and on the joint resolution. We ought to vote on it this evening.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I hope so.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think we ought to stay here even if it takes until 7 o'clock. Senators have other business for to-morrow. There are a good many committee meetings and there are conference committees to meet.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Montana will give me one moment, I will say that I had it in mind to make a speech of two or three hours' length on this amendment, but I have concluded not to do it in the hope that we would get a vote on the amendment and on the joint resolution to-night. The committees are very busily employed, and I think if we could pass the joint resolution we might give to-morrow to committees.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that is what I want to do. If we can vote to-night I shall move an adjournment until Monday, so that committees may complete their work. If the joint resolution is not finished this evening, I shall feel it my duty to move a recess until to-morrow.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is right about that.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I had it in mind to make a speech of two or three minutes' length on the amendment, and I have still the same mind. I believe it is always the privilege of the affirmative to close the debate, and I will proceed to do that very briefly, in behalf of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New].

I have not had the benefit of hearing all the debate on this amendment, but I am so profoundly impressed with the wisdom of the amendment that I can not forego the privilege of speaking a few words in its behalf. I think it is the best piece of military legislation offered in this body since the enactment of the draft law.

I believe the war in which we are engaged will undoubtedly last several years longer, probably five years. We might just as well realize that we have undertaken in this war the most gigantic task which has ever been undertaken by the son of man since God's sun began to shine. I agree with former President Taft that we will have to put 5,000,000 men in Europe before the war is won, and it is high time we were beginning to do it.

This amendment is a step in the right direction. It is at least a beginning. Where are we to get the men? We must get them wherever we can. If it is proposed to put more men in the field, it is objected that they will be taken from the farms, from the shops, and from manufacturing industries. So they will be drawn from all, but we must have men in order to win this war. "We can not eat our cake and have it, too." We can not put large numbers of men in the fighting field in Europe and have them on the farms and in the shops and factories at the same time. We must have soldiers and at the same time have our farms tilled. Both are necessary. Germany has millions of men in the field; France has millions of men in the field; Great Britain has millions of men in the field; and yet they are cultivating their farms and are furnishing food to their armies. Who is cultivating their farms? Every man,

woman, and child who is not in arms and who can be spared from any other vocation. We shall have to do the same thing.

One objection that has been made to this amendment is because of the fact that it will take some young men from the farms in the great farming States of the Northwest. As to that objection, I have to say that Montana is one of the great farming States of the Northwest and I have received very few complaints about young men being taken from the farms there. The few complaints I have received are inconsequential and negligible in number. The people there are not complaining.

Furthermore, with all that has been said about the lack of care and neglect of our young men in training camps and cantonments, of all the letters written by fond parents, complaining that their sons are not getting the same treatment and comforts in camps and cantonments that they received at home, I am proud to say that I have received but two complaining letters on that score from Montana. One letter was from a father whose son was in camp at Spokane, Wash., who complained of a shortage of clothing; another letter came from a man who was evidently an extreme pacifist, a peace-at-any-price man, a man who was opposed to all war, who complained of everything in connection with the war. Those are the only two complaining letters that I have received from Montana since we entered in the war about the treatment of our soldiers in camps, and I am proud of it.

The people of Montana are not complaining to any great extent of the young men being taken from the farms or the shops or the mines. I read from the Helena (Mont.) Independent of the 19th instant, as follows:

MONTANA STILL LEADS NATION IN THE PER CENT OF VOLUNTEERS.

WASHINGTON, March 18.

Adj. Gen. McCain's report to-day showed that Montana is still leading the Nation in percentage of volunteers in the Regular Army to population. The State's quota was set at 752, and 5,826 have volunteered. This is only for the Regular Army and does not include the National Guard, National Army, Marine Corps, or Navy.

That is the spirit of the people of Montana. They are in favor of this war and are behind the administration in the prosecution of it. If they have to give up some of their young men from the farms, they will do it ungrudgingly, I am sure, and in a spirit of patriotism, believing that it is necessary in order that we may win this war for democracy.

The amendment of the Senator from Indiana would take the young men from 19 to 21 years of age, and in two years or less time would make a magnificent trained army of them, ready to put into the field in Europe, without waiting to be trained after they were drafted and put into the Army. We would have a ready-made army in two years from now, and, upon my soul, I believe it will be needed, too, two years from now, and even later; probably three, four, and five years hence. We can not win this war without soldiers.

I believe there is much wisdom in the amendment; I believe it is necessary; and I believe the people of the United States would respond to it in the same patriotic spirit in which it is offered. I say, here and now, we will need millions more of men under arms before victory comes to our cause in this awful war, and now is the time to begin providing them, and this is as good a way as any. Let us begin. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Indiana may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW].

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to ask unanimous consent for permission to perfect my amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has a right to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the modification of the amendment he desires to make.

Mr. NEW. I send it to the desk to be read, and I would state also that the amendment consists in restoring my amendment to its original form and eliminating the amendment which was offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], which was accepted by me. This is a perfection of my amendment and eliminates that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary informs the Chair that that has already been done.

Mr. NEW. I did not so understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as it now stands is in its original form, and the pending question is on the amendment to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, may the amendment to the amendment be read before the vote is taken? It is very short.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana which has been proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of Mr. New's amendment the following proviso:

*Provided further,* That attendance by those subject to the provisions of this section under 21 years of age upon military schools, colleges, or other educational institutions where military instruction is given, under standards, rules, and regulations prescribed by the President, shall be deemed a compliance by such students with the provisions of this section.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I accept the amendment to my amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question is on the amendment as modified.

Mr. NEW. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] as modified by the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. NEW. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The roll call will develop whether or not there is a lack of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has been ordered. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES (when his name was called). I transfer the pair I have with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (when Mr. McNARY's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McNARY] has been called from the Senate on official business.

Mr. SWANSON (when Mr. MARTIN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is unavoidably detained from the Senate, but he is paired with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. If he were present, my colleague would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN. I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I desire to transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and I vote "nay."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING]. In his absence I transfer the pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and vote "nay."

Mr. KELLOGG (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and vote "nay."



Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. STERLING. I transfer my pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] and vote "yea."

Mr. MCKELLAR. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 36, as follows:

## YEAS—26.

Calder	Frelinghuysen	Myers	Sterling
Chamberlain	Gallinger	Nelson	Sutherland
Cummins	Gerry	New	Wadsworth
Curtis	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Warren
Dillingham	Kellogg	Poindexter	Watson
Fall	Kenyon	Sherman	
France	King	Smoot	

## NAYS—36.

Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	Thomas
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Saulsbury	Thompson
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Shafroth	Tillman
Fletcher	Kirby	Sheppard	Townsend
Gore	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Trammell
Gronna	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Underwood
Henderson	Nugent	Smith, Md.	Veraman
Hitchcock	Overman	Stone	Walsh
James	Reed	Swanson	Wolcott

## NOT VOTING—33.

Ashurst	Harding	McLean	Shields
Baird	Hardwick	McNary	Simmons
Brandegge	Hollis	Martin	Smith, Mich.
Broussard	Kendrick	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Coit	Knox	Penrose	Weeks
Culberson	La Follette	Phelan	Williams
Fernald	Lewis	Pittman	
Goff	Lodge	Pomerene	
Hale	McCumber	Ransdell	

So Mr. New's amendment as modified was rejected.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

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

## AMENDMENT OF ESPIONAGE ACT.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 9504) to amend section 4067 of the Revised Statutes by extending its scope to include women. The bill, which has been reported unanimously by the Judiciary Committee, makes a slight amendment to the statute in relation to alien enemies by simply leaving out the word "male," so that it will apply to women as well as to men.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate. Then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government.

Mr. OVERMAN. I now ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senator from Minnesota may secure action upon the bill which he has in charge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside.

Mr. NELSON. I renew my request for unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 9504.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, we are reaching a point over here where we desire to have an adjournment. I should like to ask the Senator whether the bill for which he asks consideration will take any time?

Mr. NELSON. It is very important that the bill should be passed immediately. I have here a memorandum from the Department of Justice, from which I will read two paragraphs, as follows:

The department is daily receiving complaints, some of them well founded, against the activities of German-born women who are at present not subject to internment but who ought to be interned.

The various intelligence services of the Government are greatly hampered by the present situation and are unanimous in urging the immediate passage of this measure.

As I have stated, the only change the bill makes in the existing statute is to strike out the word "male," so that the law will apply to both men and women. In addition a proviso has been reported by the committee that the act shall not apply to native-born loyal American women who are married to foreign husbands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9504) to amend section 4067 of the Revised Statutes by extending its scope to include women, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 1, line 6, after the word "is," to strike out "declared," and, in the same line, after the article "a," to insert "declared," so as to make the section read:

That section 4067 of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 4067. Whenever there is a declared war between the United States and any foreign nation or government, or any invasion or predatory incursion is perpetrated, attempted, or threatened against the territory of the United States, by any foreign nation or government, and the President makes public proclamation of the event, all natives, citizens, denizens, or subjects of the hostile nation or government, being of the age of 14 years and upward, who shall be within the United States and not actually naturalized shall be liable to be apprehended, restrained, secured, and removed as alien enemies. The President is authorized, in any such event, by his proclamation thereof, or other public act, to direct the conduct to be observed on the part of the United States toward the aliens who become so liable; the manner and degree of the restraint to which they shall be subject, and in what cases and upon what security their residence shall be permitted, and to provide for the removal of those who, not being permitted to reside within the United States, refuse or neglect to depart therefrom; and to establish any other regulations which are found necessary in the premises and for the public safety."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That this act shall not apply to native-born women loyal citizens of the United States, married to aliens, and residing in the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum from the Department of Justice, to which I have referred, may be printed in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

Memorandum for Senator NELSON, in re H. R. 9504.

MARCH 29, 1918.

Hon. John Lord O'Brian, the special assistant to the Attorney General for war work, on yesterday wrote to Senator CULBERSON inclosing the following memorandum with reference to the bill H. R. 9504, now on the Senate calendar, having been reported by Senator NELSON from the Committee on the Judiciary favorably with amendments:

"The department is daily receiving complaints, some of them well founded, against the activities of German-born women who are at present not subject to internment, but who ought to be interned.

"The various intelligence services of the Government are greatly hampered by the present situation and are unanimous in urging the immediate passage of this measure, which was introduced February 4, 1918."

## ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 1, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 29, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Oh Thou, who hast ever been our dwelling place and upon whom our fathers relied in all the exigencies of life for strength and guidance, and were not disappointed, turn not Thou away from us, for without Thee we are nothing; with Thee we are all things; for with Thee who can be against us? Strengthen therefore our arm of faith that we may cling to Thee in this hour of extreme peril.

We bless Thee for the grim determination and stern resistance of our allies, who have checked the advance of the overwhelming forces, battling against the civilization of the world.

Give victory to our arms and hasten the day when the hearts of all men shall be inspired with pure and undefiled religion; that a lasting peace may come to bless the world, in the name and spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

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

## PENSIONS.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the bill now before the House is completed the omnibus pension bills on the calendar may be in order.

Mr. GARNER. Does that apply to to-day only?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Only to to-day.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, when this bill is completed I want to try and send the Agricultural appropriation bill to conference.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have no objection to taking up the pension bills any time to-day.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I suggest that it would be in order to proceed now?

Mr. ASHBROOK. There will be no debate on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take up the bills now.

Mr. COX. I object.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman would have the right to call them up anyway.

The SPEAKER. This is not pension day.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I beg the Chair's pardon, I thought to-day was pension day, and that he would have the right to take them up.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the completion of the bill now before the House and the agreement to send the Agricultural bill to conference, referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina, the omnibus pension bills on the Private Calendar may be taken up.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that after the bill now before the House is disposed of and the gentleman from South Carolina has the Agricultural bill sent to conference the omnibus pension bills on the Private Calendar may be taken up. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. I have no objection to that arrangement being made to-day, but I want to state that it is the purpose of the Ways and Means Committee to get the bond bill up for consideration to-morrow, and I do not want any unanimous-consent agreement to interfere with to-morrow's business.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask this question: Is it thought that by the passage of the pension bills to-day their final passage will be expedited? I am asking the question in absolute faith, and let me say this to the gentleman from Ohio: There are matters that are deemed of extreme urgency. There is what is known as the housing proposition, for which there appears to be a very great demand, and it seems to be based on great merit—greater than some other measures that are brought in here in my opinion. If passing these bills to-day will expedite their final passage, I do not wish to interfere; but these other matters that I refer to are matters of extreme urgency. Of course pensions never fail; they always get through.

Mr. ASHBROOK. There is no question but that it will expedite the passage of these bills, and I do not anticipate that it will take a very long time to pass them. I have no desire to interfere with more pressing legislation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not keep up with the pension legislation very closely, but if I understand the situation right there are now in the Senate some three batches of bills passed here at different times upon which no action has been taken.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I have had a talk with the examiner for the Senate committee, and he says that he is up with his work, which the gentleman knows is necessary before the committee can consider the House omnibus bills. If we hurry these bills over there, he will get through them and have them ready, so that when the Senate meets at its next meeting they will probably pass all the bills.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to say, and I am sure all Members of the House appreciate the situation, that we are getting badly cluttered up with legislative matters. There are matters that appear to be matters of extreme urgency. I am not going to object to this request, on the assurance of the gentleman from Ohio that it will expedite matters. I know pensions are going through, and I do not object to their going through.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio to yield, or I will reserve the right to object. How many bills is it intended to call up if this consent is given?

Mr. ASHBROOK. One from the Committee on Invalid Pensions and two small bills from the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LANGLEY. It will not take more than half an hour if there is no debate.

Mr. WALSH. Will any rights be prejudiced if these measures are deferred until the next regular pension day?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to the gentleman and the House that there is no question but that it will expedite the

passage of these bills to send them over to the Senate to-day. The reason that there are a number of bills over there that have not been disposed of is due to the fact that the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Jersey, died, and for some time there has been no chairman of that committee.

Mr. LANGLEY. And his successor was ill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Would it be possible to have an agreement for a night session to consider pensions?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to any time in the day—5 o'clock, 6 o'clock, or 8 o'clock.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that there may be a session of the House, beginning at 8 o'clock this evening, for the consideration of the bills referred to in the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that there shall be a session of the House to-night, beginning at 8 o'clock, running not later than 10 o'clock, for the consideration of these bills mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], and for no other business. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK]?

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. There are a number of pressing war measures on the calendar of this House. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has just referred to one and I will refer to another. There is a Senate bill on the calendar, under a unanimous report from the Military Committee, providing an amendment to the condemnation law so as to authorize the Government to condemn necessary lands upon which to construct Government nitrate and powder plants.

The President has located two nitrate plants which have been authorized by Congress. They are under process of construction. The Government has not been able to secure some of the lands absolutely necessary for this purpose. Is the Government to be forced to suspend work on any part of these ammunition plants for want of legislation authorizing the Government to acquire necessary lands?

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

Mr. ALMON. I can not. I do not suppose there is a Member of this House who would not regret to hear of our boys in France retreating with empty guns for want of ammunition. This may happen if we do not speed up on war legislation and quit talking about pensions and such things.

The chairman of the Military Committee has tried repeatedly to have the bill I have referred to acted upon by the House, and has been forced to ask the Committee on Rules for a rule, and I must not allow, if I can help it, other measures of less importance to intervene and postpone action on it, which will only require a few moments' time when reached under the rules of the House, as I do not suppose there will be a vote against it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, I am forced under the circumstances to object.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I move that following the completion of the bill before the House and the consideration of the conference report referred to by the gentleman from South Carolina, the omnibus pension bills on the Private Calendar shall be in order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. RUBEY. Oh, I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. CARLIN. Mr. Speaker, for the present I withdraw it.

## MILITARY TRIBUNALS.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, within that time I shall ask the Clerk to read the following resolutions which I desire to have in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read.



The Clerk read as follows:

Rotary Club of Chester, Pa. Resolution.

Whereas the members of this club recognize an almost universal dissatisfaction among patriotic Americans at the immunity from adequate punishment which disaffected and disloyal elements of our population have heretofore enjoyed; and

Whereas it is the sense of this organization that the present emergency requires and demands that treason shall receive quick, certain, and condign punishment, and that avowed disloyalty shall be suppressed:

Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Rotary Club of Chester hereby requests and urges the Congress of the United States to create military tribunals in which all offenses aimed with hostile or treasonable intent at the integrity of the Military Establishment or the war efficiency of American industry, wherever committed, shall be tried; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this club recognizes the right and duty of every patriotic American citizen to expose and resist sedition and disloyalty, and recommends to its members and to this community an individual policy of aggressive and uncompromising opposition to every act or utterance tending to give aid or comfort to the enemy.

The above preambles and resolutions were unanimously adopted at a regular meeting of the Rotary Club of Chester, held March 26, 1918.

Attest:

E. WALLACE CHADWICK, *Secretary*.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, to conclude my two minutes, I desire to indorse the views of my constituents as expressed in these resolutions.

Mr. LANGLEY rose.

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

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I made that request for the purpose of saying what I had it in my mind to say when I interrupted the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON] a moment ago, and that was that in my judgment it is very important for us to enact as war measures laws to show to our soldiers and to the world that we recognize to the fullest the debt of gratitude that this Republic owes to the fathers and grandfathers of the boys over there and to those who are yet to go, who are fighting and preparing to fight for the liberties of that Republic which their sires preserved. [Applause.] I am sorry the gentleman used the language he did in referring to these bills we are pressing for the relief of those old fellows, some of whom are doubtless dying at this moment.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on the subject of the resolutions which were just read.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I listened quite carefully to the reading of the resolutions submitted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], and if I understood the purport and effect of the resolutions it was that Congress immediately proceed to create some military tribunals to try people in civil life.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman did not understand them.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, that the military authorities create them? Well, the military authorities of the United States can not do any such thing as that.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not understand that they ask any such thing. They simply ask that all of the authority of the United States might be employed for the purpose of suppressing sedition, and that all utterances and demonstrations of any kind which would interfere with the purpose of the war—

Mr. GORDON. Oh, do not take my two minutes. I want to call attention to the fact that neither the military authorities nor the Congress of the United States has any right to create military tribunals to try people who are not in the Army or Navy. You have got to amend the Constitution in order to do that, and this proposition here is just simply an old thing that was stamped out after the Civil War by the Supreme Court of the United States in Milligan's case. You can not create military tribunals to try people in civil life.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand there is any such request.

Mr. GORDON. That is all they ask for.

Mr. BUTLER. They are simply the views of my constituents upon what is commonly known as patriotism, and they are of the highest order.

Mr. GORDON. Oh, yes; we understand that.

SALE OF SEED GRAIN TO FARMERS.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the committee substitute for 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.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly 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. POW in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer. I move to strike out, in line 4, page 5, the words "until the purposes of this act have been," and, in line 5, the word "accomplished," the last three words of that line, "as soon as," and, in line 6, the words "possible after the close of each calendar year."

Mr. LEVER. All of that?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. And, in lines 8 and 9, strike out "during such calendar year" and insert after the word "that," in line 4, the words which I sent to the Clerk's desk to be read.

Mr. BUTLER. How will it read?

Mr. STAFFORD. "That at the opening of the next regular session of Congress the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be made to the Congress a detailed report showing all proceedings and transactions under this act," and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 4, strike out the words "until the purposes of this act have been"; in line 5 strike out the word "accomplished," and, after the word "shall," strike out the words "as soon as"; and in line 6 strike out the words "possible after the close of each calendar year"; and in lines 8 and 9, after the word "act," strike out "during such calendar year"; and after the word "that," in line 4, insert the following: "at the opening of the next regular session of Congress."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this bill, it is merely to provide for the temporary condition existing at the present time and to meet this condition during the present year. The phraseology of section 4 as framed by the committee would embody the idea that it is permanent legislation. The amendment I propose merely provides for striking out that permanent character of perennial report and substituting a report at the opening of the next regular session of Congress.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The matter of making loans to assist farmers in procuring seed is for this session alone, but there is business connected with this that will extend over into another year, and perhaps still into a further year. It can not be closed up this year, in my judgment, and the words of the bill, as the bill stands, are better to take care of that situation than the wording of the bill as amended by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if this language remains in the bill as reported by the committee, there will be warrant in future Agricultural appropriation bills for carrying appropriations for the various purposes that are carried in this bill. I do not understand it was the purpose of the committee or those supporting this bill that it was to provide for any other time except for the exigency that is now claimed to be existing in certain sections of the country. The amendment I propose will provide a report by the Secretary of Agriculture of the operations of this fund during the present calendar year, and that he make that report to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session. I hope the amendment will be accepted by the committee, because it is in consonance with the general idea of the bill that it is for the season of 1918.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman is entirely right in the assumption its use is a temporary measure, but the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the committee, I think has force, and it may be you would not collect all of this money up to the opening of the next session of Congress. There may be some that will never be collected, as a matter of fact.

Mr. STAFFORD. My amendment calls upon the Secretary to make a report of the operations of the law at the beginning

of the next regular session of Congress. If the work is not completed and it is unsettled, the gentleman can bring in a paragraph on the Agricultural appropriation bill requiring a further report. We would like to have at the beginning of the next regular session a report as to the operation of this bill. I can not see any reason for requiring, reaching into the future, reports at the beginning of every calendar year, as the phraseology of the bill requires.

Mr. LEVER. Has the gentleman from Michigan any serious objection to that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It seems to me that the bill as it is is better. Of course, it is a temporary matter, the loaning of money and the providing of seeds for this year alone, but everyone knows that the collections will not be made, all of them, this year; that there will be considerable business under the law for some time to come. No one can tell how long it will extend. The gentleman from Wisconsin will provide for a report at the opening of the next regular session of Congress, and there he would stop. This bill provides for a report at the close of this calendar year, which is only two or three weeks after the opening of the next session of Congress, and would call for an annual report as long as business remains on the book, so we will know from time to time just what the status of business is.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It seems to me that while the idea of the gentleman from Wisconsin may be right as to making a report at the opening of the session of Congress, he would stop there. We ought to go further and continue it until the matter is entirely closed up, just as the bill provides.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will there be any transactions under the authorization here after the present fiscal year?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. After the present calendar year?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, there will not be certainly any advances to be made.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. And if we have this report at the beginning of the next session of Congress we will know exactly how this fund has been used, and I can not see any reason for having a further report at the close of every calendar year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I want to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if we want to have a businesslike arrangement under this bill, it seems to me we ought to have reports at stated times until all that is collectible is collected.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that if a certain portion of the moneys advanced are not collected during the fiscal year, and the bill provides that the money shall be turned into the Treasury of the United States, that the Treasury would report that annually as the amount collected on this back balance, and the point trying to be arrived at by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is to stop the sale?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is limited by the first section of the bill.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. For the seeding season of 1918.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yesterday reference was made to the position of the President of the United States in respect to this legislation. I wish to say, in response to a letter written by me to the President on March 14, he wrote me, under date of March 18, a letter which I am sure Members of the House will want to hear. I will send both letters to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report them.

The following are the letters referred to:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1918.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
White House.

Mr. PRESIDENT: The cry will soon be food for a hungry world. Lord Rhonda's almost frantic appeal to Mr. Hoover indicates that in some portions of the world the pinch of hunger has already come.

Campaign phrases sometimes become so well known that they fail to take hold. "Food will win the war," a tremendously important thing to remember at this planting season, has become such a hackneyed expression it scarcely attracts either the eye or ear.

The President of the board of agriculture of England has expressed it in a new way: "Victory will come to the side which has the last bushel of wheat in its possession."

Three million acres can be planted to wheat this year which would otherwise be barren waste, if Congress will quickly pass a bill now on the House Calendar—H. R. 7795—introduced by Mr. BAER, of North Dakota. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to contract with farmers to grow grain and advance a part of the cost. It also places in his hands a fund for the voluntary mobilization of farm labor. The labor problem upon the farms is one of increasing difficulty. Something must be done and done quickly to replace the farm labor diverted to the factories and the Army.

Mr. Hoover wired the British Government that we had in America 170,000,000 more pounds of meat at the end of 1917 than had been expected, due to the economy in meat consumption by the American people, and meat saving is still increasing, a great testimonial to the work done under Mr. Hoover.

But with bread it is different. Bread is a daily necessity of life the world over. Wheatless days will help, but they will not solve the problem.

Much has been done through publicity campaigns to increase food production, but we have stopped short of actual appropriations to supplement such publicity efforts.

The bill referred to carries \$10,000,000, a drop in the bucket as compared with the mammoth war appropriations.

Is not the importance of increased food production being overlooked by reason of the tremendous and all-absorbing activities in other directions?

The seeding of grain has already begun in some of the States. May I suggest that now is the time to act?

Yours, respectfully,

GEORGE M. YOUNG.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, March 18, 1918.

MY DEAR MR. YOUNG: Pardon me for not having replied sooner to your important letter of March 14. I was waiting to get the views of the Secretary of Agriculture, who is out of town on a departmental errand. You may be sure that the subject matter of your letter concerns me very much and that I shall do everything possible to advance necessary legislation.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Hon. GEORGE M. YOUNG,  
House of Representatives.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Before the gentleman proceeds, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments to the section be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And I would like to have some time.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 20 minutes, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. LEVER. I prefer that the Chair control it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the letter that has just been read, coming from the President of the United States, is not addressed to the Congress in such cordial terms as might be expected under the circumstances. The President evidently does not go the whole hog on this bill. He has been talking with the Secretary of Agriculture and he has concluded to further such legislation as he thinks desirable, so far as Congress is concerned. Thus far does the President go, but not much further. I do not think there will be a stampede in this House because of this letter which the gentleman from North Dakota produces. I question whether the President is fully informed upon this measure. I doubt whether he has read or will have an opportunity to read, unless he takes up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, about the activities of the Nonpartisan League, which is harassing Members of Congress at the present time. The league was organized by a gentleman whose business failed and who did not pay his obligations. He organized the Nonpartisan League on a \$16 per annum dues basis so that indigent farmers might get free seed and other things. This organization is having its influence throughout the Northwest just now. But the gentleman who controls it is under indictment for alleged seditious utterances in the State of Minnesota. Is the President of the United States cognizant of these facts? Is it possible in these war times that the President of the United States would urge as a military necessity a bill advocated by a political organizer who is under indictment for seditious utterances?

I endeavored to tell the House something about this bill yesterday. The State of North Dakota is in some trouble about this measure, because the State of North Dakota, through its legislature, undertook to cover the matter of seed distribution. It got angled up with the law and the Government of the United States, in that it provided that while it would take care of its own farmers it wanted to have the first lien over and above the Government lien on what it loaned to the farmers. That is the



trouble with the State of North Dakota. It is not our fault. The bill introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER], calling for \$50,000,000 to be given to indigent farmers, included certain preferred States. North Dakota, of course, was included. For apparently good strategic reasons Texas was included. They have a good many farmer votes down in Texas, and Texas, working with North Dakota, would make a good team. Whether all the gentlemen from Texas bite or not, I do not know, but certainly some of them did not bite. The bill also included the State of South Dakota, but thereby hangs a tale. South Dakota now comes forward and resents the notion that her farmers are indigent and in need of Government aid. South Dakota insists that she will take care of her own farmers.

I read from a resolution signed by the president of the senate, the secretary of the senate, the speaker of the house, and the chief clerk of the house of the Legislature of South Dakota. It throws a timely light upon this paternalistic bill.

That resolution sets forth:

*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;

And whereas South Dakota is now honestly advertising the prosperity of the State: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the legislature now in extraordinary session, with representatives present from all sections of the State, singly and collectively declare that, to the best of their knowledge and belief, the farmers of South Dakota are not asking for Federal aid to procure seed and feed; and that the State is amply able and willing to aid, if necessary, any farmer who needs aid, and that the few individual or isolated cases that may exist, if any, can and will be taken care of either by township or county aid. And further that the advertising South Dakota has received through "H. R. 7795" has done her a great injustice, as South Dakota has never been more prosperous than now, as proved by competent authority; be it further

*Resolved*, That engrossed copies of this resolution be prepared by the secretary of the senate and delivered by United States mail to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of South Dakota now serving in the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

W. H. McMASTER,  
President of the Senate.  
W. N. VAN CAMP,  
Secretary of the Senate.  
A. C. ROBERTS,  
Speaker of the House.  
C. W. GARDNER,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. Chairman, it will be noticed that the bill mentioned in these resolutions, namely H. R. 7795, is the very bill you are asked to pass to-day. The State of South Dakota rejects this bill. South Dakota farmers are too proud and too prosperous to be put upon your \$450 free-seed roll. They are willing to pay for their seed, as every other State ought to be willing to pay for its seed. South Dakota rejects this measure.

The Secretary of Agriculture evidently knows these facts. Why does he not come forward and indorse the statement of the gentleman from South Carolina, who places his hand upon his heart and pleads so fervently for the boys in the trenches? [Applause.]

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

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

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes in which to reply to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from North Dakota that a unanimous-consent agreement has been entered into, to the effect that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, and the time was all allotted.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] may have the time that I intended to use myself, five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina was to have five minutes. The gentleman from North Dakota will be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], that I do not want to enter into personalities which he is trying to bring into this debate. He has not brought forth one argument against the bill itself. I can not see where prejudice and patriotism mix. There is no partisanship in patriotism. I do not believe there has been sufficient argument brought out on this floor at any time against this legislation to warrant us in throwing this bill down at this time.

I want to say that if the farmers of South Dakota do not need seed I am greatly deceived. The Legislature of South Dakota does not represent the farmers of that State as the Legislature of North Dakota represents the farmers of North Dakota. We have a farmer legislature up there, and they have realized the need, and they have taken care of it as best they could.

From South Dakota I have received resolutions from the Farmers' Equity Society, one of the largest organizations of its kind in the United States. They indorse this bill. They say there are large sections in that State which need aid. I have also received letters from the Farmers' Union and many individual farmers of South Dakota, saying they need aid.

In Texas cattle are starving, and the cradle of our cattle industry is being robbed to-day. Talk about meatless days! Five years from now we will not have any meat at all in this country if we continue to kill off the yearlings and the 2-year olds as we are doing now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAER. No; I can not yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say to the gentleman that the Legislature of Texas has done what the Legislature of North Dakota ought to do. It has appropriated \$2,000,000 to take care of that.

Mr. BAER. Texas is to be congratulated, and I repeat that North Dakota has done its best. I want to read what several men have said about the Nonpartisan League. The clipping is from the Courier-News, of Fargo, N. Dak.:

ST. PAUL, March 21.

"The National Nonpartisan League is the only movement which will save the United States from a revolution," in the opinion of Carl S. Vrooman, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

George Creel, chairman of the Committee on Public Information, said: "Despite attacks, I believe intensely in the loyalty of the Nonpartisan League. I have done all in my power to protect it from unfair assaults." Statements from these two men were read to the great audience attending the Farmers' and Workers' National Nonpartisan League rally at the morning session in the St. Paul Auditorium by Rev. S. R. Maxwell, of Denver, Colo., league lecturer.

Rev. Mr. Maxwell also said he had a personal letter from President Wilson lauding the league, which he said he did not feel at liberty to make public.

Other speakers at the morning session were George D. Brewer, veteran of the Spanish-American War, and Ben F. Wilson, both league lecturers.

"We are going to lick hell out of the Kaiser in Germany," Mr. Brewer said, and, as the cheers subsided, added, "and we are going to lick hell out of the industrial kaisers in this country, too."

R. E. Crane, indorsed by the league as candidate for lieutenant governor of Minnesota, spoke briefly at the afternoon session, as did F. E. Tillquist, indorsed as candidate for railroad and warehouse commissioner.

I could go on and read many other indorsements of men of prominence who say the league is loyal and patriotic.

Now, I am going to read an editorial from this morning's Washington Herald, a Republican newspaper, one of Mr. MOORE's newspapers. It says:

#### THE FARMERS' LEAGUE.

It has become more or less popular in some publicity channels to denounce the Farmers' Nonpartisan League as an "anti-American combination of traitors."

This organization of farmers, with a membership of nearly 200,000 in Mississippi Valley and Rocky Mountain States, has been accused of many un-American things. The other day the Minnesota State convention of this nonpartisan league was held. Included in its platform, which declares for Government ownership, were these words:

"We pledge anew our devotion to our country in this supreme hour of trial. We reaffirm our faith in the principles of democracy and pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to the struggle to free the world from autocracy and establish democracy, political and industrial, among the peoples of the earth.

"We declare it to be our solemn conviction that the German military autocracy, revealed in all its horrors by the ruthless rape of Russia, is a menace to the world. We pledge our unqualified support to our Government in the war to free the world from this menace.

"We indorse wholeheartedly the statement of war aims by the President of the United States. We believe that he has stated clearly and unequivocally the real intent in the hearts of the American people and that this statement forms a sure basis for a lasting and democratic peace."

"If this be treason," doubtless Patrick Henry would say, if he were writing this, "make the most of it!" It doesn't look like treason; it doesn't sound like pro-Germanism; it doesn't sound like anti-Americanism.

I could go on and read these resolutions adopted by the Farmers' and Workers' Nonpartisan League at St. Paul, March 19-21, but I hate to take up the time of the House at this time, and I will append them to my remarks, if there be no objection. [Applause.]

Following are the resolutions referred to:

We, organized workers of the farms and the cities of the State of Minnesota, assembled in mass convention in the city of St. Paul on this the 21st day of March, in the year 1918, do hereby resolve and proclaim our sentiments and the principles for which we stand, as follows:

We and each of us hereby renew our pledges of loyalty and devotion to our common country and reaffirm our unalterable determination to work always for its best and highest interests and for the permanent welfare of its people, our fellow citizens.

Our Nation is engaged in a great and terrible war in which we believe its purposes, and the purposes of its people, as given clear enunciation by the President whom we have chosen to direct the administration of our national affairs, to be right and just and worthy the whole-hearted support of every good citizen.

Therefore we pledge our adherence to these purposes, we commend our President for his faithful statement of the intentions which are in the heart of the American people, and we assure him and our fellow citizens of our unqualified support of our Government in its war efforts.

We declare it to be our solemn conviction that the aggressive and lustful purposes and intention of the German military autocracy, as most lately revealed in the ruthlessness with which prostrate and bleeding Russia has been overridden, have imperiled the foundations of government by the people everywhere in the world, and that we can not hope to work out in safety the problems of free and democratic government and equal rights and opportunity until the German military autocracy has been vanquished and this menace thus removed.

This is the issue upon which the peace and liberty loving peoples of the world have taken their stand against a power which makes might its only justification.

We count ourselves one with forces everywhere in the world which are fighting despotism and aggression and seeking to make governments more just and to cause all governments to permit and foster just economic conditions.

We express our abhorrence of the doctrine that militarism is necessary to guarantee peace. On the contrary militarism is one of the inciting causes of war, and it is for this very reason that the interests of all the workers lie in the utmost concentration of effort in this war, which holds in it the possibility of making future great wars impossible.

We adhere to the principle of organization of all workers as a necessary step in the accomplishment of economic justice and as a protection and a safeguard for true democracy.

Therefore we organized workers and organized farmers now stand and will continue to stand side by side for the accomplishment of our common aims, to make democracy more perfect and the division of the fruits of labor more just.

The President of the United States already has asked Congress for further authority to fix prices of products where profiteering is holding sway, and we here demand of Congress that it accede to this request of the President in order that the Nation and its people may be defended against those individuals and corporations who are unjustly preying upon them and interfering with the Nation's progress in the war.

We urge that further authority be given to the Government to act as buyer and distributor, through the parcel post, of the necessities of life in any case where price fixing may not prove to be an adequate remedy for existing evils.

We demand that in those great industries where profiteering in Government supplies holds sway the Government take over the mines, the plants, the machinery, and the tools and operate them with the willing aid of the patriotic workers in those industries. Least of all do we believe in excessive prices on war contracts which build up huge vested interests enriched by wealth taxed from the people of the Nation. We believe that war supplies and the tools of war ought to be manufactured by the Government, and that the necessary factories and machinery for the purposes should be conscripted by the Government.

We indorse the course of organized labor throughout the country in being willing to submit to Federal mediation in all industrial disputes, which is an evidence of the fundamental patriotism of American workmen. We urge upon the Government that as a necessary complement to its policy of mediation in industrial disputes affecting the war it adopt the course of commandeering those industries where there are disputes between capital and labor which do not promptly yield to mediation, and that all such establishments or industries or contracts thereafter for the duration of the war be operated and carried on by the Government.

The gains achieved for the producers and the consumers by Government regulation which has mitigated the pernicious effects of speculation and profiteering in food products since the war started must not be sacrificed when peace comes. We urge upon the Government that some form of regulation and control of the food markets be continued after the war shall have ended, that speculation in and monopoly of the food markets, by which many millions have been stolen from the producers and consumers of our own State every year, be stopped by the exercise of State and Federal authority. We also call for protection of cooperative buying and selling against the assaults of private interests, and we declare for the principle of direct dealing between producer and consumer in so far as is possible, aided and encouraged by the power of State and Federal Governments.

As a step toward the wiser stimulation and control of farm production we respectfully suggest to the administration that representatives of the producers of agricultural products should be included in the departments of the national administration having to do with the stimulation of production and the control of food products.

The live stock and packing industries of the country are under the absolute control and domination of a closely affiliated group of great corporate interests, commonly known as the Packing Trust. Recent investigation by the Federal Trade Commission has shown that the policies of this great aggregation of capital are such as (1) to oppress the workers in those industries—thousands of them living under insanitary and intolerable conditions and at a level of wages insufficient properly to support human life, (2) to control the retail meat trade and a large portion of the general food trade of the country in such a way as to collect extortionate toll from consumers, and, (3) most important of all, to menace the whole live-stock production of the country by a control over the purchasing markets which makes it almost impossible for the farmers to raise live stock.

These triple conditions of menace to the country must be alleviated. We see no sane remedy but for the Government to take over and operate the properties of the Packing Trust, at least for the duration of the war, calling upon the patriotic workers in the industries operated by the packing and food combine to render their services to the Government as faithfully as they have been rendering them to the private capital which now employs them.

The same conditions of monopoly that exist in the packing industry also exist in the milling industry, and here, too, the workers are underpaid and denied the right of organization, and we think that the same remedy as that asked in the packing industry ought to be employed, namely, that the Government take over and operate these flour mills at least for the duration of the war.

We declare ourselves for the control of the natural resources of the land, including the oil, the mineral, and the water-power wealth, as an asset of the people and in their interest. We indorse the President in

his opposition to the bill known as the Shields bill, already passed by the Senate, which proposes to turn over great public wealth to private exploitation without adequate return to the people.

Huge sums of money must be had to finance our fight for democracy, and so much of these sums as can not be had by taxation must be had by bond issues. The bond issues of the Government are a safe and profitable investment. They merely postpone to another day the decision as to how the expense of the war must be met and make it possible to devote all necessary resources at once to the prosecution of the war. Therefore we urge upon all our fellow workers that they lay aside so much of their savings as is possible to invest in the liberty bonds, which are to be our investment in the cause of world freedom.

While we thus do our part, let us continue to urge that the war debt be wiped out as speedily as possible, so that it may not be an intolerable burden upon the future generations of workers, and that in providing for the taxation with which the debt must be paid heavy levies be made upon profits coined out of the war and upon the swollen incomes which represent far too heavy a drain upon the toil and the suffering of the workers.

We believe that conscription of wealth is as necessary and as equitable as conscription of men. We favor increasing the rate of taxation on war profits and incomes beyond the rates levied in the present war-tax bill until they are at least equal to the rates imposed by Great Britain, and we favor continuing these rates of taxes until the debt accumulated by the present war is fully paid.

Our own sons are making the supreme sacrifice for liberty upon a foreign soil and we would be recreant to our natural affection, as well as to our patriotism, if we did not adopt every means possible to make their struggle easier and their lot more tolerable. Therefore we urge all to make regular contributions to the Red Cross, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Knights of Columbus, and the other agencies for giving comfort and aid to the soldier and extending mercy to those who fall wounded.

We urge the attention, both of legislators and of private citizens, to the need of taking care of the families and of the affairs of the men in the national service while they are absent and of providing useful employment for them when they return. Particularly, we urge upon our legislature the need of a soldiers' moratorium law, acting as a stay of all debts of the soldier in service, such as was adopted at the recent session of the farmers' legislature in the State of North Dakota.

Our State has been the scene in recent months of lawless violence committed against citizens of the State, of usurpation of authority by petty officials, of neglect of duty by high officers who have failed and refused to extend the common protection of the law to all citizens. We condemn these individuals and officials who have thus been recreant in their duty as well as all those unscrupulous agitators who have falsely and for political purposes impugned the loyalty of good citizens, and we brand as an act of injury to our Nation these false charges of disloyalty, these acts of mob violence, this connivance at disorder by public officials, all of which have tended to arraign class against class in the State of Minnesota, and to make it appear—falsely—that a majority of the citizens of this State are disloyal.

Yet, while we condemn these derelict officials and these fomenters of disorder, we urge our fellow workers not to be drawn into resistance of authority, and not to make the mistake of opposing violence with violence, but steadily to maintain the dignity of good and peaceful American citizens, while at the same time with firmness they continue to advocate and to uphold those things which they believe to be right, to the end that they, at least, may not be the cause of any embarrassment to the Nation in its time of stress. Thus will the blame for such divisions and disorder as have occurred in the State be placed squarely where it belongs and not with the organized workers or the organized farmers.

We commend organized labor for its course of patriotic support of the Government in the war, a course which we believe serves best the permanent interests of the workers, and we pledge ourselves to cooperation in the problem and the struggle of finding the best means toward industrial justice in the reconstruction period that is to follow.

Finally, we declare our purposes to be, not the selfish advancement of any class, but the common good of all, and we call upon all men, whatever may be their views on the wisdom or the unwisdom of proposed reforms, to remember that the traditional birthright of Americans is tolerance and freedom and to strive always to maintain these ideals unsullied by the resentments of war time and unprejudiced by narrow political desires. We feel sure that only by adherence to these principles can the Nation come with moral triumph out of the stern trial of these times.

In reference to Mr. Townley's arrest, the New York American affirms that each statement which he made was a true statement, a patriotic statement, and a thoroughly American statement.

The fact that the editors of the metropolitan press quote Mr. Townley and assume responsibility, by stating editorially that they are thoroughly in accord with his position, is mathematical proof that the Minnesota incident is purely a case of the opponents of the league trying to use the Minnesota government machinery to pull their political chestnuts out of the fire.

The arrest of A. C. Townley, president of the National Nonpartisan League, looks very much like a trick of politics—of politics of the low sort.

In brief, Mr. Townley makes four affirmative statements:

1. That the Nonpartisan League is opposed to profiteering during the war.
2. That freedom of speech and of the press is the bulwark of human liberty.
3. That one of the causes of this world war was the desire of opposing groups of governments and groups of monopolies to gain financial and commercial supremacy.
4. That the rule of jobbers and speculators must be overthrown in this country as well as in every other country if true democracy is to prevail.

Now, we affirm that each of these statements is a true statement, a patriotic statement, and a thoroughly American statement.

If the president of the farmers' organization in the Northwest, or any other man, can be arrested and indicted and imprisoned for making such statements as those quoted, then the constitutional guaranties have lost all their force and the liberty of no man is safe.



The Nonpartisan League, of which Mr. Townley is president, is a body composed almost entirely of farmers living in Minnesota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, Utah, and Washington.

During the past few months Mr. Townley and other officers of the Nonpartisan League have worked almost day and night holding patriotic meetings throughout the Northwest, pledging support to the President, and soliciting and receiving large donations to the Red Cross.

The real offense of which Mr. Townley and his associates are guilty is that of making uncompromising and successful war upon the trusts and jobbers and speculators and other extortioners who have exhibited and robbed the wheat growers of the Northwest year after year and who have debauched politics and stuffed public offices with their creatures and tools.

In North Dakota the organized farmers, with the assistance of sympathizers in the towns and cities, have knocked out both the Republican and Democratic rings and have put on the statute books economic legislation which has ended the power of the trusts and monopolies and jobbers and speculators to rob the producers and consumers of that Commonwealth.

In Minnesota, in Nebraska, in Colorado, in Utah, and in Washington the same Nonpartisan League proclaims its intention to repeat the excellent results achieved in North Dakota.

Every day sees a new political organization becoming stronger and stronger and sees the profiteers more and more in panic.

Under these conditions the frightened gangs of profiteers have resorted to exactly such tactics as the Mitchell gang used here in New York. They are trying to hide their own sinister purposes behind a camouflage of patriotism and to discredit the farmers' organization by false accusations of disloyalty.

The whole thing is only another proof of how right old Dr. Johnson was when he defined "patriotism" as the last refuge of a scoundrel.

There is nothing disloyal in the language we have quoted by the president of the Nonpartisan League. There is nothing unpatriotic either in the attitude or the purposes of the Nonpartisan League.

On the other hand, any body of men who propose in any State or in any community to unmask the scoundrelly profiteers who hide their scoundrelism behind the camouflage of patriotism; any body of men banded together to obtain social justice, to put an end to the exploitation of the industrious farmers and workers by the unprincipled extortioners who prey upon both, perform a public service that is in the highest degree patriotic.

We protest against the arrest of President Townley and this attempt to besmirch the organized farmers of the Northwest with the false accusation of disloyalty. It is an indefensible assault upon the constitutional rights and liberties of American citizens.

A nation is only truly free in which every individual is free to speak and to write his opinion upon public affairs—political, social, and economic.

The liberties of all are firmly bound up in the protection of the liberty of each.

Every newspaper in the United States and every public man and every private citizen should speak out loudly and boldly in condemnation of this attempt to fasten the stigma of disloyalty upon the farmers of the great Northwest and to bring the president of the organization to punishment as a criminal because he exercised his undoubted rights as a free American to condemn the extortioners and exploiters who have robbed him and his people, and to point out that the war for democracy will indeed have been fought in vain if these scoundrelly profiteers are to continue after the conclusion of that war to rob and despoil the workers of the land.

In the Nonpartisan League movement the people of this country will not find any conspiracy nor discover any secret-planned sedition. On the contrary, we have presented publicly and openly, without equivocation or illusion, certain principles. A statement of these principles in this public manner precludes the possibility of their being dangerous. Yet that these public statements have driven some to the extremity of wrath and denunciation is the only answer of which they seem as yet capable. The Nonpartisan League is not too radical for progressive men of both parties, and I admit that it is not too conservative for the liberals of all groups. Jefferson says: "Error of opinion can be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." A man who boldly proclaims a principle, no matter what it may be, can do but little injury. No amount of intellect, learning, or eloquence can make him dangerous. If the principles advocated by the farmers are wrong, they can only be destroyed by reason and argument—not by epithet and abuse. The farmers have set an example. They have set forth the principles they purpose to maintain calmly, clearly, and openly. These have been proclaimed from platform and through the press, so that all may read and know. There is nothing secret or sinister in their methods—just the plain American method plus pitiless publicity. No injury can come to the Nation from that. On the other hand, benefit can come from it if there should be a fair discussion and criticism of them. Iron sharpeneth iron and discussion brings out much that might be overlooked. Threats of personal violence and of arrest, such as have been made, are not only un-American but actually hurtful, as they prevent the discussion needed to test under the hammer of logic and under the acid of reason the principles put forward by the farmers.

It is time to drop the high-tragedy rôle and get down to common sense. It is time to cease howling and begin thinking. It is time to quit questioning the patriotism of the men who feed, clothe, and sustain us. If the farmers' movement be wrong, we must grant that it is supported by men who are sincere, earnest, and determined. Hard names will not change them and hysteria will not cause them to waver. Only clean-cut argument and sound sense will make an impression on

them. If, in the ranks of those opposing, such things may be found, it is time to bring them out.

I extend the following letters and telegrams at the request of Mr. GANDY, of South Dakota, who wanted to be present and vote for this bill:

HARRY L. GANDY, M. C.,  
Washington.

In spring, 1912, Perkins County furnished \$67,000 worth of seed grain to 1,292 farmers. Of this amount \$5,700 is still uncollected; the greater portion of this will be a loss to the county.

A. MICHELSON, County Auditor.

HARRY L. GANDY,  
Washington, D. C.:

Seed grain furnished farmers, Meade County, spring of 1912, 6,300 bushels, at a cost of \$9,000; 125 farmers supplied with a loss to county of \$680.

FRANK J. MURPHY, County Auditor.

RAPID CITY, S. DAK., March 8, 1918.

HON. H. L. GANDY,  
Washington, D. C.:

Eight thousand one hundred and ninety-one bushels applied for by 117 farmers; no loss; county still holds a few of the seed-grain notes.

A. D. CLIFFE, Pennington County Auditor.

BELLEFOURCHE, S. DAK., March 9, 1918.

Congressman HARRY L. GANDY,  
Washington, D. C.:

Approximately \$10,000 spent for seed; about 200 farmers furnished; \$1,500 uncollected notes; deficit covered by tax levy of \$3,000 in 1912.

N. P. LANG, County Auditor.

ISABEL, S. DAK., February 22, 1918.

HON. HARRY L. GANDY, M. C.,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you to ask you to try and get the Baer bill or some measure that will give the farmers an opportunity to get money to buy seed this spring and give us all a chance to do our best to get all of our land in crop this spring, as I do not think one-half of the farmers here in this locality are going to get in a full crop without they get help from the Government. Our crops were so poor last year that we are not able to put in a big crop without help, and you know we must have the crop this year, and I am sure you will do your bit.

Yours, truly,

F. PROUTY.

—  
SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., March 1, 1918.

HON. HARRY L. GANDY,  
Washington, D. C.:

MY DEAR MR. GANDY: It has recently come to my attention that there is now pending before Congress a bill providing for help being extended by the Government to indigent farmers in North Dakota and Montana in buying seed wheat and other seed grains for use this spring, this help being needed on account of the almost total failure of the small-grain crops in the two States mentioned.

Mr. GANDY, if there ever was a bill before Congress that was worthy of your consideration and support it is this one.

I have no ax to grind in asking you, if you can conscientiously do so, to support this bill, but am asking this for the reason that previous to three months ago I traveled in the State of Montana for five years as a salesman selling farm implements. In this line of work I had plenty of opportunity to observe just what the agricultural conditions are in Montana, particularly in the new and undeveloped portions of the State. In that time we saw three almost total crop failures.

If you have never made a close study of the State of Montana in particular, you perhaps have not the least realization of the unlimited possibilities for the agricultural development of that country. There are thousands and thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres of virgin prairie land that with even subnormal moisture conditions will raise the best crops that ever grew outdoors. However, as is generally the case in new countries that are just developing, the settlers are composed of people of limited means—ex-professional men, ex-merchants, ex-clerks—people that are striving honestly and sincerely to better their condition. They are not afraid of work, but they are limited for capital, and the experiences that I have seen some of these people go through have been almost heart-rending. Many a family have gone hungry during the winter on account of their crop of the season before not panning out.

To summarize, Mr. GANDY, all that these people need is a chance and a little help. The banks out there are not always as willing to help with loans as they might be. Were it not for the help and the extensions that have been given merchants of that country by the wholesale houses the country would not be in near the stage of development that it is to-day, but the country is so large that with the help that the Government can give them in getting seed grain for this spring, as said before, even with subnormal moisture conditions the crops they will raise there will be phenomenal. Could you get a map or Government statistics of the new land that has been opened in the Montana country for cultivation even in the last five years you could see without a doubt where even with a large crop, Montana will help in the production of wheat to feed the people of this country and our allies, and, of course, this is what we all want and are straining every nerve to accomplish.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration, and trusting that you may see your way clear to support this bill, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

W. L. NEWPORT,  
Manager Dakota Moline Plow Co.

Mr. LINTHICUM, Mr. Chairman, the thought has been expressed in the House very frequently that men who do not represent agricultural districts are not particularly interested in bills appertaining to agricultural matters, but I take a differ-

ent view from that. I think we Members who represent those people who live in the cities are more vitally interested in what the agriculturists do than are the agriculturists themselves, for the reason that we are entirely dependent upon the farmer for our food and thereby our very existence. We in the city have no way to produce food and we must depend entirely upon the farmers. The cities pay a large part of the taxes of this country, and they are willing to contribute in every way that will insure a full food supply. A sufficient supply is not alone vital to our people, both rural and urban, but to the winning of the war itself. Food! Food! Food! should be the slogan as Ships! Ships! Ships! Now, I do not know anything about matters in South Dakota. I do not know anything about the Nonpartisan League to any extent. Both of which are embraced in the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. In our State we have only two parties practically, the Democratic and the Republican, others are infinitesimal; and, by the way, let me tell you that they are not very far apart just at this time. They are all working in unison for the winning of this war and not worrying about politics. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If there was an organization known as the Nonpartisan League, that had a million and a half of dollars in its treasury, which was sending lecturers into the gentleman's district, would he not recognize it?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly I would recognize it; but they do not have to send lecturers into our districts in Maryland. We have such good Democrats and Republicans up there that we can explain political matters to the satisfaction of our intelligent constituents without the assistance of this Nonpartisan League and its lecturers. [Laughter.]

Mr. LOBECK. And you would get their votes if they did come there.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Of course, I would get their votes if they came over there. Why should I not? They might go further and fare worse. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That would be largely on account of the color of the gentleman's necktie.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know whether that would attract the Nonpartisan League, but this tie and what is back of it does attract most of the leagues we have up there in Baltimore. I will say that. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I am very deeply in earnest about this bill. It is vital to our people that we have a large production of food this year.

I for one am willing to take a chance with the farmer by advance of seed. I know if he can make the crop he will repay the Government. He is willing to advance his labor, his honor, and his character against the advance of seed to him by Uncle Sam. Thousands of individuals take this chance with the farmer and why should not the National Government do the same when it has so much at stake. You have advanced to the munition makers, the shipbuilders, and others; are they more honorable and honest than the farmer? I think not. Do you realize that you must not only produce for the people at home and the soldiers and sailors abroad but you must also produce in such abundance that when the submarines take their dreadful toll that there will be sufficient left. We must not alone produce for consumption but destruction as well, just so long as these terrible pirates of the sea continue their diabolical work.

Now, as to the advance of money to the farmers for seed, I have had business relations with farmers for years, and I have had business relations with farmers who did not have a dollar's worth of real estate, and very little in the way of farm implements, and I tell you that the money you advance to the farmer is generally very safe. The farmer is honest, and honesty and labor are great assets. The farmer has both. You lose very little of it in proportion to what you lose in other enterprises. If the farmer can possibly produce a crop and sell it, he is going to pay his debts. One of the first things he does when the season is over is to take the money he gets for his crop and go around and settle his debts. I know it. My father was a farmer, and I have had their association and friendship all my life. I do not believe we are going to lose much money that we advance to the farmers under this bill, and if we do lose half of it, what is the difference, just so we get the wheat to feed the people. Food is the vital thing, cost what it may. That is the thing I am interested in, representing a city district, whose very life depends upon the labor and success of the farmer.

It is not only seed we need to produce this crop. We need farm machinery; and I have always advocated the loaning of money to the farmer to buy farm machinery, because he can put in so many more acres by machinery than he can by mere hand labor. I am very sorry to see the gentleman from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. MOORE], who has such a bright mind and is usually of wide view, opposing this bill. His city needs food just as much as Baltimore needs food, and he ought to use every effort to see that legislation is passed which will assist in the raising of food. I told the gentleman this morning about a letter I received from my nephew, Lieut. Walter Linthicum, who is at Camp Lee. He fits out the soldiers there, and he tells me that among the very best men who have come to that camp are large numbers who recently came in from Pennsylvania. He says they are some of the finest men who have yet come to Camp Lee. There are also some from West Virginia and a few from Virginia. I am very much surprised that a gentleman representing such a high-class constituency should oppose a bill of this kind, the object of which is to feed the people of the country, the country for which these splendid and intelligent Pennsylvanians are to risk their very lives.

It will be too late to cry out what should have been done if we once run amuck of that grim monster—that monster worse than war—hunger.

Speaking of machinery, I wish to call to the attention of this House to a most interesting article by C. Bosley Littig, recently published in one of our Baltimore papers, in which he calls special attention to the standardization of farm machinery. No one can well estimate the loss occasioned the farmers by the many makes of farm machinery. What a blessing and saving it would be to standardize this important branch of industry.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That Camp Lee compliment is a very worthy one from excellent soldiers to their commander, who is doubtless a worthy commander.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; it is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But I want to ask the gentleman if the people of Baltimore, as well as those of Philadelphia, at the present time are not getting less food and paying more for it than they ever did before in their lives?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Of course we are getting less food and paying more for it, and that is one of the reasons why I want this bill to pass, so we can get more food and pay less for it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. One other question. If the gentleman's farmer friend had a tractor such as he refers to, does he think he would have any trouble in getting money to buy his seed?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I think the two things ought to go together. One is seed and the other is farm implements, so we can put in large crops.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I agree with the gentleman as to that.

Mr. GORDON. The bill does not provide for money for furnishing farm implements.

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; it does not; but it ought to provide money for furnishing farm implements. That is one of the things I have been advocating.

Seed alone, however, is not the only great aim of this legislation. Section 2 provides for the voluntary mobilization of labor. This is a most important work. Labor must be had upon the farms, and this will give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to provide the men needed. Only 10 days ago the leader or a leader of the Poles of Baltimore told me that there were thousands of his race who would gladly take to the farms if means and homes could be provided. He said the Pole was a natural born farmer, his whole training had been farming, and that he loved the outdoor life and God's beautiful sunlight above all things. He was a denizen of the city from necessity, not choice. I believe this to be true. I know the Pole by close association, his work and his love for the farm. I have seen large numbers employed by my father on his farm in Maryland. They are good, clean, practical farmers. This section will take care of just such cases and many others. It will help the labor situation.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, my district takes in the Minnesota side of the Red River Valley. For more than 200 miles on the west line lies the district of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER], who takes in the Red River Valley on the west side of the river. It is perhaps the greatest wheat-producing region in the world.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] stated correctly that he was not asking for this relief on account of the needs of his particular congressional district. The conditions there are similar to those prevailing in my section, where the wheat crop last year, though light, was not a failure. I presume it averaged over 10 bushels to the acre. There is no lack of seed wheat there. But in western North Dakota and Montana there was a drouth, and in large areas the wheat crop failed. Although I have no personal knowledge, I have reliable information from people I know, who formerly lived in my district and who have moved to western North Dakota and Montana and



taken up new lands there, as to conditions prevailing in that region. Owing to the failure of the wheat and the lack of banking and credit facilities it is difficult, if not impossible, for some of these settlers to get seed unless the Government steps in and helps.

The fact is that wheat and other grain prices have gone so high that it takes a little fortune to put in a 160-acre farm. I feel that the wheat crop will be reduced in acreage unless this bill passes. The land out there is virgin soil, it is very productive. I have no doubt that if they get a favorable year it will produce 25 bushels to the acre. Wheat at \$2.50 a bushel for seed, \$7,500,000 will buy 3,000,000 bushels of seed. If wheat produces fifteen or twenty fold, we will raise from forty-five to sixty million bushels of wheat from that amount of seed. That is not a small item. Some years our whole foreign export has not exceeded 60,000,000 bushels.

Now, when we are confronted as we are with the order that we must cut down the bread portion to 2 ounces per day, that we must cut the consumption in order to supply and meet the crying needs of the allies and of our soldiers, in face of the fact that the Government policy of fixing the price of wheat below its market value has discouraged the planting of wheat, in face of the fact that the country districts away from the railroads are now using wheat and compelled to do it as the most economical for the feeding of cattle, and selling the coarser grain, as was shown by Senator NELSON in the recent Senate debate on the Agricultural bill. By reason of these facts the tendency has been to discourage the production of wheat.

Wheat is exhausting to the soil, and it is not profitable to grow it on the same land for a series of years, for the last becomes weedy and the crop dwindles to 8 or 10 bushels to the acre.

Since the bill has been amended so as to include seed corn it will, however, supply a great need in my own State and district. The early frost caught all out corn, so that we have absolutely no seed corn. All must be brought in from outside. I hope this bill will pass.

The proponents of this bill and the committee deserve praise for bringing it up for action. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the bill on account of the special emergency, and we want that 45,000,000 bushels of wheat next fall to help feed our people and soldiers and our allies. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, may we have the paragraph read as it will read if amended?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the paragraph as it will read if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That at the opening of the next regular session of Congress the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be made to the Congress a detailed report showing all proceedings and transactions under this act. 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.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—44 ayes and 42 nays.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the figures "1,000" and inserting "5,000," and striking out "six months" and inserting "five years." In other words, I move to increase the maximum penalty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 19, after the word "exceeding," strike out "1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "5,000," and in line 20, after the word "exceeding," strike out "six months" and insert in place thereof "five years."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I propose simply increases the maximum penalty which may be imposed from \$1,000 to \$5,000 and from 6 months to 5 years. This is a war measure, and I submit that if anybody, a farmer or anybody else, knowingly makes a false representation under the guise of war-emergency legislation, for the purpose of fleecing money out of the United States Treasury, the court ought to have ample latitude to impose a severe penalty. Simply to say

that he may be fined \$1,000 or put in jail for 6 months would strike but little terror to some of the so-called farmers who are enrolled in certain organizations whose principles are not founded upon what is best for the United States. I believe that the courts ought to have authority to impose heavy penalties, to deter others from attempting to get any amount of money under false pretenses.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I would like the gentleman to say whether he thinks we should impose a higher penalty upon a man who can not possibly take advantage of the Government to the extent of more than \$450?

Mr. WALSH. I do not think it is a question of money. Why not fine him \$450 and the interest, or fine him the amount of the money he procures?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. He has no money; that is the point.

Mr. WALSH. Then impose the imprisonment sentence along similar lines; but my idea is simply to make this conform to the other criminal statutes that we have passed.

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

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania has concluded?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I submit to the gentleman that inasmuch as he raised this question during the passage of the War Finance Corporation bill and succeeded in placing a higher term of imprisonment and a larger fine upon those magnate malefactors who might get the better of the Government through the operation of false statements, perhaps it would be fair in proportion to keep the fine and imprisonment down in the case of a man who can only get \$450 from the Government in one year. The gentleman will bear in mind that we are not dealing with millionaires or large corporations, and we ought to be fair to the poor farmer, from whatever State he comes, who, having no property whatever, no land, no nothing, can still obtain \$450 from the Government.

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

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. STEVENSON. In order to make this conform to the criminal statutes generally, had you not better insert a minimum punishment?

Mr. WALSH. Let me say to the gentleman that I was simply seeking to make it conform to the emergency war legislation which Congress has passed. In nearly all of those acts the maximum is stated.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does it not always carry a minimum penalty?

Mr. WALSH. No; not in most of the war measures.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. In the first place, there is no need of putting a drastic penalty of this sort in this bill, and if you fix a penalty of \$5,000 and there are violations you will not get any convictions, because a jury will not bring in a verdict of guilty with such a heavy penalty to be imposed.

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

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman not think there ought to be a minimum punishment imposed here for obtaining money from the Government by false pretenses?

Mr. RUBEY. I am perfectly willing to leave that to the courts, as we have in a great many other cases.

Mr. GORDON. To obtain the \$450 by false pretenses is a felony under the laws of every State in the Union.

Mr. RUBEY. The courts will take care of that.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman not think there ought to be a minimum penalty fixed?

Mr. RUBEY. I do not.

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

Mr. RUBEY. Yes. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. It may be \$1, or \$10, or a hundred dollars, or one day, or no imprisonment. If you increase it it will not do any good, because it is already so high. Does the gentleman not think that no court, taking into consideration everything, would go to the maximum?

Mr. RUBEY. I agree with the gentleman, we should not increase it.

Mr. CANNON. I think we better leave it as it is.

Mr. RUBEY. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to oppose the amendment. But, first, I desire to appeal to my usually warm-hearted friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], coming as he does from the rock-bound coast of New England, not to insist upon this harsh amendment. The amount the

Government would lose in individual cases is so small—only \$450—that—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the great embarrassment that it would cause the gentleman from Pennsylvania to be compelled to vote on this amendment I ask to withdraw it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the paragraph, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOLSTEAD: Page 5, line 18, after the word "act," insert "or shall use money or grain procured under the provisions of this act for a purpose different from that for which the same shall have been obtained or shall, without first repaying the indebtedness incurred for money or seed furnished under this act, secrete or convert or suffer to be converted to his own use or to the use of any other person the crop or other property upon which said indebtedness is then secured by lien or mortgage."

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that this matter has been taken up with the Solicitor of the Agriculture Department, and the committee agrees that this amendment should be adopted in a modified form, and I send to the desk and offer as a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota the following:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUBEY as a substitute for the Volstead amendment: Page 5, line 18, after the word "act," insert "or shall use money or grain procured under the provisions of this act for a purpose different from that for which the same shall have been obtained, or shall, without first repaying the indebtedness incurred for money or grain furnished under this act, secrete or convert or suffer to be converted to his own use or to the use of another person the crop or any part thereof or any other property upon which such indebtedness is then secured by lien or mortgage."

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to say very much in regard to the amendment, as it has been accepted by the committee. I believe such an amendment ought to be made to the bill. It embodies usual provisions for safeguarding the Government, and as such ought to be insisted on. It was suggested by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that the penalty ought to be made very severe for misusing any of the money which we appropriate—five years' imprisonment. I think that is entirely unnecessary. The section as it stands with this amendment would be in line with the laws that we generally have in our Western States, where mortgage security of this kind is quite often taken.

Now, just a word in regard to the merits of this bill. A great deal has been said against it, and a great many sneers and gratuitous insults have been directed against the farmer. I want to remind my friends upon this floor who have engaged in this sort of sport that you have just arranged for a credit of \$4,000,000,000 to banks and industrial concerns. You advanced to them out of the Treasury \$500,000,000, and you gave a like amount to the railroads and guaranteed them during the war the highest earnings they have ever received. We all recognize that these advances are hazardous and can not be justified except as war measures. Now, when the farmers in the West, many of whom are homestead entrymen on Government lands, are asking for a smaller amount so they may be enabled to do their bit in this war by raising food, you apparently make a virtue of your prejudices. These men are just as patriotic as those who are to get the billions and their need is much greater, as they had a crop failure last year. Why not make this appropriation? We are not giving it to the farmers. They are not asking a donation. On the other hand, we are demanding security. We are asking that it be returned, just as we do from the men who are to get the billions. A great deal has been said here in regard to the Nonpartisan League. I am not aware that the Nonpartisan League is at all interested in this legislation. Not a word have I received from that organization, though there are a number of them in my own district. Not a kernel of this grain will be used in my State, as far as I am aware. Let me remind you that the Great Northern, the Northern Pacific, and other railway companies have, year after year, been doing this very work. They advanced seed to farmers and hauled labor free for the purpose of building up the country along their lines. They have done it as a business proposition. This country could afford to do the same thing, even in peace times. Is there any sense in abusing farmers who are asking that same sort of relief? You have taken from them the opportunity to get relief from the railroads. The railroads can not do it. They are in the hands of the Government. The wheat must be had; the Government needs it. We ought to be willing to do something to save the situation. [Applause.] This may mean thirty or forty million bushels that can be had in no other way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. SUMNERS. I want to speak to the motion. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very much interested in the pending amendment, but I do not know just what is the disposition of the committee toward it.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The committee accepts it.

Mr. SUMNERS. Then I make the pro forma motion to strike out the last word for the purpose of making some observations upon the bill. As a man representing a southern district, a district where we do not produce one-tenth of the grain we consume, I am going to support this bill dealing with wheat production in the Northwest. [Applause.] My people living in the fifth district of Texas are vitally interested in the wheat production of that section. Their boys are in France and must be fed; they must themselves have bread. There is much opposition to the labor mobilization feature of this bill. I want to say to you gentlemen of the South when that time comes, when the grain farmers of Kansas need labor to save the wheat that you must eat to live and that your boys who are in France must have to win, it is good old-fashioned horse sense to send any labor which we can spare to harvest that grain [applause], just as though it belonged to you.

Mr. VENABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. I will yield.

Mr. VENABLE. Is there any surplus labor in the gentleman's district?

Mr. SUMNERS. In the towns there may be some. There come times when we have laid by our crops and there come times in the gentleman's district when his people lay by their crops in the summer time—

Mr. VENABLE. Is that the time to sow wheat?

Mr. SUMNERS (continuing). No; but that is the height of the harvest in the Northwest. It would be a wise policy to have the labor which can be spared sent into that territory to save the wheat—not somebody else's wheat, if we look at it broadly, but the wheat of all of us, the wheat to put the strength into the bodies of your people who are to harvest the cotton of the South and to put the strength into the bodies of our southern boys which will give them a better chance to come back to us. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SUMNERS. Just for a question.

Mr. VENABLE. Are crops laid by and labor idle when the spring wheat is harvested?

Mr. SUMNERS. Why, no; and there is nothing in this bill and there is nothing in the whole situation to justify the conclusion that labor will be shifted from the country from which it is needed into a place where it is not needed. We have got to credit the men charged with the administration of this bill with practical common sense. I do not think there will be much shifting of labor, but I will tell you what I think will be done under this bill. There are in the towns and villages of this country many men who have been trained on the farm, there are many patriotic boys and girls there, and I believe firmly that with a proper campaign in those villages and towns that are closely associated with the agricultural interests we could mobilize those forces, with a retired farmer possibly at the head of a squad of young patriots, and put them into the fields at the high points of necessity. [Applause.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. I am sorry I have not the time. I know there comes times in the cotton fields of the South when we have a rainy spell. It becomes then a contest between the weeds, the grass, and the cotton as to which one is to survive. If we could throw a little surplus labor at that time into these fields and clean them out, then the ordinary labor that is engaged in the cultivation of the crops can take care of them.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS. I am sorry I can not yield. That is what I think will be done under this bill. But the thing, gentlemen, in this discussion I do not like—

Mr. GORDON. Something for nothing.

Mr. SUMNERS. Get something for nothing! Nobody is to get something for nothing. A lot of folks on the floor of this House think if the Government would loan its money to big city banks and then the big city banks loan it to the little country banks at a profit and the little country banks loan it to the farmer and take a mortgage on everything from his bull



calf to his wheat crop, it would be all right. They could not discover anything paternalistic about that. According to their idea there is no paternalism if there be a large enough number of toll takers between the Government and the man of final destination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS. I shall endeavor to resume under the next section.

Mr. PRICE and Mr. RUBEY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate has been exhausted on this paragraph. If the gentleman will wait until the next paragraph is reached there will be opportunity then.

The question is on the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

The question was taken, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, is not there a vote to be had on the amendment offered to the last section? You simply voted on the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair considered that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], in view of the committee having adopted the substitute, did not desire a vote on the amendment himself. The Chair will be—

Mr. LEVER. I understood the gentleman from Minnesota accepted the substitute and withdrew his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understood it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Page 6, line 3, after the word "act," add the following:

"Provided, however, That no expenditures or advances shall be made under this act unless and until the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine and by proclamation declare that the same is necessary for the more effectual prosecution of the war."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is the gentleman from South Carolina willing to accept that amendment?

Mr. LEVER. I would be glad to have the gentleman's statement on it, and in the meantime I will consult with my colleagues.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if there be any justification for this measure at all it surely must be based upon the theory that we are at war and that the legislation is necessary for the more effectual prosecution of the war.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. LONDON. Is there any precedent for a proclamation by a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, I do not happen to recall whether there is or not. This, of course, can make a precedent if there is none.

The theory upon which this bill was brought in, as I understood it, was that it was necessary for the more effectual prosecution of the war; that is, to encourage the production of food-stuffs, which encouragement was made necessary by reason of war conditions. This is to put into the law its purpose, and for that reason I offer the amendment. I very much hope that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], the chairman of the committee, after consultation with other members of the committee, can see his way clear to accept it.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I have consulted with gentlemen who are vitally interested in this proposition, and they feel that making it necessary for the President to issue a proclamation—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Secretary of Agriculture—

Mr. LEVER. For the Secretary of Agriculture to issue a proclamation, conditioned upon his investigation of the facts, will throw around the operation so much red tape as to delay the effectiveness of it, and for that reason I shall feel constrained to vote against it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Chairman, while I deeply regret that the chairman of the committee and the mem-

bers of the committee can not see the way clear to make the passage easy by accepting it and approving of it, I shall have to appeal to the Committee of the Whole to consider it very carefully and in the hope that they will consider it favorably. The purpose of the bill, as it has been pressed upon us from the beginning to the end, was to protect the Nation's war interests. Is that true or is it not true? Is the war being used as a cloak here to put over a proposition to which no 10 men in this House would agree except placed upon that basis? Do we mean that, which has been laid as the basis of this bill from the beginning until now?

Mr. BURNETT. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not a fact that the chairman of the committee himself stated from the outset that he would not support it except as a war measure?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know as I stated it, but I will state it now.

Mr. BURNETT. You did before.

Mr. LEVER. But, practically, saying so does not make it any more so.

Mr. BURNETT. It does not make it any less so.

Mr. RUBEY. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee this, as I realize he is in earnest in this matter: How long do you think it would take the Secretary of Agriculture to make such investigation as he might feel obligated to make under this amendment before he would be prepared to issue his proclamation? And at this time, if we are going to use it at all, we will need it within the next 10 days.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I take it that he will have abundant time to make that investigation before this bill will pass the Senate. I venture to say that.

Mr. RUBEY. Will he have authority to make it?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. He will be thinking about it.

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. If he keeps in touch with the situation as much as other men will he not be able soon to determine the necessity of this legislation?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know, but I think he ought to be required to make the investigation.

Mr. GORDON. Is there a single legitimate purpose provided for in this bill that was not included in the legislation brought in here by the Committee on Agriculture a year ago?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, I would rather not answer that question for reasons that the gentleman will understand. Yes; I will answer it. I think the bill that was brought in covered all the necessities.

Mr. GORDON. Both purposes?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes. Now, I have answered the question.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will prevail. I think it ought to prevail. If it does not prevail, then we have gone into the realm of—

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

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON], as to whether or not there was any precedent for the issuance of a proclamation addressed to the people of the United States—

Mr. LONDON. By a member of the Cabinet—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; by a member of the Cabinet, the gentleman from Tennessee replied that he knew of none. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he does not think it would probably establish a very dangerous precedent to authorize a Cabinet officer to issue a proclamation? If the power is granted at all, should it not apply to the power of the President of the United States instead of a Cabinet officer?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, the answer which I made to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York was that I did not remember whether there was a precedent, and I do not; but inasmuch as the entire operation of the machinery in this bill is placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, and inasmuch as the President has nothing to do in any sort of way under the terms of the act with its operation, it occurred to me as being proper to permit that official who had the authority under the terms of the act to issue the proclamation. But I would not object to making it incumbent on the President to make the proclamation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does not the gentleman think that it would be wiser for the President to make the proclamation?

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to close the debate now while anybody wants to speak, but I ask unanimous con-

sent that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes. I wonder if gentlemen who have asked for five minutes would not be content with three minutes?

Mr. BUTLER. Two for five.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to have five minutes. I have not yet spoken on the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, make it 35 minutes, the Chair to control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto conclude in 35 minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move at the proper time to strike out this paragraph. I would like to have five minutes on that.

Mr. LEVER. I presume the gentleman can get five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Would not the gentleman's request preclude that?

Mr. LEVER. No; I would not think so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Would it not be better to give each Member speaking five minutes?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to move to close the debate. I have not done it in the consideration of this bill, but I have almost reached the point of physical exhaustion on this floor here for the last three or four days. While I have tried to be liberal, I do not want to be forced to move to close debate, but I shall feel, unless gentlemen are a little bit liberal with me and the committee in charge of this bill, that I shall have to do it. I will modify my request, Mr. Chairman, by asking unanimous consent that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto shall close in 40 minutes, to be controlled by the Chair.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded, which is equivalent to an objection.

Mr. LEVER. Then I move—

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman moves, I will make the point of no quorum.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts is only trying to limit these speeches to three minutes. I wonder if the gentlemen who have requested time will not be willing to accept that proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be concluded in 40 minutes, and that the gentlemen speaking during that 40 minutes be limited to 3 minutes each. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I suggest the substitute, that all debate on the bill and all amendments be concluded in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that this is the last section of the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, people may want to strike out the last word, and all that.

Mr. LEVER. Nobody is objecting.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I withdraw my suggestion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the Chair to control the time, and that the speeches be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman can not include in his motion.

Mr. LEVER. Then I withdraw that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes. The question is on agreeing to that motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PRICE] is recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture says in its report that they recognize that the farm-labor situation is the most serious one to the farmers of this Nation. I think that any man who comes from an agricultural section of this country will agree to that proposition. I know that in my own district it is an acute problem, and I want to say that something will have to be done to cure it. While the legislation proposed in this bill is not ideal, yet I propose to support it, because it may, perhaps, accomplish something.

The chairman of the committee stated here yesterday, in answer to a question, that if this bill were passed it would be likely to produce, according to their calculations, some 30,000,000 additional bushels of wheat in this country, and he warned this committee that the time might come when the bread line might be interrupted between this country and France, and where this prospective 30,000,000 bushels might be the deciding factor in this war.

With that idea in mind, Mr. Chairman, it becomes a serious matter to vote against this proposition, however much we may dislike this sort of legislation. The fact is that 1,000,000 bushels of grain might be the deciding factor in this war, and I shall therefore support this bill.

The main point I wish to discuss, however, is farm labor. I saw a statement the other day from Prof. Wood, president of the agricultural college of my State, in which he said that, according to the best estimates that they could get, the farms of Maryland are short 9,000 men. Assuming that one skilled farm laborer can cultivate 20 acres of ground, that would mean 180,000 acres of productive land in my State that will not be tilled. I presume these same conditions exist all over the country. The causes of this are various. One is that the munition factories and governmental activities generally have taken great numbers of farm laborers at high wages away from the farms. Another is that the draft law has operated to the detriment of the farm and has resulted in many places in stripping the farms of labor. It is proposed that another draft of farm laborers be made. I want to say to you that the farms of this Nation can not stand another drain by the draft or from any other cause, if you are to produce the food that is to win this war.

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

Mr. PRICE. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. As it is important to have something to eat at home and abroad, does not my friend believe that the farm laborers will be cared for under existing law, or under a law to be passed before the next draft?

Mr. PRICE. I hope so; but as a matter of fact it has not been done, and it is recognized that there is a defect in that respect, because the War Department has recently modified its rules and regulations to the extent that they are placing farm laborers at the bottom of class 1. I do not believe they ought to be in class 1 at all, and I propose to offer a joint resolution, to bring this matter before Congress, placing farm laborers in a deferred classification.

Mr. BLAND. Does not the gentleman know that we passed a furlough bill for the benefit of farm laborers, to enable those who are in camps and cantonments to go home and help in putting in the crop?

Mr. PRICE. I do.

Mr. BLAND. Does the gentleman know whether it is going to be put in operation or not?

Mr. PRICE. That is simply a recognition that there is something wrong with the system. I fear that before this law can be put into full operation another call will be made further depleting the farms of their labor and the farmers already in camps be sent away, thereby rendering this furlough law of little value. It is evident, therefore, that some additional law or regulations must be passed to meet this very serious situation. I therefore propose to introduce to-day a resolution that will, in my opinion, largely cure the existing trouble should it be acted on favorably by this Congress.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that under the rules and regulations that the Provost Marshal General has adopted shipbuilders and those engaged in the shipbuilding industry are put into a deferred classification and, according to the testimony of Gen. Crowder, that has operated to the very great advantage of that industry.

Mr. PRICE. That is true, and the resolution that I have referred to is intended to treat farm labor in the same way, and I have no doubt will operate with success, the same as shipyard labor. I shall insert the text of the resolution in the Record, so that gentlemen may familiarize themselves with its provisions, and at the proper time I shall ask the Committee on Military Affairs to report it to this House for its consideration.

The resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 272.

Joint resolution authorizing and directing the President of the United States to so amend the selective-service regulations as to place in a deferred classification all registrants who are bona fide farmers or farm laborers, including owners and managers of farms and overseers of farm operations and laborers regularly employed thereunder, and to formulate regulations for special "food-producing classification lists" by the local boards and prescribing that the classification of such registrant shall not be changed so long as he shall be engaged in such occupation, except that so long as he remains on the "food-producing classification list" he shall be regarded as not available for military service, and in all respects as though he stood classified in class 5.



Whereas the United States of America is now at war with the Imperial Government of Germany and her ally, Austria, for the successful prosecution of which we have pledged all the resources of the Nation; and

Whereas one of the chief and fundamental resources is the products of the farm; and

Whereas the magnitude of our war preparations has made such an unusual demand upon labor that farm laborers in large numbers have been induced by high wages to abandon their usual occupation on the farm; and

Whereas the operations of the selective-draft act as administered through the selective-service regulations has resulted in a further depletion of farm labor; and

Whereas further depletion of said labor will seriously affect the production of the farm which will prove disastrous to the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the raising of food and the increased production thereof is absolutely necessary to the cause of human freedom to which we have pledged ourselves; and

Whereas the Food Administration is continually calling upon our people to further conserve food, as well as calling upon our farmers for increased production; and

Whereas our allies are constantly reminding us that more American farm products than heretofore supplied will be required to feed them, and our own large and continually increasing Army; and

Whereas the selective-service regulations has made especial provision for workers in shipyards while engaged in the building of ships, which for the successful prosecution of the war is next in importance to food itself, which regulations have resulted in an ample supply of labor for this purpose; and

Whereas we believe some special regulations regarding farm labor will bring equally as good results: Therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to so amend the selective-service regulations as to place in a deferred classification all registrants who are bona fide farmers or farm laborers, including owners and managers of farms and overseers of farm operations and laborers regularly employed thereunder, and that a special "food-producing classification list" of registrants shall be made by the local boards under such regulations as the President may prescribe, and the classification of such registrant shall not be changed so long as he shall be engaged in such occupation, except that so long as he remains on the "food-producing classification list" he shall be regarded as not available for military service, and in all respects as though he stood classified in class 5.

Mr. Chairman, the operation of the draft law has already taken 215,000 men from the farms of the Nation, which is 20 per cent of the total and more than the proper proportion, as less than 13 per cent of the total population of the country are farmers. It is therefore evident, Mr. Chairman, that the farm has contributed more than its proper share to the National Army already raised. In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, it has been estimated that 1,750,000 farmers have been induced by high wages to leave the farms to engage in munition manufacture and other war work, leaving the farms of the Nation already depleted of about 2,000,000 workers. If this estimate is correct, or approximately so, and this shortage can not be replaced, it means that 40,000,000 acres of productive land in America can not be cultivated, and are therefore eliminated from food production. This, too, at a time when we are called upon to feed about two-thirds of the world. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but when to fail may mean the loss of the war, which means the destruction of all our dearly bought liberties, in fact the destruction of civilization itself. In less than one year of war we have already felt the necessity of food conservation and have in fact realized an actual shortage in some foods. Every day we are warned by the Food Administration of the necessity for cutting down our food supplies, and almost every day our governmental agencies are urging increased food production to make sure the feeding of our soldiers and sailors and our people as well as the feeding of the armies and peoples of our associates in the war.

In the face of these conditions we find large numbers of farm laborers included in class 1 A of the draft uncertain as to the date of their call to service, which further embarrasses the farm operations of the country. This embarrassment and uncertainty should be removed and removed immediately. I have made an investigation in my own district and find from the figures submitted by the local boards that just about 25 per cent of the registrants classified in class 1 are farmers. I presume this is a fair index for the country at large. Should a call for another million be made, that would take another quarter million men from the farms, which in my judgment spells disaster and in all likelihood will be the direct cause of the interruption of the bread line between the storehouses of America and the battle fields of Europe. This is too serious a matter to trifle with or take any chances on, and I warn this House and the country now before it is too late. My mail is filled daily with complaints from farmers setting forth clearly the situation and its dangers, and I urge upon the Members of this House the wisdom—aye, the necessity—for the protection of the farmer in this labor crisis which also means the protection and perhaps the preservation of the Nation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the words "Secretary of Agriculture" where they appear in the amendment and insert the word "President."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see the gentleman from Tennessee on the floor, but he stated to me that he would have no objection to that amendment.

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

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the section.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WALSH: Page 6, line 1, after the word "means," strike out the word "in" and insert "outside," and strike out the words "and elsewhere."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that this money, for rent and the employment of labor, shall be expended outside the District of Columbia. I do not think this is a good time to bring more clerks and Government employees into the District or to spend more money for rents here. Furthermore, inasmuch as this work is to be carried on in the wheat-growing States, I submit that the Government can establish its headquarters, for instance, at Bozeman, Mont., where they have a great agricultural college, and the work can be more economically and more efficiently conducted in that part of the country, and the administrative officers can keep in touch with the Department of Agriculture here in Washington and carry on the work just as well as if we brought down a hundred or two clerks, messengers, stenographers, and assistant superintendents and put them here in Washington.

Mr. SEARS. I agree with much of what the gentleman has said, but the gentleman said this was going to be carried on only in certain States. I call attention of the House to the fact that the House amended that, and now we can supply seed wheat to sow anywhere.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman yields to me the remainder of his time.

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can not yield his time.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Does your amendment apply to the amendment that is pending?

Mr. WALSH. My amendment applies to the section.

Mr. GORDON. Then it is not in order at this time. I want to speak on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. WALSH. I have answered the gentleman's question. Now I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY] for a question, and then I will yield the floor.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What the gentleman says seems to apply solely to the disposition of seed. It does not seem to apply to the mobilization of labor. For instance, his illustration as to headquarters, which he said could be established in Montana, would hardly apply to the mobilization of farm labor.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, no; and you could not mobilize farm labor from an office in the District of Columbia. That, I assume, will have to be done by agents, who will be sent out from the Department of Agriculture. It is unnecessary that they should establish headquarters here in Washington for that purpose. They can be sent out, and I believe are now being sent out by the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture, also. What I mean to accomplish by my amendment is to have the headquarters for the loaning of this money and the making of the arrangements to supply the seed at a place within the reach of the States where the aid is going to be given, and not to clutter up Washington with additional clerks, stenographers, and other employees and with the renting of other buildings. Let us keep some of them out there nearer to the scene of the action which the department is going to conduct.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does not the gentleman believe that the purpose of his amendment could be accomplished better by changing the wording of it?

Mr. WALSH. In reply to the gentleman I do not think that any part of this \$100,000 appropriated under this act will ever be used for the purpose of mobilizing labor, because I think that is already being done under the appropriation which the department now has, and that it can be conducted without disturbing this appropriation in any way whatever.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all of the debate upon this bill. The impassioned argument of the chairman of the committee yesterday reminded me of a little story

that appeared in Life a few months ago. It was an interview between a landlord and his chef. He called the chef in and says, "You cut the portions in half and I will double the prices, and we will win this war." [Laughter.]

That sums up in the practical effect of the argument of the chairman of the committee. "Why," he said, "you are threatened with the bread line, and there is a great necessity. Mr. Hoover has informed the committee that there is need for an increase in the production of wheat." That is wholly beside the question of the bill. The President's letter says that any necessary and proper legislation to increase the production of wheat ought to be enacted. I agree to that.

The object of this debate is to find out whether or not this legislation is practical and necessary, and whether or not it will accomplish the purpose. The legislation as reported by the committee was a mere scheme to give money to a lot of the "ragtag and bobtail" who do not have any money or credit enough in the community in which they live to borrow any. That is all there was to the bill. Every practical and sensible provision of the bill was included in the Agricultural bill a year ago. There was authority there to mobilize, as far as practicable, farm labor, and to sell seed to the farmers at cost for cash. That is as far as the Government ought to go. This going around and looking for somebody to loan money to for the Government, who can not get trusted where he is known, is disgraceful and will not accomplish anything. It is pandering to a lot of the "ragtag and bobtail" that have no credit—proposing to take Government money and loan it without security to fellows who can not borrow from anybody else, on the pretense that they are going to save us from starvation. [Applause.]

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. BAER. Does the gentleman consider that the shipyards and the war industries to which the Government is loaning money—

Mr. GORDON. Oh, we are not loaning any money to them without security, and there is the real point.

Mr. BAER. What kind of security? They have nothing but the "know how."

Mr. GORDON. No; they have plenty of land and other property—millions of dollars' worth.

Mr. SWITZER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. SWITZER. Under the provisions of the war-finance bill, does not the man have to bring a certificate that the banks will not loan him any money?

Mr. GORDON. That is a different thing. The war-finance bill is based upon a condition created by the Government itself in monopolizing the credits of the country by the sale of Government bonds, and there was a real necessity for that legislation. That legislation does not propose to give anybody anything.

Mr. BAER. It is the same way here.

Mr. GORDON. The only necessity for this legislation is that a lot of fellows who have not got any money or credit or character, who can not borrow any money from individuals, want to borrow it of the Government without security, and that is all there is to this bill. [Laughter and applause.] You have my opinion of the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the discussion on this bill for three or four days with a good deal of interest, and am very much surprised in many instances. Especially have I been surprised just now in listening to the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gordon], speaking of those who will be the recipients of the benefits of this bill as the ragtag and bobtail of society and of the country.

I come from a State, while not mentioned in this bill as one entitled to the provisions of the bill, yet we raise a great deal of spring wheat in Colorado, and for the past 30 years I have been intimately and well acquainted with the farmers of that district.

The men who will make application for the provisions of the bill are the homestead farmers, and in my judgment they are men of very high character. Perhaps they may be unable to furnish the security required by banks to buy seed. They are high class in every respect. They are honest and patriotic citizens. They have been reduced by circumstances over which probably they had no control to the condition they now occupy, "that of homestead entrymen," builders of the great West.

Mr. VENABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I will.

Mr. VENABLE. The theory of the bill is that these people who need this aid are not able to borrow \$450, or any part thereof, in the local communities where they live. Hence it becomes necessary that the Government should extend to them credit without security. What is the reason that the people in

the gentleman's district are in this condition that they are not able to borrow any money at all in the local community?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Let me answer that by saying that these people who will perhaps be the beneficiaries under this bill are residing on homesteads to which they have not secured title, and the only security they would be able to offer is that which is contemplated in this bill—a mortgage on their crop, a chattel mortgage which would require in that western country a very high rate of interest, which they ought not to be called upon to pay.

Mr. VENABLE. That is all based upon the property qualification. Why can not they get some loan on character?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. If there was a plethora of money in that country, as is true in portions of the country which are fully developed, money could be loaned at rates of interest that would probably take care of applicants for loans of that character. There are very large demands for money in the West and the banks are not always able to supply that demand where undoubted security is offered; hence the man who has little security or none to offer can not be or is not taken care of.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Yes.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman state what rate of interest these pioneers who have no title to real estate must pay?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Ten per cent, I will say, usually, and not infrequently 12 to 15 per cent on chattel security. At two different times during my residence in Colorado I have contributed in raising money by subscription in order to furnish seed to homestead farmers. And I want to tell you that we never lost anything. If they were not able to repay the first year they repaid whenever they had a crop that would enable them to do so.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman says that they have to pay from 10 to 12 or 15 per cent interest out there?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. At least that upon chattel security.

Mr. KEARNS. If that condition exists in the gentleman's State, ought it not to be remedied?

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. It is a condition that will regulate very largely itself with development, but when there is a large demand for money, as there is in the development of a new country, it is only reasonable that a high rate of interest should obtain. I am very much interested also in the labor provision of this bill. How labor can be procured I am unable to say, but the demand for labor, if we are going to increase the crop production as we should in that country, needs very careful consideration by this House.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated many times during this debate that it is proposed to have the Government extend its credit without security. There is nothing to justify that statement. The Government is to be secured by every grain of wheat produced by the man who gets the money, and, in addition to that, the Government is to be protected by a criminal provision in the bill under which the borrowers could be sent to the penitentiary if he uses the money or grain furnished for any purpose other than that for which loaned, or sells one grain of the wheat raised before the Government is fully repaid. Let us see if this is not a fair deal for the Government. Out in the northwestern country there are farmers who know how to raise wheat. In that territory the production of wheat is more or less hazardous. They had a drought in some of those sections last year. Many of these farmers are homesteaders. They have no established personal credit. The banks can not supply their necessities if they did have. The Government says to these farmers, "We are engaged in fighting a great war, we need more wheat." Gentlemen, this legislation is not for the benefit of these people who live in that territory; it is for the benefit of the Nation. Under the provisions of this bill the Government says to those people who live up there, "We recognize that the Government must have more wheat than would probably be needed under ordinary conditions, more than the land in prospect of wheat production will probably produce. The Government wants you to do your best to help out this situation. The Government knows you have got to take a chance, and the Government of the United States is willing to bet the cost of the seed wheat that you can raise a crop of spring wheat if you will bet your labor and the use of your land. Do this, and let us see if we can not raise more wheat in America than we now propose to do." Gentlemen, that is all there is to this bill. [Applause.] Just a plain practical trade between a Nation needing a large wheat production and a lot of farmers who, if given a little help, can help meet that need.

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

Mr. SUMNERS. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. The necessity for this legislation is based upon the fact that these men have failed to make a crop on these lands, and if that is true, is it not a bad business proposition



in times like these, when dollars are so much needed, to gamble \$7,500,000 of the people's money?

Mr. SUMNERS. Let me answer you. The year before last I had a piece of overflow land that I wanted my tenant to plant some wheat on. Wheat was high, labor was high, and the man could not afford to take the whole risk. I told him that I would risk the price of the grain, the seed wheat, if he would risk the labor. By my taking a part of the hazard he was able to take the rest of it and we won. That is this proposition. [Applause.] These men are on their own homes. They will try to raise wheat there or not at all. I understand that that territory is fairly dependable; and if it were not for the fact that the country is new, that it had a drought last year, and wheat is so high now these people would need no help perhaps. But I repeat, gentlemen, this bill is not for those people. It is for the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. In this case, instead of asking the landlord to make the gamble, you are asking the Government to take the tax money of the people and gamble it.

Mr. SUMNERS. The Government of the United States is more interested than the landlord is. Besides, many of these people are on their own new-made homes. The Government of the United States, if it be a gamble, is gambling for its life. That is what some of my colleagues from the South do not seem to appreciate. The Nation's life is at stake; and the Nation says, "We must have more bread; we have utilized certain territory for wheat, but we do not have enough; we have got to go out into the territory where men take chances, even where men take big chances." Up in the Northwest, farmers went up against a drought last year and they have not got the money this year to buy seed and make a crop; they can not borrow the money. The United States will put up the wheat if they will go out there on those plains of the West, plant a crop, and harvest it. The Government then says to them: "This is a straight business deal. This is no something-for-nothing proposition. If you sell one grain of that wheat before paying the money you owe the Government, you will be put in the penitentiary." When a man mortgages his grain and his labor in that fashion, you gentlemen of the opposition get up here and talk about the Government having no security. These men hypothecate their liberty and put a mortgage upon their good names as a guaranty of integrity of transaction. They put a mortgage upon every grain of wheat that comes from their honest toil, and yet you talk about no security and denounce this as a paternalistic and socialistic proposition. Where are you going to get the wheat which we have got to have? I want results.

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

Mr. SUMNERS. No; I can not; my time has almost expired. Just the other day we set aside \$500,000,000 to be loaned to private concerns, and one of the conditions provided in the act was that no concern could get any of that money unless its credit was below that of the best commercial institutions. You gentlemen of the opposition practically all voted for that bill. You swallowed it down and did not bat an eye. But when a man who is out in the fields of this country and is willing to help this country win a great war comes here and asks for a little pittance, pledges the use of his land and the strength of his body to repay the debt, you talk about socialism. Mortgages every ounce of the energy in his body from the beginning of the planting season until the thrasher ceases its hum, and you talk about no security! What do you want? He is giving you the best security on earth.

We take some chance; but we take a bigger chance if we refuse to take this chance. I am willing to take the chance with the money, but I am not willing to take the chance of not doing the best I can to insure the maximum of effort to produce the grain necessary to sustain the morale of our people during the trying times upon which we are just entering and to sustain our boys on the other side who to-day, while we debate this bill, are receiving their baptism of fire. [Applause.]

Mr. MORGAN. There is one matter that I presented yesterday that I desire to call attention to again. Section 1 of the bill limits loans to the crop of 1918. The wheat planted this fall—in 1918—will be the crop of 1919. Hence no loans could be made to aid farmers planting wheat this year. I insist that the bill should be amended so as to apply to wheat sowed or crops planted in 1918. To say that we will aid the farmers who sow wheat in the spring of 1918 and not aid those who sow wheat in the fall of 1918, to my mind, is an unjustifiable discrimination. But beyond this, the object is increased wheat production. We should provide for this increased production in both the spring-wheat area and the fall-wheat area. Now, why not amend this bill so it would apply to crops planted in 1918? Certainly the spring-wheat area is very limited. If this

bill is worth anything at all, it ought to include the contingency of what might happen this fall. So I appeal to gentlemen from the State of Kansas, to gentlemen from northwestern Texas, to gentlemen from eastern Colorado, to gentlemen from Nebraska, to my colleagues from Oklahoma, and to all of you, to permit this bill to be amended so that it will apply to crops planted in 1918. Do not discriminate against three-fourths of the semiarid regions where one-third of the wheat of the United States is produced from year to year. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that this amendment is offered at the last moment by an enemy of this bill, and is being supported by men who have said in this debate that this bill would do no good, because it was to be passed so late. It was said there was no use—

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have but four minutes. That it was no use to pass this bill because it will become a law so late it can not be put into operation until this planting season is over. By offering this amendment it means the adding of red tape to the administration of the bill, with consequent delays, and if those gentlemen were right when they were talking yesterday, that this bill ought not to be passed and the House ought not to take up its time to consider it, because it was too late, then to-day, if they are consistent, they ought not to be in favor of this amendment, which will delay the administration of the act.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is not referring to the amendment offered by myself?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am talking of the one offered by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. What was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. STAFFORD. To have the clerical work done outside of the city of Washington.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is silly, because there ought not to be any unnecessary restrictions on the administration of this bill. Action by the department will have to be quick if the law is to get seed where it is needed before the planting season is over.

Mr. WALSH. It is right in the bill. They can do it, and I am compelling them to do it; so if it is silly, the committee brought the silliness into it.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There is nothing in this bill to compel the Secretary of Agriculture to take the administrative force to any particular point of the United States, and ought not to be. It is true that the Department of Agriculture is working on a plan to put this bill in operation. The Secretary has done just as much as he possibly can in that direction, and just as soon as this bill is passed I do not doubt it will be put into operation very quickly if we do not load it down with red tape; if we do not load it down by passing amendments like the one offered by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee—offered by a man who has shown he is unfriendly to this bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman favor the bill independent of its war character?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There is no need of raising that question, because there is a war on now and everybody recognizes there is a war necessity for this bill. The author of this bill would never have asked for its consideration had it not been for the need of an increased food supply for our people and for the armies of the United States, France, England, and Italy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. Efforts have been made to overload the bill with amendments, and some of doubtful value have been added during this consideration of the measure. I am supporting the bill for the reasons ably set forth by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] and others. Rather than continued amendments I would have preferred to see the bill tightened to its original purpose, and the section which appropriates \$2,500,000 for an Agricultural Department bureau of labor stricken out. However, I did not press such an amendment, as I desired not to delay the bill. In my opinion the new bureau will overlap and run counter to the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor, produce confusion, unnecessary competition, and additional governmental expenditure. But that section has been retained, so detailed discussion of it now is unnecessary. I have opposed the various amendments, and voted to keep the bill alive when the southern cyclone suddenly sprang up against it and

nearly swamped it the other night. However, one amendment is pending that I think might be adopted, the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. For some time I have thought that additional side-line governmental activities in connection with the war should not be brought into the overcrowded city of Washington. I note that the Shipping Board a while back seriously contemplated moving to Philadelphia, with its thousands of office employees. It should have moved there. This seed-purchase bureau might be in Chicago or Minneapolis rather than here. But I presume that the headquarters of this new activity will prefer to be in Washington, because here we find the headquarters of the new weekly Government publication known as the Seed Distributor, or something like that, a 5 or 6 weeks' old "war baby" published in the interests of—

Mr. SWITZER. Of the borrower?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not the interests of the borrower. And then there is the United States Employment Service Bulletin—a weekly newspaper. It is another "war baby" and only 8 weeks' old. And there is the Emergency Fleet News—also a "war baby" and about 4 weeks' old. There seems to be dozens of these departmental newspapers being printed by the Government nowadays, when everything is congested, sent out under departmental frank, literally jamming the mails, and all proclaiming themselves house organs, and nearly all of them useless.

Mr. WALSH. When the gentleman said "house organ," did he mean Col. House?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no; but, of course, there is the Official Bulletin, which is "higher up" than these "seed" publications. I mean house organs in the sense that department stores use the phrase. These Government newspapers call themselves house organs, but in reality they are departmental organs.

I sincerely hope that the liberal sum mentioned in this bill for printing and the like in connection with the putting out of seed in the stricken districts of the Northwest will not, any part of it, be used for another governmental newspaper. Even though the wheat situation entitles this bill to come in as a war necessity, these governmental weekly newspapers are simply masquerading when they pretend that they are necessary to the conduct of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I hope this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will be adopted. All the time during consideration of this bill in the Committee on Agriculture it was urged that it was a war measure. It was put at no time on any other ground. It was urged that it was necessary to pass this bill at this time because of conditions existing by reason of the war, and it was conceded, eliminating that view, in normal times there would be no justification for it. Not only was it urged all the time before the committee as a justification and a reason for passing this bill that it was a war measure, but it has been continuously stated and emphasized upon the floor of the House from the commencement of this discussion up to this present moment that it is a war measure, and that was the justification for passing the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I regret, my friend, I have not the time.

So if that is true, I see no reason on earth why it should not be stated in the bill itself. In all other war measures that have been passed statements, though not exactly similar to this, but sufficient to put them upon war grounds, have been included. Now, the delay which might occur by this provision if put in the bill is not well founded, it seems to me, for the reason that this matter has been under consideration for a considerable length of time. It is stated that arrangements have been made already to put it into effect immediately. If arrangements have been made, if the investigation has already taken place, then no delay can possibly occur. The President can get the facts promptly and act without delay. [Applause.]

Mr. LEVER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Always, to the chairman of our committee, with pleasure.

Mr. LEVER. After a reconsideration of the Garrett amendment, I think I am in position to say that, as far as the chairman of the committee is concerned, he has no objection to it.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am very much gratified to hear the chairman of the committee make that statement. I call the attention of the House to the fact that now the chairman of the committee [Mr. LEVER] states that upon reconsideration of the amendment, and realizing the force and effect of it, so far as he personally is concerned he will not object

to it, but will vote for it. The chairman of the committee being for the amendment, I hope there will be no serious opposition to it. So far as I am concerned, I am always in favor of stating the facts and the truth, no matter what it is, in bills as well as everywhere else, and if it is the fact and it is the truth that the foundation, the reason, and justification for the passage of this bill is that it is a war measure, then there should be no objection on the part of anybody to stating the truth in the face of the bill and putting it upon that ground. I know the adoption of this amendment will bring considerable support to the bill which it does not have now. Its adoption and incorporation into the bill will promptly remove considerable determined opposition to it, and therefore I urge upon the friends of the bill the importance of this amendment and assure them that its adoption will be very beneficial. I hope the amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the amendment, because it would involve delay that ought not to be made possible. This bill should be passed at once, and the Secretary, without a moment's delay, must enter upon the execution of it, if it is to be of any effect whatever. I am opposed to the amendment for the further reason that it makes the execution of the law depend upon the proclamation of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Congress of the United States, if this bill becomes a law, will itself have declared that it is a war measure, and that it is wise and necessary during the existing emergency, and Congress does not need to wait for the word of the Secretary of Agriculture or any other official. The Congress knows enough itself to determine some of these things. Why should we delegate authority to one after another of the executive officers? Why, one watching legislation, as time goes on, sees bill after bill passed, law after law enacted, to be executed "in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture," the "Secretary of the Interior," the "Secretary of War," and so forth. Is Congress losing its power to think and act for itself? We have considered this measure day after day, and we know as much about it as does the Secretary of Agriculture. Everyone who has spoken of it has said that this would never have been suggested but for the war emergency, the need of additional supply of wheat because of the war. We know that. We have declared it. The passage of this act declares it. We do not need to have the Secretary of Agriculture or anyone else declare it and issue a proclamation to that effect.

I trust the House will retain a little bit of its independence and pass this law without referring it to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. In any of these other bills that have been passed as war measure has there been any such an amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Sometimes, I think, but not often.

Mr. LITTLE. The President has announced, with many of them, that they were war measures?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. We have declared them war measures, and we have not left it to be determined by an executive officer whether we were right or wrong in so declaring. And I say that with respect for the Secretary of Agriculture, one of the great men of this administration, an official for whom I have the highest regard. I do not wish Congress to humiliate itself by "passing the buck" to the Secretary of Agriculture or anybody else.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman knows the amendment has been amended as now to give that power to the President of the United States?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Congress is abundantly able to think for itself, and ought to do so in some of these matters, and I object to an amendment of that kind in any form.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Gentlemen, I want to say a word in regard to this legislation. I do not know that I can inform you any on the matter, but if there is any kind of legislation that I ought to be posted on it is legislation of this kind.

I spent 20 years in buying from and selling grain to farmers, and every spring every grain buyer was confronted with this difficulty of furnishing seed to the farmers. Now, my district, at the present time, I presume, is as independent as any district in this country would be as far as legislation of this character is concerned, and I presume it will not aid them in any way. I will say, however, that I believe that there are places in this country where this character of legislation will be of great



assistance in producing more foodstuffs, and I expect at this time to vote for the measure, and I do it fully conscious that there are some things in the bill that probably ought not to be there. However, I believe, as a whole, the measure is meritorious and ought to receive the support of every Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, is there any time left?

The CHAIRMAN. There are six minutes remaining.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take two minutes just simply to say that I am absolutely and unalterably opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I do not think this is a time for this House to say that we are going to pass a bill; that we are going to vote for a bill; but that it shall not go into effect until the President of the United States issues a proclamation saying it is a war necessity. I have unbounded confidence in the President, and I have no objections to his issuing such a proclamation, but this is simply a plan devised by gentlemen here in order that they may put themselves in position where they can support the measure. This amendment is put in here in order to relieve them of any responsibility in voting for the bill. Now, that is all there is to it. That is all the amendment is brought in here for. It is proposed by a gentleman who is absolutely opposed to the bill; has been opposed to it, and is opposed to everything in the bill from beginning to end. He brings this proposition in here in order that those who are opposed to the bill may protect themselves. Put this amendment on here and then they can all answer "yea" when the roll is called on the final passage of the bill. Now, that is all there is to it, and I am unalterably opposed to it. I hope the House will vote it down. [Applause.]

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

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, when the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] first came to my attention, I felt inclined to be opposed to it. But practically all of the legislation that we have had touching the war has been put upon the basis that it was a war measure in the act itself. I can see no objection to this amendment. I understand that the President must proclaim the necessity. I take it that, inasmuch as the President is in favor of the bill, he must have the facts upon which he forms his opinion. The Secretary of Agriculture has announced himself in favor of the bill, and he likewise must have the facts. So that I can not see that any special delay can be occasioned by writing this amendment into the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Is it not a fact that all the other legislation along this line has provided for proclamations by the President?

Mr. LEVER. That is very true. I said so in my opening statement. I am satisfied that the bill can not be hurt in its effectiveness by this amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman how it will be helped?

Mr. LEVER. It will be helped in this way: There are a great many gentlemen in the House who feel that legislation of this kind ought to be predicated upon war necessity, and they would like to say so in direct terms.

Mr. FARR. Do you not think the common sense of those gentlemen ought to rescue them from a different conclusion?

Mr. LEVER. Well, you know there are common sense and uncommon sense, and we will have to deal with both of them.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. And it would take away the idea that it is a precedent for all time to come?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly. This is only temporary legislation. It is not permanent legislation. I would not think for a second of voting for it in time of peace. I am going to vote for it because it is a war measure, and I will be glad to have the President of the United States so declare it to be and issue his proclamation.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. DECKER. Would it not be better for the House of Representatives to state on its own knowledge and information that it is a war measure? Why leave it to a coordinate branch of the administration to make a statement that we ourselves either believe or do not believe?

Mr. LEVER. My answer to that question is that the gentleman from Missouri has not offered an amendment to declare this a war measure. The proposition here is the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee to declare this a war measure. We are dealing with the proposition as we find it.

Mr. DECKER. I am heartily in favor of the bill, and support it on the ground that it is caused by the needs of the war, and I think that we are the ones that ought to state it in the bill.

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

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. Has the gentleman forgotten that the title of the bill as reported by the committee was "A bill to provide for the national security and defense and further to assure an adequate supply of food"? Is not that so?

Mr. LEVER. That is so.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That would be entirely true in time of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. RUBEY. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 78, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALSH: Page 6, line 1, after the word "means," strike out the word "in" and insert the word "outside"; and strike out the words "and elsewhere."

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

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new section.

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 6, after section 6, add the following as a new section:  
"Sec. 7. That the provisions of this act shall be construed to apply to any crop planted during the year 1918."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Under the rule, I understand, the committee automatically rises, and the previous question is ordered. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise and report back the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly 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 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, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on each amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands a separate vote on each amendment. The Clerk will report the first one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "in spring-wheat areas."

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 97, noes 19.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, after the word "of," and before the word "wheat," insert the word "corn."

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, after the word "oats," insert the word "rye."

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 25, after the word "eighteen," strike out all down to and including the word "therefore," on line 4 of page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No seed shall be furnished or supplied under the provisions of this act unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall first secure the payment of the price for the same by good and sufficient first lien on all seed so furnished and supplied and upon all crops to be produced therefrom."

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

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 4, after the word "that," strike out the rest of the line; line 5, strike out "accomplished." After the word "shall," strike out "as soon as"; line 6, strike out "possible after the close of each calendar year"; lines 8 and 9, strike out the words "during such calendar year," and insert, in line 4, after the word "that," the words "at the opening of the next regular session of Congress," so that as amended the section will read:

"SEC. 4. That at the opening of the next regular session of Congress the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be made to the Congress a detailed report showing all proceedings and transactions under this act. 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."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. WALSH) there were—ayes 102, noes 29.

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. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-six Members present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that section 4 of the bill as it now stands may be read for the information of the House, if that may interrupt the roll call. It is very short.

The SPEAKER. The fact has been ascertained that there is no quorum present, and you can not turn a wheel until you get one.

Mr. WINGO. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. We vote on the amendment, do we not?

The SPEAKER. Yes; you vote on the amendment that was just read.

Mr. WINGO. Would it not be proper to read the language?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. After you ascertain that there is not a quorum present, you can not do anything until you get a quorum. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which has just been read. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 184, nays 132; answered "present" 1, not voting 114, as follows:

YEAS—184.

Alexander	Browning	Carter, Okla.	Denison
Aswell	Brumbaugh	Chandler, Okla.	Dent
Austin	Buchanan	Church	Dominick
Ayres	Butler	Clark, Fla.	Doughton
Bacharach	Byrnes, S. C.	Clark, Pa.	Drane
Barnhart	Byrns, Tenn.	Claypool	Dunn
Beshlin	Campbell, Kans.	Collier	Dupré
Black	Campbell, Pa.	Connally, Tex.	Dyer
Bland	Candler, Miss.	Connally, Kans.	Fagan
Blanton	Cannon	Cox	Eagle
Brand	Cantrill	Crisp	Elliott
Britton	Caraway	DeLaney	Emerson

Fairchild, G. W.	Igoe	Moore, Ind.	Snyder
Farr	Ireland	Morgan	Stafford
Fisher	Jones, Tex.	Morin	Stearns
Foss	Juul	Mudd	Stedman
Francis	Kearns	Nicholls, S. C.	Steele
Freeman	Kelly, Pa.	Nichols, Mich.	Stephens, Miss.
Gallagher	Kettner	Oldfield	Sterling, Ill.
Gallivan	Kless, Pa.	Overstreet	Stevenson
Garland	Kincheloe	Park	Stines
Garner	Kitchin	Parker, N. J.	Strong
Garrett, Tenn.	Kraus	Phejan	Tague
Garrett, Tex.	LaGuardia	Platt	Taylor, Ark.
Gillett	Langley	Quin	Tilson
Glynn	Lazaro	Ragsdale	Treadway
Gordon	Linthicum	Rainey	Venable
Gray, N. J.	Little	Raker	Vinson
Greene, Vt.	Lonergan	Ramsey	Waldow
Gregg	Longworth	Rayburn	Waiker
Hamill	Lufkin	Riordan	Walsh
Harrison, Va.	McAndrews	Robinson	Walton
Haskell	McArthur	Rogers	Watkins
Hastings	McCormick	Romjue	Watson, Pa.
Heaton	McCulloch	Rose	Watson, Va.
Heflin	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.	Weaver
Helm	McKeown	Sanders, La.	Webb
Helvering	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanford	Welling
Holland	Magee	Saunders, Va.	Whaley
Houston	Mansfield	Shackleford	Wheeler
Howard	Martin	Shallenberger	White, Ohio
Huddleston	Mays	Sherry	Wilson, La.
Hull, Tenn.	Merritt	Shouse	Winslow
Humphreys	Mondell	Sisson	Woodward
Husted	Montague	Smith, Mich.	Wright
Hutchinson	Moore, Pa.	Snook	Young, Tex.

NAYS—132.

Almon	Fields	Lea, Cai.	Scott, Iowa
Anthony	Focht	Lee, Ga.	Scott, Mich.
Baer	Foster	Leshner	Sears
Bankhead	Frear	Lever	Sells
Barkley	French	Lobeck	Sims
Beakes	Fuller, Mass.	London	Sinnott
Bell	Godwin, N. C.	Lundeen	Slayden
Booher	Goodwin, Ark.	Lunn	Sloan
Browne	Graham, Ill.	McClintic	Small
Burnett	Green, Iowa	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Burroughs	Hadley	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snell
Cary	Hamilton, Mich.	McLemore	Steenerson
Cooper, Wis.	Hamlin	Mapes	Stephens, Nebr.
Cramton	Hardy	Mason	Summers
Crosser	Haugen	Nelson	Sweet
Currie, Mich.	Hawley	Nolan	Switzer
Dale, Vt.	Hayden	Norton	Temple
Dallinger	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Thompson
Davis	Hicks	Oliver, N. Y.	Tilman
Decker	Hilliard	Osborne	Timberlake
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Overmyer	Towner
Dickinson	Jacoway	Pou	Vestal
Dill	James	Purnell	Voigt
Dillon	Johnson, Ky.	Ramseyer	Volstead
Dixon	Johnson, Wash.	Randall	Wason
Doolittle	Keating	Rankin	Welty
Doremus	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	Williams
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Reed	Wilson, Ill.
Elston	King	Robbins	Wilson, Tex.
Esch	Kinkaid	Rowe	Wingo
Evans	Knutson	Rubey	Wise
Fairfield	La Follette	Rucker	Woods, Iowa
Ferris	Larsen	Russell	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Greene, Mass.

NOT VOTING—114.

Anderson	Edmonds	Kehoe	Rodenberg
Ashbrook	Ellsworth	Kennedy, R. I.	Rouse
Blackmon	Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Rowland
Borland	Fairchild, B. L.	Kreider	Sabath
Bowers	Fess	Lehlbach	Sanders, N. Y.
Brodbeck	Flood	Lenroot	Schall
Caldwell	Flynn	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Fordney	McKintley	Scully
Carlin	Fuller, Ill.	Madden	Sherwood
Carter, Mass.	Gandy	Maher	Siegel
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	Mann	Slemp
Classon	Glass	Meeker	Smith, C. B.
Cleary	Good	Miller, Minn.	Smith, T. F.
Coady	Goodall	Miller, Wash.	Sterling, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Gould	Moon	Sullivan
Cooper, W. Va.	Graham, Pa.	Mott	Swift
Copley	Gray, Ala.	Neely	Talbot
Costello	Griest	Olney	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Griffin	O'Shaunessy	Templeton
Curry, Cal.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Padgett	Thomas
Dale, N. Y.	Harrison, Miss.	Paige	Tinkham
Darrow	Hayes	Parker, N. Y.	Van Dyke
Davidson	Heintz	Peters	Vare
Denton	Hersey	Polk	Ward
Dewalt	Hollingsworth	Porter	White, Me.
Dies	Hood	Powers	Wood, Ind.
Donovan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pratt	Zihlman
Doelling	Jones, Va.	Price	
Drukker	Kahn	Roberts	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. GLASS with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. HERSEY.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. PRATT.



Mr. GARD with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.  
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. MOTT.  
 Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HAYES.  
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 Mr. MOON with Mr. MADDEN.  
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. MEEKER.  
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. ZIHLMAN.  
 Mr. PADGETT with Mr. PAIGE.  
 Mr. POLK with Mr. PETERS.  
 Mr. ROUSE with Mr. SANDERS of New York.  
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. PORTER.  
 Mr. SABATH with Mr. RODENBERG.  
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. SLEMP.  
 Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. SWIFT.  
 Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. TINKHAM.  
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. WARD.  
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. WHITE of Maine.  
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.  
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. CURRY of California.  
 Mr. DIES with Mr. KAHN.  
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.  
 Mr. KEHOE with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.  
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWLAND.  
 Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. ROBERTS.  
 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. GANDY with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WARD.  
 Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. COSTELLO.  
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. GOOD.  
 Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.  
 Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. FORDNEY.  
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. DENTON with Mr. FULLER of Illinois.  
 Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. CRAGO.  
 Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. GOOD.  
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. DARROW.  
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. GOODALL.  
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. DAVIDSON.  
 Mr. CLEARY with Mr. GOULD.  
 Mr. FLOOD with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. COADY with Mr. FESS.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 A quorum being present, the doors were opened.  
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.  
 The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUBEY as a substitute for the Volstead amendment: Page 3, line 18, after the word "act," insert: "or shall use money or grain procured under the provisions of this act for a purpose different from that for which the same shall have been obtained, or shall, without first repaying the indebtedness incurred for money or grain under this act, secrete or convert or suffer to be converted to his own use or to the use of another person the crop, or any part thereof, or any other property upon which such indebtedness is then secured by lien or mortgage."

The amendment was agreed to.  
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.  
 The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Page 6, line 3, after the word "act," add the following:  
 "Provided, however, That no expenditures or advances shall be made under this act unless and until the President shall determine and by proclamation declare that the same is necessary for the more effectual prosecution of the war."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.  
 The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DILLON) there were 115 ayes and 78 noes.  
 So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.  
 The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.  
 The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman on the committee?  
 Mr. MORGAN. I am not.  
 The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?  
 Mr. MORGAN. I am not.  
 The SPEAKER. Is there any gentleman opposed to the bill who wants to make a motion to recommit?  
 Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill with instructions to strike out section 2.  
 The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion,

The Clerk read as follows:  
 Mr. RAGSDALE moves to recommit the bill with instructions to strike out section 2 of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.  
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAGSDALE) there were 55 ayes and 197 noes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The question on ordering the yeas was taken; and the Speaker announced that 25 Members had risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was lost.  
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.  
 The question was taken; and there were—yeas 250, nays 67, answered "present" 4, not voting 110, as follows:

YEAS—250.

Alexander	Farr	Lazaro	Sanders, Ind.
Almon	Ferris	Lea, Cal.	Sanders, La.
Anthony	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Sanford
Aswell	Focht	Lever	Saunders, Va.
Austin	Fordney	Lithicum	Scott, Iowa
Ayres	Foss	Little	Scott, Mich.
Baer	Foster	London	Sells
Bankhead	Francis	Longan	Shackelford
Barkley	Frear	Longworth	Shallenberger
Barnhart	Freeman	Lufkin	Sherwood
Beakes	French	Lundeen	Sims
Beshlin	Gallagher	Lunn	Sinnott
Bland	Gallivan	McAndrews	Sisson
Blanton	Garland	McArthur	Sloan
Booher	Garrett, Tex.	McClintic	Small
Britten	Godwin, N. C.	McCormick	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Goodwin, Ark.	McCulloch	Smith, Mich.
Browning	Gould	McFadden	Snell
Brumbaugh	Graham, Ill.	McKenzie	Snook
Burnett	Gray, Ala.	McKeown	Snyder
Burroughs	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stedman
Butler	Gregg	McLaughlin, Pa.	Steele
Campbell, Kans.	Hadley	McLemore	Steenerson
Campbell, Pa.	Hamil	Magee	Stephens, Miss.
Candler, Miss.	Hamilton, Mich.	Mapes	Stephens, Nebr.
Cantrill	Hamlin	Martin	Stiness
Caraway	Haskell	Mason	Strong
Carlin	Haugen	Mays	Summers
Carter, Okla.	Hawley	Montague	Sweet
Cary	Hayden	Morgan	Swtizer
Chandler, Okla.	Heflin	Morin	Tague
Church	Helvering	Mudd	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Pa.	Hensley	Nelson	Temple
Claypool	Hicks	Nichols, Mich.	Thompson
Cornell, Kans.	Hilliard	Nolan	Tillman
Cooper, Wis.	Holland	Norton	Timberlake
Cox	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Tower
Cramton	Husted	Oliver, Ala.	Treadway
Crosser	Hutchinson	Oliver, N. Y.	Vestal
Currie, Mich.	Igoe	Osney	Vinson
Dallinger	Ireland	Osborne	Volgt
Davis	Jacoway	Overmyer	Volstead.
Decker	James	Parker, N. Y.	Waldow
Delaney	Johnson, Ky.	Phelan	Walker
Dempsey	Johnson, Wash.	Platt	Walton
Denison	Jones, Tex.	Pou	Watkins
Dickinson	Juul	Purnell	Watson, Pa.
Dill	Kearns	Quin	Weaver
Dillon	Keating	Raker	Webb
Dixon	Kelley, Mich.	Ramsey	Welling
Doolittle	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer	Welty
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Randall	Whaley
Doughton	Kettney	Reavis	Wheeler
Dowell	Key, Ohio	Reed	White, Ohio
Dunn	Kless, Pa.	Robbins	Williams
Dupré	Kincheloe	Robinson	Wilson, Ill.
Dyer	King	Rogers	Wilson, La.
Eagle	Kinkaid	Romjue	Wilson, Tex.
Emerson	Knutson	Rose	Wingo
Esch	Kraus	Rowe	Woods, Iowa
Evans	La Follette	Rubey	Young, N. Dak.
Fairchild, G. W.	Langley	Rucker	
Fairfield	Larsen	Russell	

NAYS—67.

Bell	Elston	Hull, Tenn.	Sherley
Black	Fisher	Humphreys	Shouse
Brand	Fuller, Mass.	Kitchin	Slayden
Buchanan	Garner	Leshar	Stafford
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett, Tenn.	Mansfield	Steagall
Byrns, Tenn.	Gillett	Merritt	Sterling, Ill.
Cannon	Glynn	Moon	Stevenson
Clark, Fla.	Gordon	Moore, Pa.	Tilson
Coller	Gray, N. J.	Nicholls, S. C.	Venable
Connally, Tex.	Greene, Vt.	Overstreet	Walsh
Crisp	Hardy	Park	Watson, Va.
Dale, Vt.	Harrison, Va.	Parker, N. J.	Winslow
Dent	Heaton	Ragsdale	Wise
Dominick	Helm	Rainey	Woodyard
Drane	Houston	Rayburn	Wright
Eagan	Howard	Riordan	Young, Tex.
Elliott	Huddleston	Sears	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.  
 Ashbrook  
 Greene, Mass.  
 Rankin  
 Wason

## NOT VOTING—110.

Anderson	Edmonds	Kennedy, R. I.	Rodenberg
Bacharach	Ellsworth	Kreider	Rouse
Blackmon	Estopinal	LaGuardia	Rowlan
Borland	Fairchild, B. L.	Lehbach	Sabath
Bowers	Fess	Lenroot	Sanders, N. Y.
Brodbeck	Flood	Littlepage	Schall
Caldwell	Flynn	Lobeck	Scott, Pa.
Carew	Fuller, Ill.	McKinley	Scully
Carter, Mass.	Gandy	Madden	Siegel
Chandler, N. Y.	Gard	Maher	Slemp
Classon	Glass	Mann	Smith, C. B.
Cleary	Good	Meeker	Smith, T. F.
Coady	Goodall	Miller, Minn.	Sterling, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Wash.	Sullivan
Cooper, W. Va.	Griest	Mondell	Swift
Copley	Griffin	Moore, Ind.	Talbott
Costello	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Taylor, Colo.
Crago	Harrison, Miss.	Neely	Templeton
Curry, Cal.	Hastings	O'Shaunessy	Thomas
Dale, N. Y.	Hayes	Padgett	Tinkham
Darrow	Helntz	Paige	Van Dyke
Davidson	Hersey	Peters	Vare
Denton	Hollingsworth	Polk	Ward
Dewalt	Hood	Porter	White, Me.
Dies	Johnson, S. Dak.	Powers	Wood, Ind.
Donovan	Jones, Va.	Pratt	Zihlman
Doollug	Kahn	Price	
Drukker	Kehoe	Roberts	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Miss RANKIN (for) with Mr. PORTER (against).  
Mr. BOWERS (for) with Mr. LEHLBACH (against).  
Mr. WASON (for) with Mr. TINKHAM (against).  
Mr. DARROW (for) with Mr. PAIGE (against).  
Mr. LOBECK (for) with Mr. BACHARACH (against).  
Mr. COSTELLO (for) with Mr. SABATH (against).  
Mr. WARD (for) with Mr. TEMPLETON (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. JONES of Virginia with Mr. RODENBERG.  
Mr. DEWALT with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.  
Mr. PADGETT with Mr. HERSEY.  
Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. SIEGEL.  
Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. SWIFT.  
Mr. CLEARY with Mr. COPLEY.  
Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MADDEN.  
Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on the first call of the roll I voted "nay." On account of a letter that I have seen from the President I desire to change my vote from "nay" to "yea."

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be recorded "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the lady in the Hall listening when her name was called?

Miss RANKIN. No.

The SPEAKER. The lady does not bring herself within the rule.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Would a person who was in the Hall but who did not hear the name called be entitled to answer "present"?

The SPEAKER. Oh, yes. It is a part of the duty to get a quorum here, and the Chair has the right to count Miss RANKIN present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "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."

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on March 29, 1918, approved and signed joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial in Washington to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War;

S. 3129. An act to provide for the disposition of the effects of deceased persons in the naval service;

S. 3130. An act to amend section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3445. An act to authorize the payment of gun pointers and gun captains while temporarily absent from their regular stations, and for other purposes;

S. 1546. An act to permit the use of certain refined products of petroleum as stores on steam vessels carrying passengers; and  
S. 3689. An act authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan at Kansas City, Mo.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

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

S. 3528. An act to suspend for the period of the present war sections 45, 46, and 56 of an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3693. An act 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.

S. 3736. An act to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3803. An act authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States in connection with or incidental to the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3863. An act to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3980. An act to prevent interference with the use of homing pigeons by the United States, to provide a penalty for such interference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3982. An act to suspend certain restrictions on the purchase and distribution of military stores and supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GALLIVAN was granted leave of absence for one week, on account of important business.

## AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9054, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma reserve the right to object, for an explanation? I hope he will reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma objects.

## HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been directed by the Committee on Rules to present a favorable report on House resolution 265, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

## House resolution 265.

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 H. R. 10265, entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs"; that there shall be not to exceed two hours of general debate, to be divided equally between those supporting and those opposing the bill; that at the conclusion of general debate the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule for amendments, and after the bill shall have been perfected in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union the same shall be reported to the House with such amendments and recommendations as the Committee of the Whole may make, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit the bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.



Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. WALSH. To propound a parliamentary inquiry as to whether or not the adoption of this rule would make the measure reported in order under it a continuing order.

The SPEAKER. No; it would not. It is not a continuing order.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this bill—House bill 10265—is a bill providing housing accommodations for industrial workers engaged principally in munition plants and in plants directly connected with the manufacture of war supplies. I will state to the House that this bill has had a rather full career before committees of this House. In the first place, the bill was referred to the Committee on Labor of the House, which held extended hearings on the bill. My information is that it was practically the unanimous opinion of the Committee on Labor that the bill should be favorably reported, but before the Committee on Labor reported the bill the House changed the reference of the bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which I have the honor to be a member, held extended hearings on this measure, and it is the unanimous opinion—I believe I state it correctly—of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that this measure should be speedily enacted into law. Then the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds directed the chairman of its committee to come before the Committee on Rules and ask for a rule to expedite the passage of the bill. The Committee on Rules, contrary to its usual custom, held extended hearings on the merits of the bill. Gentlemen connected with the Department of Labor and others connected with war industries appeared before the Committee on Rules, so I can say to the House that this measure has had extended hearings before three committees of the House, namely, the Committee on Labor, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and the Committee on Rules, and it is, I believe, the unanimous opinion of all of those committees that this bill is now worthy of immediate consideration, and for that reason I sincerely hope that the House will give it immediate consideration by the adoption of the rule. It is not my intention to go into the merits of the bill at this time, because it is only my business and my purpose to recite these facts, so that the House may adopt the rule, and then give the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds an opportunity to present the real reasons as to why this bill should be enacted into law. However, it might not be amiss at this time to read to the House one or two sections of the report from the Committee on Rules.

The main object of the bill is to provide, as its title indicates, for the housing of industrial workers who are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense during the continuation of the existing war, and the committee desires to express the opinion that the only justification for the proposed legislation is the condition confronting our country as shown in the hearings.

And I will state in this connection that the bill itself only applies to conditions existing during the actual war in which the country is now engaged.

Mr. SHERWOOD. How much does this bill provide?

Mr. CANTRILL. I will answer the gentleman as soon as I read this section:

This investigation disclosed an alarming condition. It was ascertained that good, skilled, competent workers could be had, but that in many cases houses could not be had, and therefore this vitally necessary work could not be performed as speedily as the exigencies of the situation demanded. Private capital could not, or would not, build on a scale to meet the demand, and therefore it became a governmental problem to house the labor which is absolutely necessary for the full development of our resources to successfully deal with the emergency confronting us.

In answer to the gentleman from Ohio I will say that the bill originally provided for \$50,000,000 to build homes for industrial workers in many parts of the United States. Those places and localities will be pointed out in the debate by members of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, however, since this rule was reported from the Committee on Rules, has decided to offer an amendment to the bill from the floor adding \$10,000,000 to meet housing conditions as they apply to the District of Columbia, making it \$10,000,000 for the District of Columbia alone and \$50,000,000 for the country at large.

In this connection also permit me to say that England was confronted with exactly the same situation which now confronts this country in the housing of our industrial workers, and England up to this time has appropriated and spent over \$700,000,000 to house the industrial workers in her munition plants. And I want to be very frank with the House and state this, that this \$60,000,000 is, in the opinion of the committee and

the experts who will have the matter in charge representing the Government, but a starter on this proposition if we are to successfully meet the conditions that we will be confronted with probably during the next few years of the war. But there is an absolute demand now for about \$60,000,000 in different parts of the country to provide houses for workers to live in who operate these plants. The Government has appropriated money for the plants, they have been built, the men can be procured, but there is absolutely no place for them to live in order to operate the plants. And I submit to the common sense of this Congress that it is utterly useless and worthless expenditure of money to build plants for the manufacture of munitions and war supplies unless homes can be provided in which men can live who make those supplies. [Applause.] One is as important as the other. And with the information that the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have, and I happen to be a member of both committees, and in two instances have heard this testimony in detail, it is an immediate, absolute war measure, and it is the duty of the American Congress to immediately pass this bill and provide this relief. I state this fact in order that the committee, I hope, will adopt the rule and give us a chance through the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to present the detailed facts to the House for final action.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield before he leaves the floor?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice in referring to the bill the gentleman spoke about munition factories. Is it intended that this will also meet the demand for housing facilities in the shipyards?

Mr. CANTRILL. No, I will state to the gentleman. It is brought out in the hearings; and I would go into it more in detail, but the gentleman will understand that under the previous question I have but 20 minutes, and I will yield other parts of that time to the other members of the committee. But I am satisfied that the gentleman will get the full detailed information as to the exact points in the country where it is proposed to spend this money and the direct purposes for which it is to be spent. In a general way, however, I will answer the gentleman by saying that this money is not intended to look after the proposition coming directly under the control of the United States Shipping Board. It is principally for munition plants and for finishing plants situated in different parts of the country for munition supplies, like aeroplanes and two or three other things, which absolutely have to be made and made speedily.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will not my colleague state that the principal argument, the concluding argument, for it before the Committee on Rules was by the Shipping Board of the necessity for housing at Hog Island?

Mr. CANTRILL. As I recall it, of course, there is that necessity; but, as I recall the hearings, in the main they would be scattered in different parts of the country to meet this immediate situation. The gentleman has time, and if his recollection is different from mine of course he can present those facts.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Yes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We passed a bill nearly 30 days ago appropriating \$50,000,000 to provide housing in our shipbuilding plants.

Mr. CANTRILL. I reserve the balance of my time, and the gentleman from Kansas can use a portion of his time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to submit a few observations on the situation that confronts us. First of all, there is necessity for housing the employees at the shipbuilding plants and also to the munition and arms-construction plants. There is no question about the necessity for housing those employed in these industries. The most forceful argument made by the Committee on Rules for housing conditions was made in behalf of the Shipping Board. Now the Shipping Board has been provided for. Only \$50,000,000 was asked for as a whole when they appeared before our committee some three weeks ago. Fifty million dollars has already been appropriated for housing conditions for that purpose. Now \$60,000,000 is asked for housing conditions aside from the Shipping Board.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that strikes me forcibly is not the fact that we must have housing facilities, but the recklessness with which we appropriate millions upon millions of dollars with little consideration or question, and in connection with these appropriations create bureaus and commissions, multiplying them in the Government until Washington can no longer contain them all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Kentucky indicated that this was intended to be only a starter. Can the gentleman give us an idea as to how much is contemplated here?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; I think I can give some idea of that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He referred to England as having spent some \$700,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. If the war continues, it is estimated that this is but a very small starter; that we will be spending anywhere from \$200,000,000 to \$300,000,000 a year for these purposes. Now, to men who have come from the several walks of life and from separate parts of this country where industrial enterprises call together large numbers of men, and sometimes suddenly, it seems absolutely reckless to appropriate such enormous sums of money for these housing purposes when it is conceded that they are necessarily temporary.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would rather proceed a little while before yielding.

Now, in the first place, let me show you the reckless manner in which those in authority reach their hands into the Public Treasury. We have an organization in the Treasury Department that is essentially the builder for the Government of the United States. The office of the Supervising Architect is equipped with men familiar with making contracts throughout the country and with builders. We have an architect's bureau there well equipped for preparing plans and specifications for any kind of housing facilities that the country requires.

Strange as it may seem, this bureau is entirely ignored, and the Secretary of Labor reaches out and grabs control of the expenditures of this money for housing facilities, and there is created a new bureau in the Department of Labor, which will cost for the first year the sum of \$300,000.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague permit me to call attention to one section of the bill which provides that this office force in the Treasury Department shall be utilized for this purpose?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes. But the utilization contemplated there will not take the place of the \$300,000 expenditure which it will cost to create the organization in the Department of Labor similar to that already existing in the Treasury Department, which within the last two years has built but few public buildings, so that this bureau in the Treasury Department is to-day on the pay roll and has its organization without anything to do. Yet it is proposed to create a new bureau at an original expense of \$300,000 to do exactly what this bureau could be required to do. That is one of the indefensible provisions of this bill. It is a reckless expenditure of the money which is collected from the people of the United States by taxes, by bond sales and stamp sales, and in other ways for war purposes. It is indefensible that Congress at this time should consent to or permit such wicked waste of public money.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I understand the gentleman to state that there is now in existence, fully organized, a housing bureau fully capable of meeting all the requirements of housing munition-plant workers and shipping-plant workers, and that this is the creation of another bureau which the gentleman says is entirely unnecessary. Is that the contention?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. My contention is that the organization now in the Treasury Department, under the control of one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, is fully equipped for taking charge of all the housing facilities that are required by the Government, and that by placing that work in the hands of that organization the expense of creating this new organization as proposed would be avoided—this new organization which will cost the Government over \$300,000, as the testimony shows, in the Department of Labor.

Mr. TOWNER. Does the gentleman contemplate offering an amendment to take care of the situation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. When the bill is under consideration for amendment that ought to be done. Now, I do not know what changes have taken place throughout the country since the rule was adopted that make it necessary not only to increase the amount of the authorization from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000, \$50,000,000 having already been appropriated for housing laborers in the shipyards, unless it be that the \$10,000,000 is necessary to provide housing facilities in Washington for the additional employees that will be required in the Department of Labor and in other departments of the Government that are brought here by reason of the reckless expenditure of these colossal sums of money for employees in Washington. Many of these employees are doing absolutely nothing to earn the salaries that are paid to them.

I stated a moment ago that the principal argument made in behalf of this appropriation of \$50,000,000 before the Committee on Rules was the serious condition that confronted those engaged in ship construction, and the necessities at Hog Island was cited as an example. Now, we have provided \$50,000,000 for housing laborers in the shipyards, and yet we are asked to authorize \$60,000,000 for other purposes.

Gentlemen, pay day will come. We must take account as we go on of the manner in which we are authorizing the expenditure of these hundreds of millions of dollars. There is not a man on this floor who understands the necessity for spending this \$110,000,000 for housing facilities throughout the country. It is all asked for in a lump sum; no details are given.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Does not the gentleman think that there is a considerable number of activities in Washington that might just as well be housed elsewhere?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; that is true.

Mr. PLATT. For instance, the Food and Fuel Administrations. Why should they be here?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not know why the Food and Fuel Administrations should be here—

Mr. TREADWAY. Or anywhere else. [Laughter.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; or anywhere else. Neither has stimulated the production of either food or fuel—and the stimulation of production is the all-important thing in both food and fuel—as a matter of fact, the production of food and fuel are limited by the conduct of these two administrations.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does the gentleman think the Shipping Board ought to be in New York?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not care where these boards are. What I am objecting to is the creation of new bureaus. Every time millions of dollars are appropriated some department of the Government takes advantage of the fact that we are at war, and that we must have the authorization of millions to create new bureaus to provide places for other employees, for other men; I am not going to say that it is to provide places for other "deserving Democrats," because I believe all "deserving Democrats" have been provided for long ago. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. LUNN. A moment ago, in referring to the additional \$10,000,000 asked for in the District of Columbia, the gentleman inferred it was possibly for the additional employees to be made necessary in the Labor Department. Am I right in drawing the conclusion that in the gentleman's opinion this bill is not necessary, and that there is no need of additional housing conditions in the District?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. LUNN. That was the inference from the gentleman's argument.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But there is made by this bill a necessity for additional housing for the additional employees that are necessarily brought here by the provisions of this bill. Many employees are provided for in this bill who are absolutely unnecessary, and there are thousands of persons on the pay roll here to-day who ought to be at home. They are not needed here.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand that the gentleman does not take a position in antagonism to the housing proposition.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, no.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But that he does object to the creation of a new bureau which is to administer the fund that is to be expended?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Now, may I ask my colleague, in all good faith, just how he would provide for the administration of that \$50,000,000 other than as is provided in the bill itself? There has to be some provision for administration.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. By the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who already has an organization. He has been for years the builder for the United States Government when we expended money for public buildings.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is architectural, largely?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The questions with which this board will have to deal, if I understand the matter correctly, from the testimony given before the Committee on Rules—which I did not follow any more closely than did the gentleman



from Kansas—are not so much questions of architecture, but matters of passing upon titles and the like.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. All that is provided for in the Treasury Department.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does not the gentleman refer to the office of the Supervising Architect in the Treasury Department?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BRITTEN. And does not that particular office let contracts for millions of dollars worth of work every year?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does it not supervise not only the architecture but the construction of the buildings, the title to the land, and everything that would come under this bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Absolutely everything that is provided for in this bill is now done by the Supervising Architect under the Treasury Department.

Mr. BRITTEN. And the gentleman also will recall that they are not building post offices now, and that this very capable organization could be used in this direction.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him just one question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Was the gentleman taking the position that the Supervising Architect's office passes on the title to the land on which public buildings are erected?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Supervising Architect refers the question of title to the United States district attorney's office in the jurisdiction in which the building is to be constructed, which this new organization will do.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; the gentleman is mistaken. It goes to the Attorney General, as the chief law officer of the Government, and the title is examined in that department.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The district attorney for the district of Florida will pass upon the titles in Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely, but could not the Department of Labor make that same reference to the Attorney General?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Undoubtedly; or the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury could make it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Why, certainly he could make it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Without this \$300,000 organization that is to be created immediately upon the passage of this bill in the Department of Labor. Three hundred thousand dollars is a large sum of money to be wasted in this way.

Mr. PLATT. Would the gentleman advocate an amendment to strike out in this bill the words "Secretary of Labor" and insert the words "Secretary of the Treasury"?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would, in order to use the organization already in existence in that department and that is in every way qualified to do the work authorized by this bill. There is no more reason why the Secretary of Labor should put up these housing facilities than there is that he should put up the courthouses and the post-office buildings throughout the country.

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Has the Committee on Rules considered the question whether some of these activities could not just as well be transferred to other places, like New York and Philadelphia, where housing facilities are plentiful?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. There is no reason why that should not be done.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. They would have to have houses there, though.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But there are vacant houses in many cities throughout the country where enterprises are engaged in Government work. The thing to which I want to call the attention of the House again is the fact that on such small pretext advantage is taken of the opportunity to create new offices, new bureaus, employing literally thousands upon thousands of young men and women, bringing them out of the activities of civil life, many of them out of the productive walks of life, bringing them here to Washington where they have difficulty in finding places to live, where they will spend all their salaries trying to pay their running expenses, and will return to their homes at the close of the war, or when their term of service here is over, without anything to show for what they have done here except the experience, and who will have rendered absolutely useless service during the time they have been here. Many of them will have just that experience, with just that result.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman state about how much of this \$10,000,000 will be required to build houses for the people who will be brought here as employees of this new bureau?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I have not the slightest idea. The \$10,000,000 have been added to the bill since the hearings were had before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CANTRILL. Let me correct my colleague there, please. The facts in the case are these, that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at a formal meeting decided to offer this amendment from the floor, because I had the rule on the original bill and stated that since I was a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I would not offer the rule if they attempted to amend the bill by making this addition to it in the committee, but that they must offer the amendment from the floor, which would give opportunity for a full discussion.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It was since the rule was considered and hearings were had before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CANTRILL. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has since decided to recommend the addition of \$10,000,000 to the bill by an amendment from the floor.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then what I said is true, that this has occurred since the hearing was had.

Mr. CANTRILL. But not added to the bill by the rule.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. How many men are employed in the Supervising Architect's office, and what are they doing at this time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not know how many men are employed there. I know that the Secretary of the Treasury has forbidden building operations, and erecting buildings has been suspended throughout the country except in cases of the most extreme necessity.

Mr. HICKS. These men are still employed in the Supervising Architect's office?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They are still employed in the Supervising Architect's office, and are provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. HICKS. But they are not doing anything as far as the gentleman knows?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I do not know what they are doing. I know they are drawing their salaries.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That very question was submitted to the subcommittee on the legislative bill in determining the force for the Supervising Architect for the next fiscal year. We examined the Supervising Architect. He went at length into the need of having an organization, to be ready at all times to meet these conditions, and although there was opposition in the subcommittee, the committee decided to give him the same organization that he has for the present fiscal year.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And he still has the same organization that he has had right along?

Mr. STAFFORD. The same organization as provided for in the current law.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I reserve the remainder of my time.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 8696) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 5351) providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32 in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of 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.

## HOUSING FOR WAR NEEDS.

Mr. CANTRILL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House but for a minute. It has recently been stated to me by several of our colleagues, on both sides of the Chamber, that the Rules Committee were being criticized for bringing in, as I was told, so many rules. I would like to suggest to gentlemen that the criticism is not deserved, and that if there is anybody deserving of criticism it is not the Committee on Rules. We have only presented such resolutions as we felt were absolutely necessary. It is just as fair to criticize this Congress because the volume of business it must consider is so large.

When the chairman of a great committee comes before the Rules Committee with a resolution from his committee requesting that a special rule be reported, with the statement that there is no other way to bring the matter before the House, what is the Rules Committee to do? I suppose if we sat on the lid they would criticize us because we did not bring in the rule. It seems we are to be condemned if we do and condemned if we do not. The Rules Committee has over 100 resolutions pending at this time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. And, if the gentleman will allow me, these resolutions are not introduced by the members of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POU. Absolutely not; the gentleman is correct. During this session, according to my best recollection, the Rules Committee has not consumed three hours of debate in discussing all the resolutions it has presented to the House.

I am going to conclude by saying that the Committee on Rules is working as a unit, all of the members of the committee, those composing the majority and those composing the minority, are together. They are trying to make the committee an agency to do what it can to speed up the great task before us of winning this war. [Applause.] Because gentlemen insist on discussing measures at considerable length, and because gentlemen get weary hearing long discussions on the floor, I respectfully submit that criticism should not be directed against the Committee on Rules but against those gentlemen who, without adequate reason, are killing time.

If we are not to report resolutions providing for the consideration of measures supported and desired by the great majority of the House, one may well ask why you have a Committee on Rules. In any event, Mr. Speaker, the Record will show that our action has been sustained by a large majority in every instance except, possibly, one. Let those who kill time, those who would hinder and delay, if there be such, be criticized if they persist in pursuing such a course; but be careful and put the blame where it belongs. [Applause.]

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

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 10265.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania in the chair.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object. The bill ought to be read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10265) to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for war needs.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of Labor, for the purposes of providing housing, local transportation, and other community facilities for such industrial workers as are engaged in industries connected with and essential to the national defense, and their families, only during the continuation of the existing war, is hereby authorized and empowered, within the limits of the amounts herein authorized—

(a) To purchase, acquire by lease, construct, requisition, or acquire by condemnation or otherwise such houses, buildings, furnishings, improvements, local transportation, and other community facilities and parts thereof as he may determine to be necessary for the proper conduct of the existing war.

(b) To purchase, lease, requisition, or acquire by condemnation or otherwise any improved or unimproved land, or any right, title, or interest therein on which such houses, buildings, improvements, local transportation, and other community facilities, and parts thereof, have been or may be constructed.

(c) To equip, manage, maintain, alter, rent, lease, exchange, sell, and convey such lands, or any right, title, or interest therein, houses, buildings, improvements, local transportation, and other community facilities, parts thereof, and equipment upon such terms and conditions as he may determine.

(d) To aid in providing, equipping, managing, and maintaining houses, buildings, improvements, local transportation, and other community facilities, by loan or otherwise, to such person or persons and upon such terms and conditions as he may determine.

The Secretary of Labor may exercise any power or discretion herein granted and may enter into any arrangement or contract incidental thereto, through such agency or agencies as he may create or designate; *Provided*, That houses erected by the Government under the authority of this act shall be of only a temporary character whenever it is practicable to so construct them; *Provided further*, That whenever it is practicable to use any part of the clerical or field force of the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department in or about any of the work contemplated by this act, the Secretary of Labor shall do so; *And provided further*, That every contract for the lease of ground upon which the Government contemplates the construction of a building under authority of this act shall contain a provision giving the Government an option to purchase the same for a stated consideration.

Sec. 2. That whenever the Secretary of Labor shall purchase, lease, requisition, or acquire by condemnation or otherwise such land or right, title, or interest therein, or such houses, buildings, furnishings, improvements, local transportation, and other community facilities, and parts thereof, he shall make just compensation therefor to be determined by him, and if the amount thereof so determined is unsatisfactory to the person entitled to receive the same, such person shall be paid 75 per cent of the amount so determined and shall be entitled to sue the United States to recover such further sum as, added to such 75 per cent, will make up such amount as will be just compensation therefor in the manner provided for by section 24, paragraph 20, and section 145 of the Judicial Code.

Sec. 3. That upon the requisition of or the filing of a petition for the condemnation hereunder of such land, or any right, title, or interest therein, or such houses, buildings, furnishings, improvements, local transportation, and other community facilities, and parts thereof, immediate possession thereof may be taken to the extent of the interest to be acquired and the same may be occupied and used, and the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes, providing that no public money shall be expended upon such land until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title, nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land is located has been given, shall be, and the same are hereby, suspended as to all real estate acquired hereunder.

Sec. 4. That the word "person" used herein shall include any person, trustee, firm, or corporation.

Sec. 5. That the power and authority granted herein shall cease with the termination of the present war, except the power and authority to care for and rent such property as remains undisposed of and to conclude and execute contracts for the sale of property made during the war.

Sec. 6. That at the beginning of each session of Congress the Secretary of Labor shall make to Congress a full and detailed report covering all of the transactions of his department with relation to the subject matter of this act, describing each parcel of land purchased, the improvements made thereon, together with the amount of money spent in connection therewith and the disposition of the same; descriptions of all parcels of property sold, to whom, the terms of sale, and the status of the title at the time of the making of such report; description of each piece of property purchased under the terms of this act and still owned by the Government and the estimated value; a list showing the names of all persons who have been employed in any capacity to aid in carrying out the provisions of this act, the service rendered by each and the amount of compensation paid to each, and a full, detailed, itemized statement showing each and every transaction of the department in the execution of the trust herein created; and immediately after the declaration of peace in the existing war the Secretary of Labor shall make a final report to Congress covering in detail all the operations and transactions of his department, under and by virtue of the terms of this act.

Sec. 7. That no work or contract done or made under or by authority of any provision of this act shall be done or made on or under a percentage or "cost-plus" basis.

Sec. 8. That for carrying out the provisions of this act and for the administration thereof the sum of \$50,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that no quorum is present. Evidently there is not; and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to give notice that we are going to try and finish this bill to-night.

Mr. CANNON. Then there is all the more necessity for a full House.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It is only killing time.

Mr. CANNON. If I may be allowed, I want to say to the gentleman that it is not killing time. I do not know anything about the bill. For the first time I have heard the bill read, and that is the only knowledge I have of it. If it is to be finished to-night with an appropriation of \$60,000,000, we ought to have a full House.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think so. I am willing to have a full House, but the bill has been printed some time.

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

Anderson	Chandler, N. Y.	Dale, N. Y.	Fairchild, G. W.
Anthony	Church	Darrow	Fess
Bacharach	Classon	Davidson	Flood
Barnhart	Cleary	Denton	Flynn
Blackmon	Coady	Dewalt	Fordney
Borland	Connelly, Kans.	Donovan	Fuller, Ill.
Bowers	Cooper, Ohio	Doremus	Gallagher
Brodbeck	Cooper, W. Va.	Drukker	Gallivan
Butler	Copley	Edmonds	Gandy
Caldwell	Costello	Ellsworth	Gard
Carew	Crago	Estopinal	Glass
Carter, Mass.	Curry, Cal.	Fairchild, B. L.	Glynn



Godwin, N. C.	Kennedy, R. I.	O'Shaunessy	Slayden
Good	Key, Ohio	Overmyer	Slomp
Goodall	Kitchin	Paige	Small
Gould	Kreider	Parker, N. Y.	Smith, C. B.
Graham, Pa.	LaGuardia	Peters	Smith, T. F.
Green, Iowa	Lazaro	Platt	Snyder
Greene, Vt.	Lehlbach	Polk	Sterling, Pa.
Gregg	Lenroot	Porter	Stines
Griest	Little	Powers	Sullivan
Griffin	Littlepage	Pratt	Talbott
Hamilton, N. Y.	McCormick	Price	Taylor, Colo.
Harrison, Miss.	McKinley	Ragsdale	Templeton
Haskell	McLaughlin, Pa.	Rainey	Thomas
Hayden	Madden	Roberts	Thompson
Hayes	Magee	Rodenberg	Tinkham
Heintz	Maher	Rouse	Van Dyke
Helvering	Mann	Rowe	Vare
Hersey	Meeker	Rowland	Vestal
Hollingsworth	Miller, Minn.	Sabath	Voigt
Hood	Miller, Wash.	Sanders, N. Y.	Ward
Howard	Mondell	Sanford	Weaver
Humphreys	Moore, Pa.	Saunders, Va.	Webb
Husted	Mott	Schall	Whaley
Johnson, S. Dak.	Mudd	Scott, Pa.	White, Me.
Jones, Va.	Neeley	Scully	Wood, Ind.
Kahn	Nicholls, S. C.	Sherley	Woodyard
Kehoe	Norton	Siegel	Zihlman

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 10265, had found itself without a quorum, that the roll had been called, and that 275 Members had answered to their names, a quorum, and he handed in the names of the absentees to be recorded in the Journal.

The committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the committee that I shall take but very few minutes to give a general outline of the provisions of this bill. I want to state the situation in order that Members may know just what they are doing when they pursue dilatory tactics to prevent the consideration of this bill. A rule has been reported and has been adopted by the House. That rule provides for two hours of general debate, and it also provides that those two hours shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the bill. Up to this time I have heard of no opposition to the bill itself, and, so far as those of us favoring the bill are concerned, we shall take but a very few minutes to submit the few remarks we may have to make in general debate. To-morrow, I understand, the Committee on Ways and Means will claim the attention of the House on a bond bill. That will take precedence of this bill, and if this bill is not passed to-night it means that it probably can not be considered again by this House under two or three weeks. That is the situation, and I want to call the attention of the committee now briefly to the provisions of the bill and ask if they will not assist us in undertaking to pass this legislation, which is so urgently necessary for the people of this country to carry on the activities which are so essential to our success in the war.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has just stated that if the bill does not pass to-day, as the bond bill would come up to-morrow, it would take about three weeks before this bill would be again reached. Will the gentleman be kind enough to say why?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Because I understand there are a number of other preferential measures to follow the bond bill.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman does not apprehend that the bond bill will take over a day?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know how long it will take. If the seed bill is a fair sample, it may take a week or two; but there are other bills to follow that, and I do not care to go into a general discussion. I have stated the facts as they are. If gentlemen want to pursue their dilatory tactics, they are at liberty to do so. I want the country to know who they are.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that the rule under which this bill is made in order requires that general debate shall be confined to the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not think the rule specifically does, but it will be so confined so far as my remarks are concerned.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question. I am going to try to get through with this if I can.

Mr. CRAMTON. This bill having been before the Committee on Labor, which was ready practically to report it when the bill was taken away from it and sent to the other committee, could not this situation have been avoided by awaiting the report

from the Committee on Labor and acting upon it some two or three weeks ago?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. How would they have been in any better position to dispose of it than the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds?

Mr. CRAMTON. For the reason that they had completed their hearings and were practically ready to report, whereas the gentleman's committee has had to hold further hearings.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. They had not completed their hearings, and I will say to the gentleman another thing—he may not appreciate it, but I do—and that is that the committees of this House are entitled to their jurisdiction, if the integrity of the House procedure is to be maintained. I do not yield to the gentleman to ask any more questions.

Mr. CRAMTON. Just simply—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not yield. I want to say this. This is a bill which the administration desires for the expeditious prosecution of the war. The bill provides for the building of houses to take care primarily of industrial workers. It also, by an amendment which we propose to offer at the proper time, proposes to take care of other Government employees who are essential to the activities of the Government in this war time. The bill provides also for the loaning of money at a reasonable rate of interest to manufacturing concerns engaged in manufacturing munitions of war or other essentials of war, to enable them to build these houses. The committee thought, as this is a new departure in Government, that it would be infinitely better to loan the money where it could be done to individuals, firms, or corporations, who would undertake on their own account to build these houses, giving the Government ample security for the return of the money and a reasonable rate of interest.

But where those arrangements could not be made and where the employees had been brought into a community where the housing was insufficient the committee thought that it was just as essential for Congress to appropriate money to build houses to take care of those workers and employees as it was essential to build manufacturing establishments and industrial concerns to manufacture munitions of war. There are thousands of employees in this country to-day in the great manufacturing centers who have been brought in there to labor for the Government who are absolutely without house room. Some of them, married men, have been carried away from their families, and it can not be expected, as patriotic as those men may be, that they will be content to live for weeks, months, and it may be for a year or more separated from their families. It is not right and the Government ought not to expect it, and we ought to make provisions to ameliorate those conditions. Another portion of this bill provides, and the committee thought it would be much better for the executors of this trust wherever it were possible to pursue that course, and it is this: Some of these plants are near large cities, where there is ample house accommodations for these workers. Where plants are located miles away outside the city, but connected by a transportation line of one sort and another, especially trolley lines, it was thought in those cases possibly it would be more economical and better serve the purposes in view to enlarge the transportation facilities by loaning the money to those operating roads or else by taking them over on the part of the Government and enlarge them so as to meet the demands for transportation. And we have thought that in those cases it would be better than building houses, if the houses are ample in the city adjacent to it, to enlarge or build transportation lines, so that the workers may go back and forth from their homes to their daily labor.

Mr. Chairman, in the discussion on the adoption of the rule the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], I think, raised one objection to the bill—one main objection. I believe—and that was the fact that the execution of this trust was placed in the hands of the Department of Labor, whereas he insisted it ought to be in the Treasury Department. Now, I want to say this matter has been discussed by the President, by the members of the Cabinet, and by those interested in it, recognizing the urgency of the situation for some time. A Cabinet meeting was held. The President was present. The Cabinet were there, and this whole question was discussed, and at that meeting it was decided that under all the existing circumstances it was better that the administration of this trust be placed in the hands of the Department of Labor. The Secretary of Labor in the hearings before this committee made this statement. Here is what the Secretary of Labor said:

The President came to the conclusion that the proper method of administering the labor problems, either the war-emergency problems or the other labor problems, was to administer them through the Department of Labor, which had been created for the purpose of dealing with labor problems. And among the problems that were thus, by the direction of the President, headed into the Department of Labor was the housing problem.

He goes on in his statement and says—this is on page 5 of the hearings in the Secretary of Labor's statement:

When the bill had been drafted, in order that there might be no confusion or duplication in connection with it, I took the bill to the President at a Cabinet meeting for consideration, and I learned there that the Secretary of the Treasury had in contemplation the presentation of a bill proposing to create a corporation with \$500,000,000 of capital, and authority to loan some billions—four billions, if I recall the figures correctly—and the Secretary of the Treasury at that time thought that possibly that corporation might be the best agency to deal with the problem of housing.

The statement of the Secretary of the Treasury so impressed the President and the members of the Cabinet at the time that the President suggested the holding of a conference, at which the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, the chairman of the Shipping Board, and the chairman of the Senate and House committees handling the shipping bill, proposing to make appropriations for housing for shipping purposes so that the problem might be worked out in a way where there would be no conflict of jurisdiction and no confusion flowing out of it, and asked that I get in touch with Senator FLETCHER, with a view to having the Senators defer action upon the bill until such conference could be had. I immediately got in touch with Senator FLETCHER, and the Senator advised me that just a few minutes before the bill had passed the Senate and had gone over to the House. It was later referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. They took the question up for consideration.

Later on he said:

Two days following the conference I have referred to was held. The President was unable to be present at the conference, because he was still laboring with a bad cold. There was no representative from the Treasury Department present. There was the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the chairman of the Shipping Board, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. King, of the War Department, and Senator FLETCHER, and Congressman ALEXANDER present at the conference.

And then he goes further and says:

It was the belief at that conference that nothing should be injected that would interfere with the appropriation being made for the Shipping Board to permit it to proceed promptly to furnish the necessary housing, but that the general problem of housing should be headed up into the Department of Labor, because the housing problem and the mobilization of labor, the placement of labor, are closely related problems, and as the Department of Labor is dealing with the mobilization of labor and the placement of labor the problem of housing should be headed into the Department of Labor, and that that should be done with the ultimate object that if Congress furnished the necessary funds, when the Department of Labor had secured the funds and built the organization, and perfected its plans to the point where it could take over the housing problem of the Shipping Board and carry it on without any loss in efficiency, then that part of the housing problem should also be headed into the Department of Labor.

The conference having come to that conclusion, I asked the advisory counsel, which I had created to help me in building the organization for handling these problems, to redraft the bill with a view to making the appropriation to the Department of Labor and placing the authority in the Department of Labor for handling it. The bill was drafted in that form and it was looked upon as being a labor problem.

Showing, Mr. Chairman, that this whole matter was considered in all of its aspects, from every possible point of view, and it was decided by those gentlemen who are conducting all of our movements in this great war, those to whom we must look and whom we must absolutely trust if we are to be successful in the great contest in which we are engaged, and they decided that the Department of Labor was the proper governmental agency to administer this trust.

And I want to say that your committee, taking that view of it, left it where the bill drawn in the Department of Labor put it, but we did this, namely, we provided by an amendment that it should be the duty of the Secretary of Labor, the administrator in this instance, to use the forces of the Supervising Architect's office wherever it was possible to do so. And he intends to do that. The Treasury Department has no building organization. They have a lot of draftsmen and architects and clerks, and that is all. They do not construct buildings. They draw plans and specifications. That is all they do. And they are to help, and their services are to be given, of course, without any further cost than their regular salaries, to the Secretary of Labor in this great work.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have a number of amendments which we propose to offer from the committee. One is increasing the amount by \$10,000,000, so changing the verbiage of the bill as to give the Secretary of Labor the power to provide housing for the employees of any kind in the District of Columbia.

And I want to say right here that I am informed by a good lady in this city who has taken a large interest in this matter that to-day there are 2,000 girls in the city of Washington, brought here under civil-service contests to take positions to help in this war work, who are only lodging temporarily with people who were kind enough to take them in and who are without permanent place of abode. Numbers of them have gone back home rather than to submit to the conditions by which they would be environed here. These people should be provided with some decent, respectable place in which to live if they are to work for the Government; and this bill proposes to do that. And the gentlemen before the committee, giving us a statement of these facts, pointed out a number of places where

the demand was urgent for housing. In Bridgeport, Conn., they needed 1,500 additional houses to take care of the overflow. At the Bath Iron Works, at Bath, Me., they are seeking relief for about 600 men engaged in the building of torpedo-boat destroyers. At Fore River, Mass., a force has been built up of from 4,000 to 11,500. At Norfolk, Va., the various Government activities, including the Army and Navy, require approximately the following: Permanent housing for 3,535 white workers, permanent housing for 2,840 colored workers, temporary accommodations for 6,000 white workers, temporary accommodations for 14,025 colored laborers. Portsmouth, N. H., has a transportation problem as well as a housing problem. Permanent housing for the Navy, amounting to about \$210,000; temporary housing for the Navy, amounting to about \$58,000, will be required. At Hammond, Ind., considerable housing is required. The Signal Corps reports that their demands for housing from Buffalo and Hammondsport, N. Y., Elizabeth, N. J., and Dayton, Ohio, are large. The Ordnance Department is and has been engaged in a systematic investigation of the housing conditions, the prospective housing requirements in connection with its work at Government arsenals. In Watertown, Mass.; Rock Island, Ill.; Watervliet, N. Y.; the Government proving grounds at Aberdeen, Md.—they need help, all of them.

And so on. At numbers of places workers have been brought in by the Government without any shadow of shelter, these men being paid, it is true, but just as patriotic as are the men who are in the trenches with Pershing to-day, just as patriotic as any men who follow the flag, because without them these men in France would be absolutely useless.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one of the most urgent necessity, one of the most meritorious that has been presented to this House under color of a war measure that I have noticed since I have been in this Hall, and I trust that no gentleman will voluntarily throw anything in its way. If he wants to amend it in order to make it better, the committee welcomes that; but I ask him in behalf of these people who need the housing, in behalf of this Government, in behalf of the boys in the trenches, not to delay it and not to attempt to filibuster upon a bill of such grave importance as this.

How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has used 18 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I occupy somewhat the same position as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. CARLIN], having been upon both the Committee on Labor and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds during the hearings on this important bill.

There seems to be some little disposition to question the necessity of this measure, as well as the propriety of investing the Department of Labor with the duty of carrying out its provisions. Both the Treasury Department and the Department of Labor are organized departments of the Government. The Supervising Architect's Office being under the supervision of the Treasury and the Department of Labor being complete within itself, there is no new bureau to create by assigning the administration of these activities to the Department of Labor instead of the Office of the Supervising Architect in the Treasury. There is nothing in that; and it occurs to me that the Department of Labor is the proper department that should supervise and superintend this great work. It is connected immediately with labor. There is not much of this labor that is to be done in the city of Washington. In fact, I might say that the \$50,000,000 carried in the bill, as it is now presented to Congress, is for use entirely outside of the city of Washington.

Who is the man in charge who works under the Secretary of Labor and is to see to the expenditure of this money and the supervision of this work? Mr. Eidlitz, of New York City, who was written to by the President of the United States to come here and take charge of the supervision of this work. Mr. Eidlitz is one of the largest builders, contractors, and architects in the United States. He comes here—not for money and does not receive one cent of compensation—leaving a most lucrative business in the city of New York. To him has been intrusted the construction of these buildings. Somebody must do it.

It is not for putting up buildings entirely. Buildings will only be constructed in those cities where they can not be rented and, where it can be done, street cars will be run back into the cities to accommodate the workmen and no buildings will be constructed. In all instances where it can be done the construction of new buildings will be avoided and this money will



be expended economically, honestly, and efficiently. Still your committee thought that for the purpose of keeping track of the project they should put in a provision requiring at every session of Congress a report to be made by the Secretary of Labor of the money expended, to whom it is paid, and for what it was expended.

I want to say a word about the necessity of this work. My colleagues, we are involved in the greatest war known to history. It is a war not of our own choosing. We were compelled to go into this war or lose our honor and, perchance, our country. This is the most honorable war, on our part, that was ever fought. There was not a principle contended for in any war fought by the United States, from the Revolutionary War down to the present time, but what is involved in this war. We either had to fight or submit to an ignominious surrender.

You may ask me the question that is frequently asked, and that is, How long will this war last? I do not know how long it will last. There is no man who knows that.

I know Germany, our enemy, the most unscrupulous, the most unprincipled, the most barbarous, the most savage, the most inhuman, and dastardly enemy that ever contended on the field of battle, was for 40 years preparing for this war. It may be 40 years after we started in before it is concluded; but, as was said by the President, not until the last drop of blood and the last dollar is gone will we surrender. [Applause.]

We can not fight this war without munitions. We can not get munitions unless they are manufactured. These great companies have put up their plants. Ford, in my own State, has put up a plant occupying many acres of land and will employ many thousands of workmen. That is a sample of the factories. But they all are not so fortunate as he, and it may be that even he will need some of this money. Shall we hesitate at this stage of the war, when our brave boys have devoted their lives and everything they have for the protection and safety of our homes and our country?

Our Nation is at stake. This matter of \$50,000,000 may be only a start. It may take several hundreds of millions of dollars, as it has in England. We must not withhold our aid. The munition manufacturers are assisting and helping us to fight this battle, and if we do not win on foreign soil we must win on our own soil. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLNEY].

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this committee [Mr. CLARK of Florida] has been good enough to yield to me five minutes, which I will use before I take the 5.45 train. In his remarks he mentioned the Fore River Shipbuilding Co. That happens to be in the city of Quincy; and with its three shifts of employees and the added Victory plant, a duplicate of the plant of the Fore River Co., makes this city the most important shipbuilding city in the United States. When gentlemen talk about men working in three shifts, it is an absolute fact that in the city of Quincy and for 10 miles or so around about that city the beds are actually working in three shifts. So it is most important and necessary that this bill, appropriating \$50,000,000 for housing purposes, be passed as soon as possible. I trust that the advice of the chairman of the committee [Mr. CLARK of Florida] will be taken and that this bill will be passed by this House before sunup to-morrow. We can talk ships and think ships, but we must build them, and the men who work in these shipbuilding plants must work, under sanitary conditions. I have received letters showing that by the investigations of the Board of Health in Quincy it has been found that persons were sleeping in rooms at night which were occupied not only by another shift in the daytime but still a third shift. A man, his wife, and baby were found sleeping in a kitchen. Several persons were found in an attic room, and rooms generally there are working overtime. Employees who work in Quincy are going as far south as Taunton, 20 miles away, and to towns near the New Hampshire line on the north, to find sleeping accommodations. Therefore it is most important that this House pass this bill as soon as possible not only for Quincy, but with the added amendment of \$10,000,000 for the thousands of girls who are coming to Washington under the civil service to work here to help win the war.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. On March 1 a bill became a law which authorized the Shipping Board to spend \$50,000,000 for

construction to house employees engaged in building ships for the United States. Have they done nothing for the Fore River yard?

Mr. OLNEY. Not a dollar, as I understand. That bill was reported out of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and, as I understand from Mr. Otto E. Eidlitz, chairman of the housing committee the money to house the employees for the Fore River shipbuilding plant is to come out of the appropriation contained in this bill reported from the Committee on Public Building and Grounds and not out of the appropriation in the bill from the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There were \$50,000,000 appropriated in that bill, and this bill will make \$100,000,000.

Mr. OLNEY. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And that other \$50,000,000 has gone nobody knows where, has it?

Mr. OLNEY. The money appropriated in the bill which came out of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is to be devoted to other purposes to which the money appropriated in this bill can not be devoted; for instance, hospital facilities for the munitions plants.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That appropriation was not for any such purpose as that.

Mr. OLNEY. Yes; according to Mr. Eidlitz, it is.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let me make a suggestion which perhaps will help the gentleman. The appropriation of \$50,000,000 that has already passed is to be used to assist in the building of ships, the most important thing next to aeroplanes that we need.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is for housing.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That \$50,000,000 is to assist in the building of ships.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have appropriated \$750,000,000 for ships.

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

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the chairman of the committee [Mr. CLARK of Florida] made some remarks, the plain inference of which was that because the point of no quorum present was made by me before the discussion began on this measure, dilatory tactics were being indulged in. Now, I did not intend and do not intend to indulge in any such tactics upon this measure, because I realize the importance of some legislation being enacted; but upon the completion of the bill which preceded this a great many Members of the House left this Hall with the understanding that there would be no vote taken upon this measure to-night. I thought it only fair on this important measure, with a very important amendment involving \$10,000,000 to be offered, that there should be a larger attendance in the House in Committee of the Whole. I want to assure the gentleman from Florida that it was not done with any intent to obstruct the proceedings of this measure.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that, but the gentleman knows that it is quite unusual to demand the full reading of a bill at the opening of its consideration.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I objected to dispensing with the first reading, and as it turned out it took four minutes more of the time of the House to have the bill read. I was seconded in my objection by several other gentlemen who had not seen, read, or heard of the bill until it was brought in under a rule. I want to say that there is no intention on this side of the House, as far as I can observe, to indulge in any dilatory tactics or to do anything to give rise to the apoplectic vigor with which gentlemen have urged this measure. I do not know of any measure that ought to be considered in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am intensely interested in this bill, as I was in the companion bill for housing the employees of the 132 shipyards of the United States. I know that the officials of this Government are exceedingly interested that this bill shall pass. I have had occasion to discuss the matter with some of them. I know that it is true of the housing committee, and I know it is true of the Chief Executive of this Nation.

I want to say that the State of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor in part to represent, is pretty liberally supplied with munition factories. The gentleman from Florida, in naming over the list needing housing facilities, unintentionally forgot to mention my home city, Erie, Pa. For diversified industries there are not more than three or four other cities in the United States exceeding it. There are 25 plants engaged in the manu-

facturing of munitions for the Government. The Government officials have been there and understand the situation; one is there now, or was quite recently, investigating conditions. Mr. Philip Hiss, of the Housing Division of the National Council of Defense, held a meeting the latter part of February in the interest of this housing legislation with the result that the citizens of Erie subscribed more than \$700,000 to help this project along. In addition thereto, the General Electric Co. offers to put in \$200,000 in cash and \$200,000 in land and borrow \$1,000,000 from the United States Government, and at the end of three years after the war take the property over at a valuation to be fixed by the Government itself. That is the kind of people out in that section. [Applause.]

I know that some families are leaving the city of Erie because they can not get housing. If we could construct the houses by the waving of the wand and put them there to-morrow there would be a stream of people coming into these factories aggregating 15,000 or 20,000 more. We are making cannon shells, electric motors, automobile supplies, parts for aeroplanes, tanks, boilers, engines, shafting, and other articles for the Government. The Erie Forge Co. is one of the largest contractors in the United States. It has contracts to-day involving something like \$63,000,000.

I know that there must be increased housing facilities in order to get a maximum output in the shortest time. The General Electric Co. is at present constructing 700 houses. The American Brake Shoe Co. is constructing 600 or 700 houses. Several real estate firms are also building, but the demand far exceeds the supply.

I can, therefore, accept readily the wish of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] that this bill may be hastened to final completion. I am ready now to vote for the bill as it stands, notwithstanding there has been some criticism as to the department that should carry out the administrative features of the bill. That is up to them. The duty rests upon them. If they carry it out well we will be satisfied, but the Department of Labor has the right to bring into use all the facilities to be found with the Supervising Architect of the Treasury and other agencies.

That feature of the bill which gives to the Secretary of Labor authority to carry out the provisions of this proposed legislation has been the subject of careful investigation by those in high official position, by the committee in charge of the bill, and by others, and adopted—let it stand. Plans of operation have in part already been worked out; to turn the business over to new hands would neutralize what has already been accomplished, cause delay and confusion.

Now, if there were a necessity for passing a housing bill for the shipbuilding plants the necessity exists for the passing of this bill to construct houses for the munition factories in my own city, and I judge that the same condition prevails elsewhere. I know that it does at Bethlehem, Bath, Bridgeport, and Fall River, and in many other cities of the United States. We have passed a great many bills on the basis that they are war measures, and any person who has been in this House a few months understands that this is a war measure.

The United States Government would never enter into any such enterprise as furnishing money to construct houses if it were not an absolute necessity.

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

By unanimous consent, Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania was granted leave to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER].

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill, and I am glad to do so, but through the kindness of the chairman I have been given this brief time in which to present a matter that I wish to call to the attention of the House relating to the proposed change in the draft law. As is perhaps known to the Members, a bill has passed the Senate and has been reported to the House that proposes to change vitally the basis for determining the quota of men to be drafted, changing it from population as at present to the number of men placed in class 1. I have asked the adjutant general of the State of Nebraska to furnish me the figures showing the way and the number of men who have been placed in class 1 in each county in the State of Nebraska by the draft boards, and also the total number of men registered and liable for service, and I have taken 20 representative counties out of the hundred counties and districts in Nebraska that are of nearly the same population and character of citizenship for the purpose of comparison, and I wish to put them in the Record in order to call the attention of the House to what will occur if quotas are determined by numbers in class 1 instead of total population or the total

number of registrants, as proposed in my amendment. Gen. Crowder has said that if the proposed bill, Senate joint resolution 123, becomes a law he will draw all the men from class 1 before he invades another class, no matter if one district thereby has to furnish the quotas lacking from another because class 1 is exhausted in the latter. To take an example from the table I submit: Seward County, with total draft population of 1,287, will furnish 1,262 soldiers for the trenches, while Antelope would furnish 156 from a total draft population of 1,206. Similar conditions are shown in the other counties compared in the table.

In like manner, if the rule of basing the draft on the number in class 1 is adopted, those States that have placed a large per cent of registrants in class 1 will have to furnish those soldiers lacking from States that have placed a small number in that class. I will say that Nebraska is a representative agricultural State. We were the eleventh State in the Union to furnish the number of men required to fill our quota in the Regular Army, and we had a less percentage of delinquents at the call of the last draft than any other State in the Union except North Dakota. So the conditions in Nebraska are probably those that exist in many other States. I hope that Members will apply to their State authorities and learn how the new rule will affect them. For instance, in Chase County the total registrants classified are 361, and the total number placed in class 1 is 283. In Dundy County, an adjoining county, the total registrants numbered 375 and the total placed in class 1 was 78. In the fourth district, represented by my colleague, Mr. SLOAN, in Seward County the total registrants number 1,287, and the number placed in class 1 by the Seward County board number 1,262, while in Antelope County, with a total registrant population of 1,206, the number placed in class 1 is only 156. And so it goes through the whole State. In other words, if the quota is based upon class 1, the numbers that are to be furnished by some of these counties with similar population will be ten times as many as others.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by placing therein this table.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Comparisons of the numbers of registrants placed in class 1 by the draft boards of counties of similar population, both as to numbers and vocations, as shown by report made by the adjutant general of Nebraska.

CONTIGUOUS COUNTIES.

County.	Total registrants in county.	Total placed in class 1.	Appeals to district boards.
Chase.....	361	283	113
Dundy.....	375	78	3
Hayes.....	283	251	187
Perkins.....	295	70	1
Frontier.....	765	636	322
Furnas.....	846	88	4

CENTRAL SECTION, ONE NORTH AND ONE SOUTH OF PLATTE RIVER.

Franklin.....	809	445	294
Nance.....	751	107	54
Nuckolls.....	1,011	615	250
Cofax.....	1,011	245	28
Gosper.....	380	269	501
Boyd.....	574	75	.....
Seward.....	1,287	1,262	543
Antelope.....	1,206	156	.....
Gage.....	2,443	1,508	1,014
Buffalo.....	1,931	425	2
Saunders.....	1,637	1,327	665
Scotts Bluff.....	1,531	253	4

LINCOLN, CITY, COMPLETE, AND DIVISIONS 1 AND 2, OMAHA, CITY.

Omaha (divisions 1 and 2).....	5,985	2,263	493
Lincoln (divisions 1 and 2).....	4,732	171	13

In entire State an average of 32½ per cent of all registrants classified were placed in class 1.

It will be noted that in counties where the numbers placed in class 1 is large in proportion to the total registrants the appeals to the district board are numerous.

At the time these figures were made up a total of 6,330 appeals were pending in the entire State before the district boards in a total of 33,681 registered and liable to military service.

Nebraska was the eleventh State to furnish its quota of volunteers for the Regular Army and had the lowest per cent of draft delinquents under the previous call of any State in the Union except North Dakota.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].



Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support and vote for the pending measure because it appears to be absolutely necessary in the successful prosecution of the war. But I rose to speak in relation to another matter which in my judgment is even more important in connection with the gigantic struggle in which we are now engaged.

While in every section of our country, in every city, town, and hamlet, our people, all true Americans who honor the flag, and whose hearts are beating in anxious sympathy with the brave boys who have gone and are going to fight the battles of the Republic, to uphold its dignity and to defend its honor, and to make the world safe for America, are making noble and generous response to every call of the American Red Cross, and while the manhood, womanhood, and childhood of the Nation are giving of their time, energies, and means to the support and assistance of this the greatest and most efficient organization for relief work the world has ever known, and while letters and messages are coming daily from the boys at the front in praise of its work, yet knockers in some sections of this country are not even sparing the Red Cross, and statements are made and given circulation to the effect that the major portion of the funds contributed go for salaries and administrative expenses and the minor portion to actual relief.

Gentlemen, these reports are without foundation either in truth or in fact, and I do not propose that they shall longer go unchallenged. I am sure that the patriotic forces who are engaged in securing contributions to the Red Cross will be glad to know that not one cent collected for the Red Cross war fund is used for administrative purposes and that every dollar goes into the work of relief, and that of the immense fund contributed to and used by this organization less than 2 per cent is required for administrative purposes, and this comes out of money paid in as membership dues by members of the organization. I ask to insert in the Record and have printed as a portion of my remarks a letter and statement just received from the deputy comptroller of the Red Cross, which furnishes a very definite explanation as to the matters to which I have just referred.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS,  
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1918.

Hon. RILEY J. WILSON,  
House of Representatives of the United States,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: I am very glad to receive your inquiry of the 25th instant about Red Cross funds.

Every dollar subscribed to Red Cross war fund is used for relief work made necessary by the war. All administrative expenses, as well as some relief activities, come out of the portion of membership dues paid over by the chapters to the national organization. No money is paid out of Red Cross treasury except under appropriations authorized by war council or executive committee.

Appropriations for relief activities up to date, chiefly on budgets for the period ending Apr. 30, 1918:		
Out of war fund	-----	\$79,700,901.82
Out of other funds	-----	553,265.38
Total for relief	-----	80,256,167.20
Administrative expenses at headquarters and 14 division offices, including cost of membership campaigns, carrying on supply business, enlisting personnel of nurses, etc.:		
Actual for eight months to Feb. 28, 1918	\$2,806,769.50	
Estimated for two months to Apr. 30, 1918	900,000.00	
		3,706,769.50
Total	-----	83,962,936.70

This indicates that less than 4½ cents out of the dollar is spent for administrative expense and over 95 cents for relief. But it should be remembered that in "expenses" there are included such activities as enlisting nurses, doctors, and other workers, and especially the considerable cost of conducting a supply business which has transactions of \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 per month. Probably the actual overhead expense of management is less than 2 per cent, and, as stated above, not one penny of this comes out of the contributions for relief purposes.

From what I have said it is clear that any statement to the effect that "ninety cents out of every dollar subscribed is used for administration" is wholly without foundation. As you suggest, such reports are probably circulated with malicious intent and as part of the enemy propaganda.

A complete financial report is in preparation and will be published early in May. I will see that a copy is sent to you, and I will have additional copies sent to any persons you may care to name.

Yours, truly,

LOUIS J. HUNTER,  
Deputy Comptroller.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we have just one business as a Nation at this time and that is to win this war,

and to do this we must have unity of action as well as of spirit among all patriotic citizens, and there should be no room or place anywhere for the "knocker," the obstructionist, and the disloyal who are hampering the operations of the forces and organizations whose activities are so essential to our success.

A portion of our forces are to-day in the battle line at the front and others are going gladly to join them, placing their all on the altar of liberty in our defense. The very heart of the Nation is with them. In every community loyal and patriotic men and women are giving them undivided and unflinching support. This is no time for quiet, passive, or inactive patriotism. The only man who can classify himself as a genuine American is he who comes forth openly and aggressively into the discharge and performance of whatever duty or service he can best render to his country now. [Applause.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, there will soon come before this House for consideration, in connection with the conference report on the Agricultural appropriation bill, the regulations for grading of potatoes recently forced upon the farmers of the country generally and of Michigan particularly by arbitrary, unwise, and unwarranted action of a section of the Food Administration. The regulations in question, mandatory in their operation, have been represented by the authorities as in the interest of potato growers and satisfactory to them. Such is not the case.

During the pendency of the Agricultural appropriation bill in the Senate the following amendment was adopted, it having been presented by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], it being No. 41 of the Senate amendments to said bill:

That act No. 41, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved August 10, 1917, be amended by adding the following at the end of section 14 of said act: "Provided, That no part of the money herein appropriated or any unexpended balance heretofore appropriated shall be used to defray the expenses of the Food Administration or any other department of the Government in the work of grading potatoes, and no regulation shall be made therefor: *Provided further*, That it shall not be lawful to grade potatoes as to size or otherwise interfere with the marketable value thereof when such products are free from blight, dry-rot, and other disease harmful to the public health."

I hope that amendment will be concurred in by the House conferees and by the House; and, as expressive of the views of the potato growers of Michigan and, I think, also of other States, I desire to call the attention of the House to the following resolutions adopted unanimously at the annual convention of Michigan potato growers held at the Michigan Agricultural College a few days ago:

Whereas the United States is engaged in the greatest war of history, involving the freedom and democracy of the world, the preservation of our Nation and the safety of our homes. We fully realize that the successful prosecution of the war and the welfare of our boys across the seas depend upon the united strength of the Nation's man power and the coordination and cooperation of all its commercial and agricultural interests. The farmers of the Nation have heeded the pleas of President Wilson that they put forth their utmost endeavors to increase the food products of the Nation that the wants of our soldiers, the allies fighting by their side, and the citizen population may be supplied; and

Whereas in complying with the pleas of the Federal Government in these respects the farmers of Michigan last spring planted the largest acreage of potatoes in their history, paid the highest prices of years for seed, labor, and fertilizer, tended the crop through a most discouraging season, and because of circumstances outside their control secured a most disappointing yield for their labor; and

Whereas when the farmers took their potatoes to market expecting that they would be graded and sold in the same manner as in previous years, they were required by the buyers to conform to a grading system which in practical operation resulted in a classification that placed in a so-called No. 2 grade having little if any market value from 25 to 35 per cent of sound edible potatoes that in previous years had found a ready market under grading rules as accepted and established by the trade; and

Whereas the grading rules so suddenly promulgated were not extended to include all potato-growing sections of the country; neither were any established rules or requirements demanded of retail dealers or distributors, thus enforcing grading rules upon the farmer without following the product to the consumer in an effort to create a demand for such grades; and

Whereas the establishment of these grades has resulted in huge financial loss to the farmers of all States, paralyzed the movement of the crop during the normal marketing season, resulted in an overabundance of potatoes at the source of supply and a shortage at the consuming markets, forced the farmers to hold their crop of No. 1 stock for much higher prices than would have been necessary to have paid the cost of production had they been able to place on the market a larger percentage of their crop as in former years; and

Whereas the lack of a market for the so-called No. 2 stock has resulted in an enormous and criminal waste of precious food, in direct contravention to the teachings and efforts of the Food Administration to conserve food products; and

Whereas the President has said, "No law can last long \* \* \* which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and Whereas the farmers of the State of Michigan have been arbitrarily compelled by virtue of the very nature of the marketing and distributing machinery of potatoes, controlled by the organized shippers

of the State, to have their potatoes graded in a manner contrary to their wishes and detrimental to their interests, having had absolutely no voice in the matter whatsoever: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we, loyal citizens and farmers of the State of Michigan, in convention assembled, do hereby pledge our utmost support to the prosecution of this great war for the cause of humanity, and to do all in our power to produce the greatest amount of foodstuffs required to win the war; and were the present method of grading potatoes in any manner a measure destined to assist us in our direct benefit to those most vitally concerned, the producer or consumer, we would cheerfully, gladly abide by its provisions; be it further

*Resolved*, That we protest against the indiscriminate waste of food resulting from the double grading of potatoes, and to request the immediate abolishment of all obnoxious rules governing the production of food that will in any way have a tendency to reduce or curtail such production, and that the Government do all in its power to assist the farmers in this effort; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we particularly condemn the double grading of potatoes as now being employed by the shippers of this State, and demand its immediate abolishment, in the interest of our common cause; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this convention of representative potato growers of Michigan go on record as favoring the principle of grading potatoes as regards to quality, which principle, in fact, has been observed for many years by the producers and by buyers in all terminal markets; but we are unalterably opposed to further interference in the matter of grades, through which neither producer nor consumer is benefited, fully believing that the discussion and determination of such regulations may, with justice to all and injury to none, be left until the close of the war.

FORREST A. LORD,  
Mount Clemens.  
LAWRENCE SIPLE,  
Greenville.  
DAVID E. BURKS,  
Beulah.  
ELMER COMPTON,  
Remus.  
A. M. SMITH,  
Lake City.

LANSING, MICH., March 7, 1918.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it was not my purpose to speak on this bill when I came in this afternoon, because I did not know that this measure was to be brought in the House to-day. Within 6 miles of my home there is a shipyard that has cost the Government \$14,000,000, but there are no homes there for the workmen. There will be about 4,000 to 5,000 men employed and, with their families, there will be something like 16,000 or 17,000 people. In a talk I had with one member of the Shipping Board the other day he informed me there were only 185,000 men employed in the 150 shipyards that are now under the control of the Government, and they wanted 300,000 more men in order to have three shifts of eight hours a day, and that it was impossible to obtain them, because of the lack of housing, and on the average a married man would not remain longer than five months at any shipyard without his family. At Bristol, on the Delaware, where the Shipping Board intends to expend some \$2,000,000 in building homes, they will also erect hospitals as well as hotels and places of amusement.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that at Bristol they are using boats in the river in order to accommodate workmen?

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. They have one large boat which was used as an excursion steamer that is tied up to the wharf, and the men are obliged to sleep on board of it in order to have a place to remain at Bristol and perform their work. The men and women who are employed in our military industries must be regarded as human beings, and their comforts be looked after, as well as those who fill high official positions. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO].

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing the report of the general secretary of the Interstate Inland Waterway League on the interoceanic canal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to print in the Record the report indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how long is the report?

Mr. LAZARO. It is very short.

Mr. ELSTON. About how many words?

Mr. LAZARO. It is very short.

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

The report is as follows:

THE INTERCOASTAL CANAL FROM THE MISSISSIPPI TO THE RIO GRANDE. [From the report of the general secretary Interstate Inland Waterway League at the thirteenth annual convention. Revised to Mar. 1, 1918.]

Interstate Inland Waterway League of Louisiana and Texas: C. S. E. Holland, president, Victoria, Tex.; Henri Gueydan, vice president, Gueydan, La.; G. J. Palmer, vice president and treasurer, Houston, Tex.; Leon Locke, general secretary, Lake Charles, La.; Roy Miller, assistant secretary, Corpus Christi, Tex.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Texas: C. S. E. Holland, Victoria; G. J. Palmer, Houston; A. B. Davidson, Cuero; J. H. P. Davis, Richmond; W. P. H. McFaddin, Beaumont; Walter Gresham, Galveston; Jan van Tyen, Port Arthur; G. B. Culver, Matagorda; John W. Gaines, Bay City; J. S. Cullinan, Houston; Arthur Mathis, Rockport; A. E. Masterson, Angleton; R. Givens, Corpus Christi; L. Cobolin, Brownsville; F. H. Farwell, Orange; Lindsay Waters, Harlingen; Duncan Ruthven, Palacios; Willett Wilson, Port Lavaca; S. W. Pipkin, Beaumont; Homer D. Wade, Freeport; Roy Miller, Corpus Christi.

Louisiana: Henri Gueydan, Gueydan; Leon Locke, Lake Charles; E. A. Pharr, Morgan City; H. B. Hewes, Jeanerette; J. G. Medlenka, Crowley; W. B. Reed, Morgan City; T. Cheney Lawless, Garden City; C. O. Mouton, Lafayette; L. H. Marrero, Gretna; J. A. Wakefield, Cameron; Horace H. Harvey, Harvey; C. S. Williams, Patterson; Martin Behrman, New Orleans; B. B. Myles, New Orleans; A. M. Dupont, Houma; Paul F. Jahneke, New Orleans; John L. Henning, Sulphur; Wilbur H. Kramer, Franklin; Walter Lemann, Donaldsonville; Rene F. Clerc, New Orleans; H. A. King, New Iberia.

The Intercoastal Canal, of Louisiana and Texas, is a part of a continuous inland waterway, already surveyed and partly constructed, reaching from Boston, Mass., along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts to the Rio Grande, Tex. The section which concerns us immediately is the Mississippi to the Rio Grande, and the Interstate Inland Waterway League was one of the first organizations to take up a plan for coast inland waterway development.

An act of Congress of March 3, 1873, ordered a survey with a view to connecting the Mississippi with the Rio Grande by cuts and canals, joining the lakes, bays, bayous, and lagunas along the margin of the Gulf of Mexico. The survey was conducted by Maj. C. W. Howell, and a report with estimates made on a cost of 25 cents a cubic yard for construction was submitted, but no appropriation was made at that time.

The project being revived by Texas and Louisiana interests, a new survey was authorized by the act of March 3, 1905, and the examination from the Mississippi River at Donaldsonville, La., to the Rio Grande was made by Maj. Edgar Jadwin, whose report is printed in House document No. 640, Fifty-ninth Congress, second session. Subsequently the Donaldsonville exit was changed to Plaquemine by reason of the locks at that place.

A general interest in waterways prompted Congress to order in the act of March 3, 1909, a survey of the entire intracoastal waterway from Boston, Mass., to the Rio Grande, Tex. To a special board of engineers composed of Lieut. Col. Lansing H. Beach, Maj. H. Jervey, Capt. J. C. Oakes, Capt. H. B. Ferguson, and Capt. A. E. Waldron was assigned the section from St. Georges Sound, Fla., to the Rio Grande, and the report of the board is printed in House document No. 610, Sixty-third Congress, second session. Location of routes and estimates are given in this report under date of January 15, 1914. No action on this report has yet been taken by Congress.

The engineers subdivide the Mississippi-Rio Grande waterway as follows: Mississippi River to Bayou Teche, Bayou Teche to Mermentau River, Mermentau River to Sabine River, Port Arthur to Galveston Bay, Galveston to Brazos River, Brazos River to Pass Cavallo, Pass Cavallo to Aransas Pass, Aransas Pass to Brazos Santiago, Brazos Santiago to Rio Grande.

Despite the efforts of the league and the attitude of the Army Engineers, Congress continues to treat each of these sections as a separate project. Recognition of the waterway in its entirety is demanded.

The section between the Mississippi River and the Sabine River embraces practically all of southern Louisiana and lies well within the region of alluvial deposit made by the Mississippi River. It consists of wide areas of marsh, numerous cypress swamps, and many lakes, which are from one-half to 30 miles in length. Many bayous, having a general north-and-south direction, intersect, and these bayous are all deep, most of them having 20 to 30 feet for miles in succession. There are no elevations, and it is possible to construct a tide-level canal across the entire section. For the purpose of preserving some fresh-water basins for irrigation, especially in the rice region, locks are located in places where the canal crosses some lake or bayou. Although the bayous are deep, the bays and lakes are usually shallow, usually from 6 to 10 feet in depth. The league, therefore, is urging a construction inland around those bays in order that a channel may be maintained and that navigation may be free from the dangers of open waters and of being left on a shoal after a prolonged blow from the north.

MISSISSIPPI TO TECHE.

This is the center of the sugar region of Louisiana and skirts the great cypress areas. The lower part, near the Gulf, has a large fish and oyster trade and is the location of many canneries. Some of the principal streams, all of which are navigable, are the Barataria, Des Allemands, Lafourche, Terrebonne, Little and Grand Caillon, Boeuf, Black, and the mighty Atchafalaya. There are also numerous lakes, among which may be named Salvador, Cataouache, Des Allemands, Field, Long Verret, Palourde, and Grand Lake, this last being a widening of the Atchafalaya. This river and lake is joined by a network of bayous and lakes with Plaquemine Bayou and connects with the Plaquemine locks, and commerce from the Atchafalaya, the Teche, and westward passes through these locks 110 miles above New Orleans.

With the construction or improvement of a short link—Lafourche, Terrebonne, Bayou Black—communication could be made with New Orleans from the west through one or both of the privately owned canals extending from the Mississippi opposite that city. The Harvey Canal connects with the river at Harvey through a lock 30 feet in width, a length of 150 feet, and a depth of 7 feet over the sills. This canal extends to Bayou Barataria and enters Lake Salvador through Bayou Villars, thence through Harvey Canal No. 2 to Bayou Lafourche. It is probably the intention of the owners of this canal to extend it still farther west, if it is not taken over by the United States to form a part of the intracoastal waterway. The other canal, known as the "Company Canal," by reason of its having been constructed about 1830



to 1850 by the Barataria & Lafourche Canal Co., is at present owned by Mr. R. R. Barrow. This canal connects with the Mississippi River at Westwego by a lock having a 25-foot width, 160-foot length, and a 6-foot depth. The route of this canal is through Bayou Segnette, Lake Salvador, and enters the Lafourche at Lockport. From this point it passes through the swamp and through Lake Field and Lake Long to Bayou Terrebonne, about 8 miles below Houma. The special board recommended a canal in this section and advised an initial appropriation of \$300,000, with a view of purchasing, ultimately, one or both canals if it was found practical. These canals are extensively used.

#### BAYOU TECHE TO MERMENEAU RIVER.

This section is in the sugar and rice country, and provision was made for it as a project in the act of March 2, 1907, on a 5-foot depth, a bottom width of 40 feet. The route is a dredged canal, known as the L'anson Canal, which connects the Teche with the Bays of Cote Blanche and Vermilion, thence through Schooner Bayou to the canal dredged to White Lake and through three small lakes to Grand Lake. This section was completed in 1911 and is in extensive use. A lock at Schooner Bayou 36 feet wide, 300 feet long, and 9 feet in depth serves to prevent the pollution of White Lake by the salt waters of the connecting bays. This lake, being fresh, has long served as a reservoir for water used in rice irrigation, this particular district being the greatest rice-producing section in the United States. The special board has recommended a route inland around these bays and lakes to avoid the shallow waters and recommends a depth of 7 feet with an adequate bottom width, but no action on this has been taken by Congress. An alternative route in the eastern end of this section often used is from the lower Atchafalaya through Wax Bayou and to East Cote Blanche Bay around Point Chevreuil.

Appropriations made by Congress for the foregoing section total \$314,203.

#### MERMENEAU TO SABINE.

An appropriation of \$100,000 was made for this section in the act of June 25, 1910. The engineers were asked to use this money on the western end of the section lying between Calcasieu River and Sabine River, it being figured that this amount would complete that connection on the prescribed basis of 5 by 40. In order to have a direct line avoiding a tortuous bayou, thereby better serving the agricultural and other interests, a new line was surveyed, and the cost in excess of the estimate of the United States engineers was figured at \$27,450, which sum was contributed by the communities asking for the new route. Of this amount \$14,183.03 was returned upon completion of the work. On this stretch are located shipyards, sulphur mines, oil fields, rice plantations, and mills and lumber plants. By reason of the need for war and commerce of the enlargement of this part of the canal two wards of the parish of Calcasieu voted bonds in the amount of \$250,000 and asked the United States Engineers to recommend the improvement of the stretch to a 9-foot plus depth and a 100-foot bottom width, conditioned on the community, through the bond issue mentioned, contributing one-half the cost. The recommendation was made and the act of August 8, 1917, appropriated \$230,000 for the work. A modification of this section is carried in the bill pending at this time, March, 1918, to a 90-foot bottom width and such depth as the funds will secure, presumably more than 12 feet. The act of last August also contained authority to construct that part of the section between the MermenEAU and Calcasieu Rivers on a 7 by 75 foot basis, provided it could be done with the funds available, which amount to about \$260,000, secured by appropriations made in previous acts. Appropriations and contributions for the entire section total \$898,000. Hydraulic dredges are at work in the Calcasieu-Sabine section and work in the MermenEAU-Calcasieu stretch will soon begin.

#### SABINE RIVER TO GALVESTON BAY.

This route begins at the head of Sabine Lake and follows the Sabine-Neches Canal to Port Arthur, completed with a depth of 25 feet. From Port Arthur the route along the north shore, by way of Salt Bayou, thence to East Galveston Bay, has been approved on a basis of 9 by 100, but no appropriation has been made by Congress. This is one of the most important links of the canal, and it would be deplorable if the interested communities suffered it to be omitted from the pending bill without a vigorous protest. The same applies to the New Orleans-Morgan City section.

#### GALVESTON BAY TO BRAZOS RIVER.

In 1851-1853 the Galveston & Brazos Navigation Co. constructed a canal 6 feet deep and 100 feet wide between the mouth of the Brazos River and West Galveston Bay. This canal, 10 miles in length, was extensively used for many years in carrying cotton and other commodities. In 1859 the State of Texas made some improvement by dredging, but the storm of 1875 practically obliterated the channel on its old depth. The canal was taken over by the United States in 1892 at a cost of \$30,000, and is now a part of the section adopted in the act of March 2, 1907. This act provided for a 5 by 40 construction, appropriating the sum of \$133,829 for the waterway on the coast of Texas and authorizing the expenditure of \$300,000 more, all of which has been used. Included in this were Pass Cavallo to Aransas Pass and the Guadalupe to Victoria.

#### BRAZOS RIVER TO PASS CAVALLO.

This section, included in the appropriations above, has been completed on a basis of 5 by 40. The only actual land dredging on the coast of Texas was the stretch between West Galveston Bay and Matagorda Bay. All the other work has been through open waters. The section between Port Arthur and Galveston Bay will pass inland, as there are no sheltering islands on that part of the coast. Another inland cut will be the Brazos Santiago to Rio Grande section, at the Brownsville end of the project. The river and harbor act of June 25, 1910, appropriated \$200,000 for this stretch between the mouth of the Brazos and Matagorda Bay. The work has been completed, but, in addition to the need for a greater depth, it is essential that some work be done to provide a way of communication from the canal to points on the immediate coast. Improvements in the Brazos Channel and Harbor near Freeport, where the second great sulphur mines are located, add to the importance of the contiguous sections of the inland waterway.

#### PASS CAVALLO TO ARANSAS PASS.

This section of the canal passes through Espiritu Santo Bay back of Matagorda Island and connects with the Guadalupe River through San Antonio Bay. There is also connection with Port Lavaca through a channel 7 feet deep and 80 feet wide from Pass Cavallo.

#### ARANSAS PASS TO BRAZOS SANTIAGO.

A part of this stretch is covered by the existing project for improvement of Turtle Cove Channel between Aransas Pass and Corpus Christi, which contemplates a depth of 12 feet, the work being in progress. At present Corpus Christi is the western end of the project so far as the completed and approved sections are concerned. The remaining part of the section is through Laguna Madre, which has a varying depth of from 1 to 8 feet. The development of the southern part of Texas and of the fertile valley of the lower Rio Grande will soon compel recognition of this stretch.

#### BRAZOS SANTIAGO TO RIO GRANDE.

This section, 8 miles long, extending from Point Isabel has been recommended by the special board on a regulation depth of 9 feet and a bottom width of 100 feet. This is a needed improvement of itself, and the completion of the interoceanic canal will make its construction imperative. It is probable that the efforts of the people in that section will result in securing deep water to Brownsville within a very few years.

Summarizing, the status of the inland waterway is as follows: Mississippi River to MermenEAU River completed with a ruling depth of 5 feet, reached either through Plaquemine Locks to the Atchafalaya, or through one of the privately-owned canals opposite New Orleans and described herein.

MermenEAU River to Sabine River, work in progress; depth MermenEAU-Calcasieu Stretch, 7 feet; Calcasieu-Sabine, 12 feet.

Sabine to Port Arthur and Port Sabine, 25 feet.

Sabine to Galveston, approved on a depth of 9 feet; now before Congress.

Galveston to Corpus Christi, completed on 5-foot depth. Corpus Christi to Brownsville, not yet undertaken.

The object and advantage of the waterway becomes plain when one remembers the dangers in the open waters of the Gulf, especially to small craft. There is a dread also of tropical hurricanes. With the completion of the canal all the markets on the Mississippi and its navigable tributaries can be reached safely and cheaply, and the communication afforded opens to the Mississippi more than a thousand miles of the navigable rivers of Louisiana and Texas. The commercial need of the waterway has been well established; its military value is obvious.

The canal will reach places in the coast country where railroad construction would be so costly that it could hardly be undertaken. The best proof of the practicability and need of the canal may be found in the fact that many private canals exist and are in constant use, serving a triple purpose—transportation, irrigation, reclamation. The last feature has been greatly stimulated by the interoceanic, and in southern Louisiana there are more than 50 extensive reclamation districts embracing a total area of over 300,000 acres.

Rights of way are furnished without cost to the United States, and these are usually obtained without much difficulty by reason of the value and use of the canal. Occasionally, however, it takes time and patience to secure a gift of a strip of land 300 feet wide, and some time to perfect the titles.

The appropriations thus far made total over \$2,000,000. It is estimated that \$10,000,000 will be required to complete the project on the basis urged by the league, 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, as stated by the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds a few moments ago, this is a war measure. It came before that committee with the assurance that it had the approval of the President of the United States and of the entire Cabinet. It is different from the appropriation which was recently made for shipbuilding purposes. While a portion of the money will be used at the shipyards, it has other objects and other purposes in view. It also makes provision for the housing of employees of munition plants at the places where they are manufacturing the big guns, aeroplanes, engines, and everything of that kind. It also, by an amendment which will be offered at the proper time, will carry \$10,000,000 for the housing of employees here in the city of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, I consider this one of the most important war measures that has been brought before the House at the present session. Our armies which we are raising and training will be of no avail to us unless we have the ships to place them upon the battle front in Europe and provide them with something to defend themselves with after they are placed there. The shipping question is the most serious proposition before us to-day, as events now going on in France demonstrate. It is more important that we get a few hundred thousand men over immediately than it is to do anything else that I can conceive of at this time. Mr. Chairman, objection has been made to this bill for the reason that it is to be handled under the Department of Labor. In my judgment that is the proper department of the Government to handle this proposition. They are in touch with the whole labor situation. They know the needs; they are familiar with every detail of it; and they have got it now at their fingers' ends and are ready to commence operations just as soon as authority is given by act of Congress. The Treasury Department, where some think the authority should have been placed, is not in a position to take immediate charge of it. The Secretary of the Treasury, with the \$20,000,000,000 of railroads of the country in his hands and all the billions of bond issues, and everything of that kind, has all he can attend to just at

this time. Now, these appropriations are not excessive. We have the assurance that England has expended \$700,000,000 for housing purposes for the laborers at the shipping yards and munition plants. This bill and the one that has heretofore been passed both together will only aggregate a little over \$100,000,000.

That is a small sum compared with the results that we hope to obtain. I will repeat that I consider this the most important war measure that has been brought before us at the present session, and I sincerely hope that the bill will be passed at the earliest possible time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, events of the greatest moment now taking place on the battle fields in France emphasize the emergency of this proposition. Under the able and efficient management of the Secretary of War we have succeeded in building up an admirable army of a million and a half men, who have been selected, mobilized, trained, and equipped in less than 12 months from the time of the declaration of war; we have great manufacturing plants in operation hourly turning out vast quantities of munitions for ourselves and our allies; our almost boundless fields of agriculture are being planted to food-producing crops; but, Mr. Chairman, these men, these munitions, and these foods can not help us win the war unless we can reach the Continent of Europe with them in time to prevent our allies from being overwhelmed by a vastly superior force.

In northern France the destiny of the civilized world hangs suspended in the balance because of the difficulties we must encounter in order to send relief before it is too late. The cry for relief comes to us from every quarter; the shipyards and munitions plants are congested on account of the inadequacy of the housing facilities for the workmen now engaged, and many additional thousands must be employed to carry on this work; the clerical force here at the National Capital can not be suitably lodged at this time, and thousands more must come; the shipyards, the powder and gun works, the motor truck and aeroplane factories, all tell a similar tale. The labor necessary for the successful operation of all these industries can be secured as soon as suitable living quarters can be provided, but without such quarters they can not be operated to their full capacity in this most critical period. Mr. Chairman, the fate of the world and our future destiny are largely dependent upon this legislation.

I sincerely hope that it may be put through with the least possible delay. [Applause.]

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania 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? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in modern times wars are not won in a single battle or by any one line of effort. Modern warfare has developed into a science where the mobilization of men and munitions is only a part of the great game.

Industries, finances, and practically all the walks of life must be readjusted and protected from the encroachment of unusual and unnatural conditions. Other things being equal, the side wins to-day who can best and most efficiently mobilize not only its military strength and power but its natural resources and industries.

The financial strain of a modern warring nation is tremendous, and it can not be withstood if industrial life is paralyzed and the earning capacity and the means of earning the livelihood of its citizens is interfered with.

Every individual in this Republic should be busy at something; if not engaged in so-called "war activities" he should be engaged in a profit-making pursuit of some kind in order that we may make the most of our powerful industrial strength from which may be drawn the revenue to sustain the financial strain of the war.

At the outset of these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I am willing to concede that there may be a few classes of industries of the United States that could well suspend, or practically so, until the war is over. If there be such industries they are the ones whose employees can be readily set to other tasks. I find a very wide difference of opinion not only among Members of Congress but among others connected with the administration of

public affairs in this country to-day as to the advisability of declaring certain industries "nonessential" to the winning of the war and discouraging them in their operation and development.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Hon. William Gibbs McAdoo, on whose shoulders rests largely the responsibility of financing this war, on February 5, 1918, gave out the following statement:

Because of the interest of the Treasury Department in the conservation of capital and credit during the period of the war, I have received several inquiries as to whether building operations of one kind and another should be discouraged. With regard to plans for public buildings under the control of this department, I have stopped letting contracts except in cases where they were absolutely necessary.

Home building is an excellent thing in normal times, but at present, unless there is a real shortage of houses for war workers, I strongly advise that materials, valuable labor, and credit be not utilized for this purpose. Whether homes should be built should be determined strictly by the urgency of the need.

Also, on February 27 the same gentleman, in explanation of his statement of February 5, directed a letter to Frank W. Conner, Esq., Washington, D. C., which is as follows:

You have asked me for an elaboration of my statement concerning the desirability of restricting at this time unnecessary building operations.

It is only by subordinating local and personal interests to the general welfare, and by enforcing the most rigid economy in matters of public and private enterprises, as well as in matters of personal expenditure, that the United States can hope to bear its part of the financial burden of the war and to release sufficient labor and materials for war purposes without depletion of our own resources.

It is impossible to lay down a hard and fast rule as to what every patriotic citizen should do in order to live up to his duty in this connection. Things that are necessary for the life and health of the people must, of course, be procured. So it is with the building of homes. It is obvious that it is unnecessary for me to elaborate the point that building operations absorb the very materials and the very class of labor and the very kind of money that the Government requires most urgently at this time.

Where it is a question of building a new home simply because it would afford greater comfort, the operation should not be undertaken. Where it is a question of need—be it on account of sanitary conditions or because without such new construction other operations essential at this time for the welfare of the country would suffer—there is no doubt that the work should be undertaken. This applies equally to construction work in cities and towns and in farming districts.

Everybody should weigh conscientiously in his own mind whether or not it is his own comfort and convenience or the national welfare that moves him in his purposes. If that is done honestly, I do not think there will be any doubt as to the proper course to be pursued in each case.

I am also informed that the Capital Issues Committee of the Federal Reserve Board, with which the Secretary of the Treasury is affiliated, advised all Federal reserve banks, as well as all banking institutions, to husband their financial resources for war credit and war purposes to the extent of discouraging loans and financial assistance for all building and other so-called "nonessential" projects.

If it is essential to the winning of this war, and if our chances of winning it would be increased by the carrying out of these suggestions, I do not think that any patriotic man or class of men should be heard to complain, because, gentlemen, we can not overlook anything that is essential to our success in this great struggle.

It is therefore not my purpose to indulge in criticism of anyone connected with the present governmental activities, but to briefly call your attention to the effect that these orders or suggestions have had upon the industrial life of the country and to especially direct your attention to their effect upon the great limestone industry of the State of Indiana, a large part of which is in the district which I have the honor to represent.

The oolitic limestone industry of Indiana is one of the great industries of this Republic, and is practically limited to the counties of Lawrence and Monroe, in the State of Indiana. In those two counties it represents a direct investment of \$10,000,000 and consists of 42 firms operating quarries and mills. The annual output in normal times from these two counties alone is from 20,000 to 30,000 carloads of limestone, and they normally employ about 5,000 men.

Indiana limestone has for many years enjoyed nation-wide markets. This Government has for a generation or more favored Indiana limestone in 75 per cent of all its permanent building operations, because from long tests and actual experience it has been demonstrated that the limestone of this district is superior in quality to any competing stone, considering its availability and price.

I here desire to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table prepared by the Government Geological Department showing the States and Territories into which the product of the quarries of this district have gone during the year 1917 and the value of such production:



	Cubic feet sold by mills (who buy rough stone).	Value.	Cubic feet sold by quarrymen (rough stone and stone milled by the quarrymen).	Value.	Total cubic feet.		Cubic feet sold by mills (who buy rough stone).	Value.	Cubic feet sold by quarrymen (rough stone and stone milled by the quarrymen).	Value.	Total cubic feet.
Canada.....	2,700		154,008		156,708	Ohio.....	247,233		180,827		428,033
Alabama.....	1,218		21,712		22,930	Oklahoma.....	8,531		17,913		26,444
Alaska.....						Oregon.....			57,448		57,448
Arizona.....						Pennsylvania.....	217,793		329,493		544,193
Arkansas.....	525		2,784		3,309	Rhode Island.....	2,700		28,271		30,971
California.....						South Carolina.....	6,127		17,502		23,629
Colorado.....	2,241		9,283		11,499	South Dakota.....	13,683		9,558		23,218
Connecticut.....	3,887		26,702		30,589	Tennessee.....	1,353		20,419		21,769
Delaware.....	1,158		2,100		3,258	Texas.....	37,784		11,747		49,531
District of Columbia.....	98,989		79,313		178,302	Utah.....					
Florida.....	7,541		1,394		8,845	Vermont.....					
Georgia.....	7,495		34,716		42,211	Virginia.....	11,841		29,172		41,013
Hawaii.....						Washington.....					
Idaho.....						West Virginia.....	31,381		25,942		57,323
Illinois.....	53,804		818,554		874,358	Wisconsin.....	16,305		62,004		78,309
Indiana.....	139,688		2,808,723		2,938,411	Wyoming.....	935		41		977
Iowa.....	36,735		71,337		108,072	Total.....	1,408,036	\$1,751,758	6,757,609	\$3,342,992	8,165,645
Kansas.....	2,431		17,247		19,678						
Kentucky.....	2,578		11,059		13,637						
Louisiana.....	17,280		22,584		39,864						
Maine.....			1,617		1,617						
Maryland.....	6,580		8,923		15,503						
Massachusetts.....	6,723		149,850		156,573						
Michigan.....	105,305		217,723		324,028						
Minnesota.....	13,275		79,814		93,089						
Mississippi.....			320		320						
Missouri.....	63,064		39,524		102,588						
Montana.....			2,119		2,119						
Nebraska.....	34,080		69,614		103,694						
Nevada.....											
New Hampshire.....	802		15,030		15,832						
New Jersey.....	8,120		77,723		85,843						
New Mexico.....											
New York.....	133,405		1,197,597		1,331,002						
North Carolina.....	62,971		17,856		80,827						
North Dakota.....	5,409		10,299		15,699						

From this it will be observed that there are but 7 States out of the 48 that did not use Indiana limestone during last year.

While Indiana is a great consumer of limestone, the large amount sold in Indiana, as is shown by the above table, is in part due to the fact that it was sold by quarrymen to independent mill operators within the State.

I also desire to insert as a part of my remarks another table prepared for me by the Government Geological Department, showing additional facts and figures as to the amount of limestone produced in each of the counties of Monroe and Lawrence, in the State of Indiana, in both of the years 1916 and 1917:

Production of limestone in Lawrence and Monroe Counties, Ind., in 1916 and 1917.

County.	Rough blocks or rough sawed.		Dressed.		Total.		Other.		Total value.
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	
1915.									
Lawrence.....	Cubic feet.	\$831,219.00	Cubic feet.	\$1,688,471.00	Cubic feet.	\$2,519,690.00	Short tons.	\$69,548.00	\$2,589,238.00
Monroe.....	3,690,973	538,833.00	2,249,082	337,050.00	5,940,055	873,883.00	187,270	17,403.00	891,283.00
Total.....	5,856,564	1,398,055.00	2,688,970	2,025,521.00	8,545,531	3,393,576.00	212,236	86,951.00	3,480,525.00
Average price.....		.23		.75		.40		.41	
1917.									
Lawrence.....	3,578,058	1,169,768.00	1,442,475	1,360,839.00	5,020,533	2,530,607.00	164,583	88,935.00	2,619,542.00
Monroe.....	1,149,692	444,529.00	321,320	268,971.00	1,471,012	713,500.00	45,740	34,068.00	747,568.00
Total.....	4,727,750	1,614,297.00	1,763,795	1,629,810.00	6,491,545	3,244,107.00	210,323	123,003.00	3,367,110.00
Average price.....		.34		.92		.50		.58	
Percentage of increase or decrease.....	-19.3	+18.0	-34.4	-19.5	-24.0	-4.4	-0.9	+41.4	-3.3

From this it will be observed that during the year 1917 there was a decrease in production but an increase in value over the year 1916. This condition is largely due to the increased cost of labor and machinery.

Picture, if you can, gentlemen, these 42 mammoth mills and quarries, employing their thousands of men, dotting the beautiful hillsides of this great portion of the State so wonderfully blessed by nature! Picture the thousands of happy, contented homes, where, owing to steady employment at good wages, the head of the house was enabled to not only shelter, feed, and clothe and educate his children, but to enjoy all the comforts and many of the luxuries of life, and incidentally to be able to buy liberty bonds and in a hundred ways contribute to the revenues of the Government that are required to finance this war. That was the condition in this prosperous community prior to the time that the production of stone, except in certain excepted lines, was declared as "nonessential." The business of these communities depended upon the pay rolls of the quarries and mills; the laborers built their homes in the building and loan, and I am glad to say that most of them own their own homes. A more thrifty, intelligent, industrious, and patriotic class of men never lived than the stone quarrymen of this district. They met the first calls of this Government for war purposes heroically.

To-day 2,000 men, I am informed, have left this community, trying to find work, work no doubt that they are not suited for.

Many of them have spent a lifetime in becoming efficient in this particular line of duty and it is difficult for them now to be torn away from their life-long pursuits and to become accustomed to new avocations of life. Probably not more than a thousand men are now employed in the stone business in this field. The quarries and mills are probably running 20 per cent capacity. There are at least, I am informed, 2,000 idle men who refuse to leave their homes and families and go out into the world of uncertainty to start life anew. The loan associations must foreclose their mortgages, because they must pay the banks or the banks must fail; the merchant must discontinue credit to his customers who have always been able to pay. I am told that bread lines and soup houses, if not there now, are only avoided by the splendid charity of public-spirited citizens.

Some one in bitterness has said that it is apparently the intention of some men in charge of governmental affairs to-day to conscript capital by taxation and to conscript labor by starvation. I do not believe this statement; I do not think there is a man connected with this Government to-day who seriously entertains such views or would dare to even attempt to put them into practice. The high cost of living has been a terrible problem to the laboring man. I have studied his condition closely and I am one of those who rejoices to-day in the splendid patriotism and sacrifices of the toilers of the Nation. If you will give him a chance to make a living for himself and his family and "keep the wolf from the door," he will help you "whip the

Kaiser"; but, frankly, I would fear the consequences if hunger were permitted to gnaw the vitals of the great laboring class who produce the wealth of this Nation.

This stone in this district is for the most part quarried and milled by hydroelectric power. Very little fuel is required in this industry. The Government is now erecting a great many permanent buildings other than post-office buildings. The manufacturers of imitation stone, terra cotta, and brick have the ear of those in charge of Federal building operations. The terra cotta fellows seem to be the favorites. Terra cotta and imitation stone require the use of a great amount of fuel, since both products are baked in ovens. The Indiana limestone mills can produce building blocks or building bricks of uniform size quicker than any of those competitors can produce either of the other products. There can be no comparison in the durability of the material and but inconsequential difference in the price.

The other day, in seeking relief for this distressed condition of the people of my district, I sought the help of Secretary McAdoo. He was patient and kind; he was, no doubt, astonished at the havoc the "nonessential" propaganda was creating in this great industrial center. Mr. McAdoo expressed his deep regret for these conditions, reexpressed his faith in the soundness of the "nonessential" principle, and at the same time expressed the hope that "the poise of industry would be maintained"; and then he asked, "What can I do to help them?" I replied that a modification of the declarations made was not only proper but absolutely essential. I do not contend that it is of first importance that jewelry shall be manufactured; that sporting goods be produced; that fancy luxuries be indulged in; or that building operations or credit essential to these luxury-making enterprises be encouraged; but I do take the position that hundreds of different building operations necessary and essential in peace times are likewise essential and important in time of war and that credit and money and labor so employed is not wasted, but, on the contrary, opens up an avenue for Federal taxation and strengthens the industrial life of the country, which I regard as essential to the winning of the war.

Yesterday I called upon the director of housing, who will probably spend the money provided for in this bill. He is now building homes for employees at Trenton, N. J., and at Hog Island, Pa. He states that they are using brick, but that they will probably use limestone from this district for the door and window sills. Now, the manufacture of ordinary brick occasions the use of fuel in great quantities, while the quarrying and sawing of stone in this district is largely done by hydroelectric power.

If this bill passes, and I hope it will, it should be seen to that Indiana limestone is used wherever it is practicable.

In the consideration of this problem it must be understood that a territory devoted to quarrying of limestone is not fitted for agriculture, and it is also true that, for the most part, the entire population of the cities of Bedford and Bloomington, which are the beautiful county seats of Lawrence and Monroe Counties, respectively, and much of the surrounding community, is absolutely dependent upon the stone industry. An expert stonecutter or quarryman, as I am informed, is rarely fitted for any other pursuit. This makes the blow fall heavily upon this community. Brick, terra cotta, and artificial stone, being manufactured products, are not limited to any particular community. It certainly should be the aim of those in charge of building activities of the Government to use the product of this quarrying district where it is at all practicable, and it is largely for the purpose of impressing this important fact upon the minds of you gentlemen and others to whom this information may go that I have spoken so much at length at this time.

In addition to my efforts in the direction spoken of, I have walked many miles through the labyrinth of corridors and oak-decked war offices in the multitude of war-activity buildings in this District trying to induce the various War Department heads to locate some kind of war activity in this stricken district or to let a contract for the making of some kind of war materials to some of the enterprising people of this community, but I have discovered that most of the war activities have gone South and the war contracts have gone South or East.

In desperation the owners of these large, idle mills, some of them nearly a thousand feet long and a hundred feet wide, equipped with derricks and cranes for moving heavy materials, have appealed to the Quartermaster General's Department and other departments for the privilege of leasing these mammoth sheds to the Government for storage purposes. I am not even hopeful that this will be done, and, in my opinion, whatever relief is to come to these people must come in the way of using Indiana limestone for Government building purposes and in the broadening of the policy of the Government with reference to a modification of its present attitude on "nonessential" industries.

I am conscious of the fact that the "nonessential" propaganda effort, if it may be so styled, has not only affected the Indiana limestone district but has paralyzed the building trades of the whole Nation. I do not have at hand the figures as to the number of men out of employment in the United States at this time, when labor is reputed as being so scarce and so valuable and high priced, but I have heard an estimate of the number so unemployed and it is truly appalling.

We are told that from actual experience abroad it has been ascertained that it requires seven persons in industry to support one soldier at the front. In the case we have a United States Military Establishment of 3,000,000 men it would mean 21,000,000 men mobilized in our industrial army. What do you intend to do with those who are so unfortunate as not to be able to participate in war activities? Will it not eventually pauperize and bankrupt the Nation? Should it be our aim to run this war on moneys already earned, or should we have as a source of revenue supply a great, active industrial army of prosperous, busy people? England and Germany have not paralyzed their industries, but are permitting them to run at full blast with labor not required for war service, and then they tax these industries to the very limit, having regard only for the continued life and tax-paying ability of these institutions.

Another view of this whole industry-destroying situation:

Some day, and we hope in the near future, this war will be over, and we will be called upon to return to the pursuits of peace. Industrial conflict and competition between the enemy and allied nations, unequalled in all history, will be the great problem of the world. What chance will we have in this conflict if our mills and factories have rotted to the ground; if their army of intelligent, skilled employees, through necessity, have wandered away from where they can give the best account of themselves? I am not contending that industries not directly connected with producing war equipment should be preferred, but it is my contention that it is essential, not only to the winning of the war but to the future welfare of our Nation, that these great wealth producers should be kept in motion.

Some days ago I received a petition signed by some of the leading and best business men of the counties of Lawrence and Monroe, representing most of the great industries affected by the present deplorable condition, and I desire at this point to make the same, together with the signatures, a part of my remarks upon this subject:

Whereas the communities of Monroe and Lawrence Counties, Ind., are in effect entirely dependent on the Indiana limestone industry so far as their existence and welfare is concerned; and

Whereas the curtailment of commercial building activities has all but annihilated the opportunities of said industry to continue its ordinary activities, thereby depriving thousands of men of their means of earning a livelihood, thus reducing to a negligible point the ability of these communities to sustain themselves; and

Whereas the labor in these communities is not generally in a position to transfer its efforts to other localities, nor the employers, merchants, and direct as well as indirect commercial establishments, as a result, in a position to guard against threatened disintegration; and

Whereas the public welfare demands that in a measure circulation in commercial channels be reestablished, which it is believed can be brought about by activities contributing to the success of our war operations: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the undersigned organizations, through their duly accredited representatives, do hereby urgently pray the Senators of the State of Indiana, the Congressmen representing Monroe and Lawrence Counties, as also the entire congressional delegation of the State of Indiana, to intercede in behalf of these communities, to the end that their needs be recognized without delay and opportunity extended either to assist in the prosecution of the war by manufacture of war supplies or by enabling the Indiana limestone industry to secure for its product a reasonable percentage of the permanent construction work for which vast sums are now being expended by practically every department of the Federal Government.

Bedford, Ind., February 26, 1918.

Ira A. Conell, Oolitic Belt Conference, representing Stonecutters' Union; Harry J. Campbell, Stone Planers' Union; W. E. McCormick, president Bedford Chamber of Commerce; E. C. Turner, representing bankers of Bedford; E. L. Bender, president Bloomington Chamber of Commerce; Roy O. Pike, representing bankers of Bloomington; Stanley T. Chrisler, representing Merchants' Association of Bedford; C. G. Creighton, secretary of Retail Merchants' Bureau of Bloomington, Ind.; A. E. Dickinson, president Bedford Stone Club and Bedford Stone Club Auxiliary (Inc.); Thos. J. Vernia, president Indiana Limestone Quarrymen's Association; C. M. Lemon, representing the milling interests of Bedford; J. A. Karsell, representing the milling interests of Bloomington; Frank R. Allen, representing the wholesale grocers of Bedford.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this bill is one that meets with my hearty approbation. I think, however, that there should be some changes made in it in order to accomplish a purpose that I have in mind. I understand from the chairman of this committee, in private conversation, that there is an amendment that will be offered by the committee that will no doubt include the things I have in mind.

I think the language of the bill should be broad enough to cover arsenals and other permanent plants of the United States having to do with Army and Navy activities, and I understand from the chairman of the committee that such amendments will be offered.

The reason I think this is true is on account of some personal experience I have had lately that impressed this on my mind. The district I represent lies in the western part of Illinois, along the Mississippi River. In the northern end of the district is the county of Rock Island, and in this county is located the great arsenal of Rock Island. It is one of two arsenals in the United States where small arms are made, the other one being at Springfield, Mass. This arsenal is ideally located on an island in the Mississippi River. When this war broke out we had working there about 1,600 men. As soon as the war broke out and the appropriations were made, so that the institution could develop, it began to develop.

We have appropriated in this Congress for the use of that institution over \$8,000,000, and it is being used, and much of it has been expended there. We are also contemplating in the Army appropriation bill large additional sums to be expended there.

Around this island are three cities. Over in Iowa, in Mr. HULL's district, is the city of Davenport, a city of 50,000 population. On my side are the cities of Rock Island and Moline, cities of about 25,000 inhabitants each.

Under ordinary circumstances, before the war broke out, these cities were able to house the employees that were there. They were small cities, compactly built, with adequate room for expansion, it is true, but at that time there was no particular reason for extraordinary expansion. But from the time the war broke out up to this time, gentlemen, the employees and laborers at that island have increased from 1,600 to approximately 16,000, and there are to-day on this island working from day to day something between 15,000 and 16,000 men.

There is no place to take care of them. Men come in there day after day and walk the streets trying to find some place to live in, and where they do not find some place to live they go back to the community from which they came, and immediately the word gets out that there is no place at Rock Island for these workers, and consequently the thing that the Government has tried to do is not accomplished, because you can not get these men in there on account of a lack of places in which they can live.

Now, those men have got to be taken care of. Plans are on foot now for the increase of that establishment up there until they can work on the island approximately 20,000 men. These men are making all kinds of necessary war munitions. They are making leather goods of all kinds; they are making mess kits of all kinds; they are making Springfield rifles; they are making guns for the Field Artillery; they are making projectiles for the field guns, and starting a large plant for the manufacture of small-arms ammunition. It is very essential that this institution, in the center of the country, in an ideal location for an institution of this kind, be built up, and it ought to run at full blast. As I have told you, it is one of the two places where the United States Government can make its own guns, the other being Springfield, Mass.

Now, I want to impress upon the gentlemen of this committee, if such a thing is necessary, the absolute necessity of taking care of these workmen. I am advised, and I think properly so, that arrangements have already been made by the Department of Labor for the doing to some extent of this thing that we are trying to do by this bill. In other words, the Department of Labor has plans that it has outlined and its agents have been making investigations, going around through the cities of Rock Island and Moline and Davenport getting information, trying to find out about these things, and these reports have come in to the department and the plans are perfected. That is one reason, and I think the best reason that could be advanced, why I believe the Department of Labor ought to have control of this situation. It is largely a temporary matter, and yet I want to call the attention of the committee to one fact. I do not know whether this suggestion is wise or not, but it seems

to me that it may be. It seems to me it would be a good thing to amend this bill so as to include arsenals or permanent institutions of the United States, and to provide that the buildings that those places shall be permanent where the Government establishment is permanent. It seems to me that in such cases the Secretary of Labor ought to have the right to make these buildings permanent, so that they may be used by the Government in the future. Take the case of the arsenal at Rock Island. There is not a single housing place on the island, which consists of about 1,000 acres. There is no place there for the housing of employees.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state that the bill does provide for the construction of permanent buildings where the community is a permanent one.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Perhaps that language has escaped my notice. I observed particularly the language that the buildings should be temporary. If the bill is broad enough, so that the buildings may be made permanent where the establishment is permanent, then my criticism is unfounded. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Labor ought to have the power to use his judgment about that sort of thing. He can conserve the financial part of it by making the buildings permanent in places where they ought to be permanent, as, for instance, at Rock Island. There are a few barracks for soldiers there, but in ordinary times there are only 100 or 200 soldiers there, while now there are several thousand of them, besides all these employees working there.

To illustrate the hardships that are entailed by this influx of men who are trying to work there, where they have not adequate housing facilities and where they can not get back and forth, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] recently mentioned on the floor of the House the situation that had arisen concerning the means of transportation, where the Army had used a large number of the cars in getting the employees back and forth to and from the island. Of course, they all have to go on street cars or jitney busses in getting back and forth.

The Navy, in order to take care of the employees of an institution that is making guns at East Moline, came in and requisitioned a large number of the cars, and took possession of them. As a consequence there was a great conflict of authority, and nobody knew from day to day how the men were to get back and forth. That is all occasioned by this condition of congestion that I speak of.

I suggest that buildings ought to be put up there to take care of these men, so that they can be housed when they come, and so that they will come there. The principal trouble is that they will not come when they learn that there are no facilities there for taking care of them. We could get plenty of men there to work in the manufacture of these necessary things if we had some place to take care of them. I know that propositions have been made by our chambers of commerce in those towns to the Government departments that the people there will even pay a part of the expense of the housing in those communities, if the Government will take hold of the thing promptly and appropriate the necessary balance.

Now, I do not want to weary the House, I have stated what I wanted to say about it in as few words as I could. I want to impress on the committee the necessity and importance of hurrying up this thing and doing something about it and doing it soon. Instead of spending two days haggling over a seed bill, which, if it passes, may be too late to do any good, you ought to do something of this kind which is important, something that will help win the war instead of wasting our time on trivialities. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, how much time has been used on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has 23 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Florida 28 minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. 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. KELLY of Pennsylvania, 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. 10265, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately on the passage of the bond bill this bill (H. R. 10265) be taken up and be made a continuing order until disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the bond bill this bill be

taken up and made a continuing order until completed. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire what the purpose of the gentleman is? Is it to take up this bill to-morrow or Monday?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand that the bond bill will be taken up to-morrow and possibly be disposed of to-morrow, and this bill will follow that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### THIRD LIBERTY LOAN.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to file the report of the Ways and Means Committee on what is known as the third liberty bond authorization by 12 o'clock to-night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to file the report on the bond bill by 12 o'clock to-night. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the bill to be reported by the committee available to Members at the present time?

Mr. KITCHIN. It will be at 9 o'clock to-morrow morning. It is an amendment to the present bond act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any objection to incorporating the bill with the report in the Record, so that Members may have it before them?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; and I will ask unanimous consent to do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to file his report by midnight. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The second request of the gentleman is that the bond bill with the report may be printed in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

A bill (H. R. 11123) to amend an act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes."

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes," be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, is hereby authorized to borrow, from time to time, on the credit of the United States for the purposes of this act, and to meet expenditures authorized for the national security and defense and other public purposes authorized by law, not exceeding in the aggregate \$12,000,000,000, and to issue therefor bonds of the United States, in addition to the \$2,000,000,000 bonds already issued or offered for subscription under authority of the act approved April 24, 1917, entitled 'An act to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes': *Provided*, That of this sum of \$3,063,945,460 shall be in lieu of that amount of the unissued bonds authorized by sections 1 and 4 of the act approved April 24, 1917, \$225,000,000 shall be in lieu of that amount of the unissued bonds authorized by section 39 of the act approved August 5, 1909, \$150,000,000 shall be in lieu of the unissued bonds authorized by the joint resolution approved March 4, 1917, and \$100,000,000 shall be in lieu of the unissued bonds authorized by section 400 of the act approved March 3, 1917.

"The bonds herein authorized shall be in such form or forms and denomination or denominations and subject to such terms and conditions of issue, conversion, redemption, maturities, payment, and rate or rates of interest, not exceeding 4½ per cent per annum, and time or times of payment of interest, as the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time at or before the issue thereof may prescribe. The principal and interest thereof shall be payable in United States gold coin of the present standard of value.

"The bonds herein authorized shall from time to time first be offered at not less than par as a popular loan, under such regulations, prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time, as will in his opinion give the people of the United States as nearly as may be an equal opportunity to participate therein, but he may make allotment in full upon application for smaller amounts of bonds in advance of any date which he may set for the closing of subscriptions and may reject or reduce allotments upon later applications and applications for larger amounts, and may reject or reduce allotments upon applications from incorporated banks and trust companies for their own account and make allotment in full or larger allotments to others, and may establish a graduated scale of allotments, and may from time to time adopt any or all of said methods, should any such action be deemed by him to be in the public interest: *Provided*, That such reduction or increase of allotments of such bonds shall be made under general rules to be prescribed by said Secretary and shall apply to all subscribers similarly situated. And any portion of the bonds so offered and not taken may be otherwise disposed of by the Secretary of the Treasury in such manner and at such price or prices, not less than par, as he may determine. The Secretary may make special arrangements for subscriptions at not

less than par from persons in the military or naval forces of the United States, but any bonds issued to such persons shall be in all respects the same as other bonds of the same issue."

SEC. 2. That the last sentence of section 2 of said act approved September 24, 1917, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"For the purposes of this section there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,500,000,000, and in addition thereto the unexpended balance of the appropriations made by section 2 of said act approved April 24, 1917, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the authority granted by this section to the Secretary of the Treasury to establish credits for foreign Governments, as aforesaid, shall cease upon the termination of the war between the United States and the Imperial German Government."

SEC. 3. That section 4 of said act approved September 24, 1917, is hereby amended by adding two new paragraphs, as follows:

"That holders of bonds bearing interest at a higher rate than 4 per cent per annum, whether issued (a) under section 1, or (b) upon conversion of 3½ per cent bonds issued under said act approved April 24, 1917, or (c) upon conversion of 4 per cent bonds issued upon conversion of such 3½ per cent bonds, shall not be entitled to any privilege of conversion under or pursuant to this section or otherwise. The provisions of section 7 shall extend to all such bonds.

"If bonds bearing interest at a higher rate than 4 per cent per annum shall be issued before July 1, 1918, then any bonds bearing interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum which shall, after July 1, 1918, and before the expiration of the conversion period prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, be presented for conversion into bonds bearing interest at such higher rate, shall be deemed to have been converted on the dates for the payment of the semiannual interest on the respective bonds so presented for conversion, last preceding the date of such presentation, and no adjustment of accrued interest shall be made in respect thereof."

SEC. 4. That the last sentence of section 5 of said act approved September 24, 1917, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"The sum of such certificates outstanding hereunder and under section 6 of said act approved April 24, 1917, shall not at any one time exceed in the aggregate \$8,000,000,000."

SEC. 5. That section 7 of said act approved September 24, 1917, be, and is hereby, amended, by adding two new paragraphs, to read as follows:

"In determining the value of the shares of any national bank, State bank, trust company, or other banking institution, for the purpose of taxation by any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or any local taxing authority, the par amount of any bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the United States owned by such bank, trust company, or banking institution shall be deducted from its assets.

"If any part of this section shall for any reason be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this section but shall be confined in its operation to the part thereof directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered."

SEC. 6. That section 8 of said act approved September 24, 1917, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to deposit, in such incorporated banks and trust companies as he may designate, the proceeds, or any part thereof, arising from the sale of the bonds and certificates of indebtedness and war-savings certificates authorized by this act, and arising from the payment of income and excess-profits taxes, and such deposits shall bear such rate or rates of interest, and shall be secured in such manner, and shall be made upon and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Federal Reserve act, and the amendments thereof, with reference to the reserves required to be kept by national banking associations and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to designate depositories in foreign countries with which shall be deposited all public money which it may be necessary or desirable to have on deposit in such countries to provide for current disbursements to the military and naval forces of the United States and to the diplomatic and consular and other representatives of the United States in and about such countries until six months after the termination of the war between the United States and the Imperial German Government, and to prescribe the terms and condition of such deposits."

SEC. 7. That said act approved September 24, 1917, is hereby amended by adding three new sections, to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. That any bonds of the United States bearing interest at a higher rate than 4 per cent per annum (whether issued under section 1 of this act or upon conversion of bonds issued under this act or under said act approved Apr. 24, 1917), which have been owned by any person continuously for at least six months prior to the date of his death, and which upon such date constitute part of his estate, shall, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, be receivable by the United States at par and accrued interest in payment of any estate or inheritance taxes imposed by the United States, under or by virtue of any present or future law, upon such estate or the inheritance thereof.

"SEC. 15. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, from time to time, until the expiration of one year after the termination of the war, to purchase bonds issued under authority of this act, including bonds issued upon conversion of bonds issued under this act or said act approved April 24, 1917, at such prices and upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe. The par amount of bonds of any series issued before April 1, 1918, which may be purchased in the 12 months' period beginning April 1, 1918, and in each 12 months' period thereafter, shall not exceed one-twentieth of the amount of bonds of such series outstanding at the beginning of such 12 months' period. In the case of any series of bonds issued after April 1, 1918, the par amount of bonds of such series which may be purchased in the 12 months' period beginning on the date of such issue, and in each twelve months' period thereafter shall not exceed one-twentieth of the amount of the bonds of such series outstanding at the beginning of such 12 months' period. The average cost of the bonds of any series purchased in any such 12 months' period shall not exceed par and accrued interest.



"For the purposes of this section the Secretary of the Treasury shall set aside, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not exceeding one-twentieth of the amount of such bonds issued before April 1, 1918, and as and when any more such bonds are issued he shall set aside a sum not exceeding one-twentieth thereof. Whenever, by reason of purchases of bonds, as provided in this section, the amount so set aside falls below the sum which he deems necessary for the purposes of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall set aside such amount as he shall deem necessary, but not more than enough to bring the entire amount so set aside at such time up to one-twentieth of the amount of such bonds then outstanding. The amount so set aside by the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby appropriated for the purposes of this section, to be available until the expiration of one year after the termination of the war.

"The Secretary of the Treasury shall make to Congress at the beginning of each regular session a report including a detailed statement of the operations under this section.

"Sec. 16. That any of the bonds or certificates of indebtedness authorized by this act may be issued by the Secretary of the Treasury payable, principal and interest, in any foreign money or foreign moneys, as expressed in such bonds or certificates, but not also in United States gold coin, and he may dispose of such bonds or certificates in such manner and at such prices, not less than par, as he may determine, without compliance with the provisions of the third paragraph of section 1. In determining the amount of bonds and certificates issuable under this act the dollar equivalent of the amount of any bonds or certificates payable in foreign money or foreign moneys shall be determined by the par of exchange at the date of issue thereof, as estimated by the Director of the Mint and proclaimed by the Secretary of the Treasury, in pursuance of the provisions of section 25 of the act approved August 27, 1894, entitled 'An act to reduce taxation, to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.' The Secretary of the Treasury may designate depositaries in foreign countries with which may be deposited, as he may determine, all or any part of the proceeds of any bonds or certificates authorized by this act, payable in foreign money or foreign moneys."

Sec. 8. That the short title of this act shall be "Third Liberty bond act."

[House Rept. No. 428, 65th Cong., 2d sess.]

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11123) to amend an act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign Governments, and for other purposes," having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

At the present time our expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, are estimated to be \$16,116,591,347.72 and our estimated receipts for the like period from all sources now provided by law are estimated to be \$12,549,539,022, thus leaving a deficit at the close of the fiscal year of \$3,567,052,325.72. It is also deemed necessary to provide for additional credit to our allies of \$1,500,000,000 to enable the Government to extend them credit at the rate of \$500,000,000 per month during the months of July, August, and September of the next fiscal year. There will therefore be required an additional bond authorization of \$5,067,052,325.72, if the expenditures for the fiscal year 1918 are as great as the estimates and if we provide for the additional credit of \$1,500,000,000 for our allies during the first three months of the next fiscal year, which seems necessary.

Your committee believes that the additional bond authorization of \$4,461,054,540 carried by this bill, together with the authority granted the Secretary of the Treasury to issue short-term certificates of indebtedness, will be sufficient to provide the necessary funds for the present fiscal year and to extend credit to our allies as above indicated.

## THE PROPOSED BOND BILL.

### SECTION 1.—BOND AUTHORIZATION.

This section amends section 1 of the bond act of September 24, 1917, to increase the bond authorization under that act from \$7,538,945,460 to \$12,000,000,000. In other words, this proposed bill provides an additional authorization of \$4,461,054,540. There are \$3,666,233,850 of bonds authorized and available to be issued during the fiscal year 1918, under the authorization of September 24, 1917, so that the total amount of bonds available to be issued during the fiscal year 1918, under the act of September 24, 1917, as amended by this bill will be \$8,127,288,390. It must be borne in mind that this amount does not include \$63,945,460 of bonds authorized to be issued and applied in the fiscal year 1919 to redeem the loan of 1908-1918.

The act of April 24, 1917, as amended by the act of September 24, 1917, authorized the issue of \$2,000,000,000 of bonds. The act of September 24, 1917, authorized the issue of \$7,538,945,460 of bonds, in addition to the \$2,000,000,000 authorized by the act of April 24, 1917.

The proposed bill authorizes the issue of \$4,461,054,540 of bonds. If this bill becomes a law in its present form, the total bond authorization since the declaration of war will amount to \$14,000,000,000.

Under the act of April 24, 1917, \$1,986,615,316.81 of bonds have been issued, and under the act of September 24, 1917, \$3,808,766,150 of bonds have been sold. Of this amount \$3,807,724,858.73 had been paid into the Treasury on March 27, 1918. The total bonds sold to date, under the acts of April 24, 1917, and September 24, 1917, aggregate \$5,795,381,466.81.

Section 1 of the proposed bill amends section 1 of the bond act of September 24, 1917, as follows:

1. By increasing the bond authorization from \$7,538,945,460 to \$12,000,000,000, or \$4,461,054,540. For the third liberty loan the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to issue \$3,000,000,000 of bonds, reserving the right to allot oversubscriptions. The proposed increase in the issue will make it possible to allot all subscriptions in full upon the third liberty loan and leave a substantial margin of bonds for a future issue.

2. By increasing the maximum interest upon the bonds to 4½ per cent.

### SECTION 2.—CREDITS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

This section amends the last sentence of section 2 of the bond act of September 24, 1917, by increasing the appropriation for loans to the allies from \$4,000,000,000 to \$5,500,000,000, or \$1,500,000,000.

The existing appropriation of \$4,000,000,000, together with the appropriation of \$3,000,000,000 in the act of April 24, 1917, was calculated to provide the requirements of the allies in this country to the end of the current fiscal year; that is, the year ending June 30, 1918. Such requirements of the allies will be within the estimates. The proposed additional appropriation would provide for their requirements at the same rate for the months of July, August, and September.

In the acts of April 24, 1917, and September 24, 1917, we appropriated \$7,000,000,000 for loans to the allies, and this bill proposes to add to that amount \$1,500,000,000, thus authorizing total loans to the allies amounting to \$8,500,000,000.

The following table shows the credits and loans made to foreign countries to and including March 26, 1918:

Loans to foreign Governments to and including Mar. 26, 1918.

[Acts of Apr. 24, 1917, and Sept. 24, 1917.]

Country.	Credits established.	Loans made.	Balances under established credits.
Belgium.....	\$104,600,000	\$85,900,000	\$18,700,000
Cuba.....	15,000,000	.....	15,000,000
France.....	1,440,000,000	1,405,000,000	35,000,000
Great Britain.....	2,520,000,000	2,480,000,000	40,000,000
Italy.....	550,000,000	485,000,000	70,000,000
Russia.....	325,000,000	187,729,750	137,270,250
Serbia.....	6,000,000	4,200,000	1,800,000
Total.....	4,980,600,000	4,642,829,750	317,770,250

NOTE.—In addition to the above, a credit of 250,000,000 francs or approximately \$44,000,000 in favor of the Greek Government has been agreed to but not yet formally established, and a credit of \$8,663,666 was arranged in favor of the Roumanian Government, the precise status of which and the drafts thereunder is not definitely determined.

### SECTION 3.—BOND CONVERSION.

This section amends section 4 of the bond act of September 24, 1917, by adding two new paragraphs which provide that the holders of bonds bearing interest at a higher rate than 4 per cent shall not have the privilege of conversion, but that the provisions of section 7 of the act of September 24, 1917, relating to tax exemption shall extend to them.

In order to prevent trouble in connection with the conversions which will result from the issue of 4½ per cent bonds, and because of the impossibility of making these conversions promptly at the date of the issue of the new bonds of the third liberty loan, it is proposed in this section to treat all conversions made within the six months' period prescribed for conversions by the Secretary of the Treasury as though they had been made on May 15 in the case of the bonds of the second liberty loan or on June 15 in the case of the conversion bonds of the first liberty loan. Inasmuch as the holders of the bonds of both of these issues have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the conversion, it may be assumed that all of them will wish to make the conversion and to make it promptly. By virtue of this section they would lose nothing by writing a month or two to present their bonds for conversion. This provision will greatly relieve the burden that would be thrown upon the banks and trust companies of the country, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing if all conversions had to be made contemporaneously with the issue of the bonds of the new loan.

There are out now more than 20,000,000 separate bonds, and one can imagine what the conversion of those into the new issue will mean, and therefore it is deemed important not to restrict the Secretary of the Treasury in such a way that those conversions must be placed upon a given day or within a limited period of time.

The 4 per cent bonds are now convertible into a subsequent issue bearing a higher rate, and the 3½ per cent are also convertible. This proposed 4½ per cent bond will not be convertible.

### SECTION 4.—THE ISSUE OF CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS.

This section amends the last sentence of section 5 of the bond act of September 24, 1917, by increasing the limit upon the amount of certificates of indebtedness that may be outstanding at any one time from \$4,000,000,000 to \$8,000,000,000.

The amount of Treasury certificates now outstanding is about \$3,200,000,000. The existing authorization of \$4,000,000,000 will, therefore, be exhausted by the middle of April. While there is no reason to anticipate that so large an amount as \$8,000,000,000 of Treasury certificates will be required to provide for the necessities of the Government before another loan can be advantageously offered, nevertheless it is apparent that the Treasury ought to be placed in a position where it can provide for the current needs of the Government from month to month for a reasonable period in advance. These certificates can not run for more than a year, and the money raised by the issue of them can not be spent except for purposes approved by Congress.

These certificates of indebtedness are issued only to bridge over the interval between the liberty loans, and as soon as the liberty loan is placed Treasury certificates are retired, or they are issued in anticipation of taxes which are payable in June, and the moment the taxes are paid in, these certificates are retired, so that they are not an outstanding indebtedness all the time; they are merely means employed, and an essential means, of temporarily financing the needs of the Treasury.

In view of the above it is evident that in speaking of our authorized bonded debt, it is not proper to add to the \$14,000,000,000 of bonds authorized since the declaration of war, the certificates of indebtedness authorized, since they can not be issued for a longer period than one year, and since the only purpose that they serve is to bridge over the periods between liberty loans or the payment of income and excess-profits taxes.

### SECTION 5.—INDIRECT TAXATION BY STATES OF LIBERTY BONDS.

All the liberty-bond acts have provided that the bonds shall be exempt from State and local taxation. Your committee is advised that notwithstanding this provision certain States are indirectly taxing these bonds by including the value of such bonds in determining the value of the capital stock for taxation purposes. This condition raises a very serious question, because if the States are permitted to tax Government bonds, when the Federal Government can not tax municipal and State bonds, the Federal Government will soon be placed in a position where it can not provide the necessary money to finance this war.

It has been suggested that States ought not to be deprived of taxes they are enjoying on Government bonds already issued. As a matter of fact, the States have not had that source of revenue heretofore, and

It has never been supposed they would get anything from the taxation of Government bonds, and they are not being deprived of anything to which they are entitled. Your committee believes that we ought to make it perfectly clear that the States must not begin to derive revenue from the taxation of Government bonds or certificates of indebtedness in order that there will be no difficulty in the future about it.

To meet this situation this section amends section 7 of the bond act of September 24, 1917, by adding the following paragraph:

"In determining the value of the shares of any national bank, State bank, trust company, or other banking institution for the purpose of taxation by any State, or any of the possessions of the United States, or any local taxing authority, the par amount of any bonds or other interest-bearing obligations of the United States owned by such bank, trust company, or banking institution, shall be deducted from its assets.

#### SECTION 6.—PERMISSION TO DEPOSIT INCOME AND EXCESS-PROFITS TAXES WITH QUALIFIED DEPOSITARY BANKS AND TRUST COMPANIES.

This section amends section 8 of the bond act of September 24, 1917, to provide for the deposit of the income and excess-profits taxes with qualified depositary banks and trust companies in the same manner as the proceeds of liberty bonds. Your committee believes that the enactment of this provision will go a long way toward relieving the fear of a money disturbance which the banks feel in connection with the large payments of these taxes, which must be made on or about June 15. The machinery for dealing with the deposit of liberty-bond payments has been completed, and about 4,000 banks and trust companies have qualified as depositaries.

#### SECTION 7.—ESTATE TAXES PAYABLE WITH 4½ PER CENT BONDS.

This section provides that a new section 14 shall be added to the act of September 24, 1917, so that 4½ per cent bonds shall be acceptable in payment of United States estate or inheritance taxes at par and accrued interest, if owned by a decedent, for at least six months prior to the date of his death. Your committee believes that this provision will be a very substantial attraction to induce the purchase of these bonds, and that it will give assurance to every bondholder that in case of his death his estate will contain assets which the United States will accept at par, whatever be the market conditions at the time, in payment of the taxes upon the estate.

Your committee believes that this provision will also have a very beneficial effect upon the general market for Government bonds, because it will then keep in the market a constant demand for them.

#### SECTION 7.—TO STABILIZE THE MARKET FOR GOVERNMENT BONDS.

This section also provides for the addition of another new section (sec 15) to the act of September 24, 1917, to provide a means to create a sinking fund to buy Government bonds issued or converted since September 24, 1917, in order to stabilize the market for Government bonds. Your committee believes that this Government must do what each of the warring countries have done in one form or another, and prepare itself to support the market for its bonds.

This new section provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall set aside, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum not exceeding one-twentieth of the amount of bonds issued or converted since September 24, 1917, and before April 1, 1918, and as and when any more bonds are issued that he shall set aside a sum not exceeding one-twentieth of the amount of such bonds issued.

This section further provides that whenever by reason of purchases of bonds the amount so set aside falls below the sum which the Secretary of the Treasury deems necessary, that he may set aside such amount as he shall deem necessary, but not more than enough to bring the entire amount so set aside at such time up to one-twentieth of the amount of bonds issued or converted since September 24, 1917.

This section appropriates the amount so set aside for this purpose, to be available until the expiration of one year after the termination of the war.

This section also provides that the par amount of bonds of any series issued before April 1, 1918, which may be purchased in the 12 months' period beginning April 1, 1918, and in each 12 months' period thereafter, shall not exceed one-twentieth of the amount of bonds of such series outstanding at the beginning of such 12 months' period, and that in the case of any series of bonds issued after April 1, 1918, the par amount of bonds of such series which may be purchased in the 12 months' period beginning on the date of such issue, and in each 12 months' period thereafter, shall not exceed one-twentieth of the amount of the bonds of such series outstanding at the beginning of such 12 months' period. The average cost of the bonds of any series purchased in any such 12 months' period can not exceed par and accrued interest.

If all the 3½ per cent bonds were converted to 4s as the 3½ and 4 per cent bonds now sold aggregate \$5,796,000,000, the most that could be set aside for the purpose of this sinking fund at the present time would be \$289,800,000.

#### SECTION 7.—PERMISSION TO ISSUE BONDS AND CERTIFICATES OF INDEBTEDNESS IN FOREIGN MONIES.

This section also provides for the addition of another new section (sec. 16) to the act of September 24, 1917, to permit the issue of bonds payable in foreign monies. This provision, it is believed, will make it possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to take steps to rectify the position of dollar exchange in those neutral countries where the dollar is at a disadvantage to-day.

The theory is that if we can sell some Government bonds in foreign countries, especially in those neutral countries where the balance is against us and where our exchange position is disadvantageous, we may be able to correct it or modify it to our advantage.

This section also permits the Secretary of the Treasury to sell bonds or certificates of indebtedness payable in foreign monies without offering them as a popular loan in the United States and to deposit in foreign countries with depositaries the proceeds from any such bonds or certificates. Your committee believe that this provision will greatly facilitate the negotiations which the Treasury Department must enter into in order to relieve foreign exchange problems.

#### SECTION 8.—SHORT TITLE OF THE ACT.

This section provides that the short title of the act shall be "third liberty bond act."

#### APPENDIX A.—Summary of estimated receipts and disbursements for the fiscal year 1918.

Balance in the Treasury June 30, 1917, free of all current obligations		\$1,066,983,361.00
Ordinary receipts	\$3,856,800,000.00	
Panama Canal receipts	6,000,000.00	
Public debt receipts (exclusive of war-savings certificates and bonds authorized but not yet issued)	4,357,607,312.00	
<b>Total estimated receipts</b>		<b>8,220,407,312.00</b>
Ordinary disbursements	9,568,029,726.72	
Panama Canal disbursements	24,338,889.00	
Public debt disbursements	334,222,732.00	
Special disbursements	6,190,000,000.00	
<b>Total estimated disbursements</b>		<b>16,116,591,347.72</b>
Estimated deficit in general fund June 30, 1918		6,829,200,674.72
Deficit as above		6,829,200,674.72
Necessary balance in general fund June 30, 1918		500,000,000.00
<b>Total estimated necessary issue of bonds and war-savings certificates during the remainder of the current fiscal year, based upon departmental estimates of expenditures</b>		<b>7,329,200,674.72</b>
Estimated receipts in fiscal year 1918 from war-savings certificates and bonds already authorized but not yet issued (exclusive of \$63,945,460 to be applied to the redemption in the fiscal year 1919 of the loan of 1908-1918)		4,329,131,710.00
Estimated authorization of bonds necessary, exclusive of cost of issue		3,000,068,964.72
To provide loans to the allies, first three months of next fiscal year		1,500,000,000.00
Cost of issuing said bonds		9,000,137.93
Estimated authorization of additional bonds necessary, including expense of issue		4,509,069,102.65

#### FISCAL YEAR 1918—ESTIMATED RECEIPTS.

Ordinary receipts:		
From customs		185,000,000
From internal revenue—		
Miscellaneous	\$973,000,000	
Excess-profits tax	1,226,000,000	
Income tax—		
Corporations	535,000,000	
Individuals	626,000,000	
From sales of public lands		1,800,000
From miscellaneous sources (including \$40,000,000 increased postage)		270,000,000
<b>Total estimated ordinary receipts</b>		<b>3,856,800,000</b>
Panama Canal, estimated receipts from tolls, etc.		6,000,000
Public debt:		
First liberty loan of 1917 (less amount thereof received in 1917)	\$520,280,222	
Second liberty loan of 1917	3,808,766,150	
One-year Treasury notes	23,540,000	
Deposits to retire Federal reserve bank notes and national bank notes	4,000,000	
Deposits for postal-savings bonds	1,020,940	
<b>Estimated public-debt receipts</b>		<b>4,357,607,312</b>
<b>Total estimated receipts (exclusive of war-savings certificates, Treasury certificates of indebtedness, and bonds authorized but not yet issued)</b>		<b>8,220,407,312</b>
Estimated receipts from war-savings certificates, fiscal year 1918	\$663,200,000	
Additional bonds authorized but not yet issued (exclusive of \$63,945,460, to be applied to the redemption in the fiscal year 1919 of the loan of 1908-1918)	\$3,666,233,850	
Less postal-savings bonds issued Jan. 1, 1918	302,140	
		3,665,931,710
<b>Total estimated receipts from war-savings certificates and bonds authorized but not yet issued less postal-savings bonds of Jan. 1, 1918</b>		<b>4,329,131,710</b>
<b>Grand total receipts</b>		<b>12,549,539,022</b>



APPENDIX B.—Statement of appropriations for 1918, of estimates of appropriations pending and proposed, and estimated expenditures in 1918.

	Appropriations, 1918.	Estimates pending.	Estimates proposed.	Total.	Estimated expenditures.
<b>Legislative:</b>					
Senate and House of Representatives.....	\$7,350,643.57			\$7,350,643.57	\$7,225,000.00
Library of Congress and Botanic Garden.....	746,905.00	85,000.00		751,905.00	750,000.00
Public printing and binding.....	7,456,915.00	1,974,208.23		9,431,123.23	9,304,022.77
Miscellaneous.....	424,915.00			424,915.00	300,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>15,979,378.57</b>	<b>1,979,208.23</b>		<b>17,958,586.80</b>	<b>17,581,022.77</b>
<b>Executive:</b>					
Executive Office.....	193,780.00			193,780.00	190,000.00
Bureau of Efficiency.....	65,000.00	50,000.00		115,000.00	128,000.00
Civil Service Commission.....	380,910.00			380,910.00	1,650,910.00
National Security and Defense.....	100,000,000.00			100,000,000.00	156,188,978.28
Alien Property Custodian.....		279,000.00		279,000.00	1,459,000.00
War Trade Board.....		1,018,331.00		1,018,331.00	1,053,831.00
Government for Danish West Indies.....	100,000.00			100,000.00	100,000.00
Trading with the enemy act.....	450,000.00			450,000.00	( <sup>b</sup> )
Tariff Commission.....	300,000.00			300,000.00	250,000.00
Miscellaneous.....	35,000.00			35,000.00	20,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>101,522,690.00</b>	<b>1,317,331.00</b>		<b>102,840,021.00</b>	<b>61,038,719.28</b>
<b>State Department:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	601,980.00	117,000.00		718,980.00	1,740,000.00
Foreign intercourse.....	5,869,746.65	1,327,856.72		7,197,603.37	18,265,000.38
Permanent appropriations.....	106,000.00			106,000.00	106,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,578,726.65</b>	<b>1,444,856.72</b>		<b>8,023,583.37</b>	<b>9,111,603.38</b>
<b>Treasury Department:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	4,249,821.67	329,445.00		4,579,266.67	14,400,000.00
Customs Service—					
Regular.....	9,955,000.00	300,000.00		10,255,000.00	10,471,752.00
Permanent.....	17,710,400.00			17,710,400.00	18,000,000.00
Internal Revenue Service—					
Regular.....	14,714,270.00			14,714,270.00	14,700,000.00
Permanent.....	3,052,600.00			3,052,600.00	3,052,600.00
Public Health Service.....	4,263,770.00	957,200.00	\$2,000,000.00	7,220,970.00	5,466,500.00
Coast Guard.....	6,731,086.00	30,500.00		6,761,586.00	6,731,086.00
Engraving and printing.....	4,203,400.00	500,000.00		4,703,400.00	4,703,400.00
Independent Treasury.....	655,740.00			655,740.00	650,000.00
Mints and assay offices.....	1,215,080.00	900,800.00		2,115,880.00	2,115,000.00
War-Risk Insurance Bureau.....	221,400,000.00	2,245,656.00		223,645,656.00	71,737,800.00
Farm Loan Bureau.....	260,000.00			260,000.00	256,000.00
Public buildings, including maintenance.....	20,005,768.88	7,401,500.00		27,407,268.88	19,361,000.00
Miscellaneous.....	2,551,673.38			2,551,673.38	1,500,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>310,988,609.73</b>	<b>12,665,101.00</b>	<b>2,000,000.00</b>	<b>325,653,710.73</b>	<b>164,145,138.00</b>
Director General of Railroads.....	500,000,000.00			500,000,000.00	200,000,000.00
War Finance Corporation.....		500,000,000.00		500,000,000.00	200,000,000.00
<b>Independent offices:</b>					
United States Shipping Board.....	1,040,517,500.00			1,040,517,500.00	1,034,273,040.97
Food and Fuel Administrations.....	152,500,000.00	2,000,000.00		154,500,000.00	107,235,000.00
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	5,466,666.66		150,000.00	5,616,666.66	5,616,000.00
Smithsonian Institution and National Museum.....	583,000.00	5,674.00		588,674.00	588,674.00
Federal Trade Commission.....	772,920.00			772,920.00	1,520,000.00
Federal Board for Vocational Education.....	1,860,000.00			1,860,000.00	1,660,950.00
Council of National Defense.....	500,000.00	300,000.00		800,000.00	1,130,000.00
Other boards and commissions.....	1,239,792.32	316,923.29		1,556,715.61	1,325,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,203,439,878.98</b>	<b>2,622,597.29</b>	<b>150,000.00</b>	<b>1,206,212,476.27</b>	<b>1,153,348,664.97</b>
<b>War Department:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,765,312.00	5,248,897.25		14,014,209.25	12,664,929.17
Quartermaster Corps.....	3,012,083,304.48	382,616,153.49	900,000,000.00	4,294,699,457.97	2,763,753,680.00
Provost Marshal General, registration and selection for military service.....	6,658,413.00	8,476,490.00		15,134,903.00	15,134,903.00
Ordnance Department.....	3,202,995,040.00	551,190,450.00		3,754,185,490.00	2,040,034,185.00
Medical Department.....	130,830,000.00	22,500.00		130,852,500.00	96,857,816.25
Signal Service, including Aviation.....	744,383,766.00	200,000,000.00	250,000,000.00	1,194,383,766.00	458,941,417.45
Engineer Department.....	349,037,000.00	70,175,000.00		419,212,000.00	307,067,231.00
Rivers and harbors.....	38,295,850.00			38,295,850.00	30,000,000.00
National Guard.....	13,512,000.00			13,512,000.00	700,000.00
Military Academy.....	1,374,646.18			1,374,646.18	343,584.42
Miscellaneous, military.....	5,747,783.00	2,000.00		5,749,783.00	2,582,460.80
Miscellaneous, civil.....	12,651,691.80	3,305,022.99	10,000.00	15,956,714.79	12,189,671.38
National security and defense.....					10,335,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>7,526,337,716.46</b>	<b>1,221,036,513.73</b>	<b>1,150,010,000.00</b>	<b>9,897,384,230.19</b>	<b>5,752,664,908.56</b>
<b>Navy Department:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,834,278.00	436,435.00		2,270,713.00	2,170,713.00
Aviation.....	62,283,000.00			62,283,000.00	51,000,000.00
Enlistment, transportation, and training.....	21,080,641.84	4,100,000.00		25,180,641.84	19,709,000.00
Emergency fund.....	215,000,000.00			215,000,000.00	165,550,000.00
Ordnance.....	393,137,598.50	19,983,593.00		413,121,000.50	332,458,500.00
Public works.....	68,188,755.01	43,636,935.00		111,825,690.01	172,240,000.00
Expenses of the fleet.....	145,746,280.00			145,746,280.00	136,000,000.00
Medicine and surgery.....	9,615,478.00			9,615,478.00	6,000,000.00
Pay of the Navy.....	126,732,518.57			126,732,518.57	124,000,000.00
Supplies, fuel, etc.....	85,939,355.85			85,939,355.85	52,800,000.00
Naval Academy.....	1,007,919.20	55,000.00		1,062,919.20	1,055,000.00
Marine Corps.....	43,440,148.78	9,930,000.00		53,370,148.78	44,930,000.00
Naval Militia.....	1,863,117.70			1,863,117.70	1,800,000.00
Increase of the Navy.....	417,702,323.00			417,702,323.00	351,720,787.00
Miscellaneous.....	3,210,073.00	150,000.00		3,360,073.00	1,437,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,596,931,455.45</b>	<b>78,261,870.00</b>		<b>1,675,193,325.45</b>	<b>1,365,800,000.00</b>
<b>Interior Department:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	5,162,845.00	16,000.00		5,178,845.00	5,200,000.00
Public Lands Service.....	2,496,000.00			2,496,000.00	2,750,000.00
Reclamation Service.....	8,227,000.00			8,227,000.00	8,250,000.00

[For footnotes see end of table.]

APPENDIX B.—Statement of appropriations for 1918, of estimates of appropriations pending and proposed, and estimated expenditures in 1918—Con.

	Appropriations, 1918.	Estimates pending.	Estimates proposed.	Total.	Estimated expenditures.
<b>Interior Department—Continued.</b>					
Geological Survey.....	\$1,850,520.00	\$250,000.00	\$100,000.00	\$2,200,520.00	\$1,850,000.00
Bureau of Mines.....	1,167,070.00	150,000.00		1,317,070.00	1,500,000.00
Alaskan Railway.....	14,500,000.00			14,500,000.00	11,500,000.00
Colleges for agriculture.....	2,500,000.00			2,500,000.00	2,500,000.00
Miscellaneous, beneficiaries, national parks, etc.....	2,136,917.57	36,448.10		2,173,365.67	2,170,000.00
Permanent appropriations.....	742,500.00			742,500.00	742,500.00
Indian service.....	18,821,631.97	254,000.00		19,075,631.97	21,184,000.00
Pensions.....	169,060,000.00	23,000,000.00		192,060,000.00	183,060,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>217,574,484.54</b>	<b>23,703,448.10</b>	<b>100,000.00</b>	<b>241,378,932.64</b>	<b>240,705,500.00</b>
<b>Post Office Department:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,942,260.00	15,000.00		1,958,260.00	1,922,000.00
<b>Department of Agriculture:</b>					
Salaries.....	5,555,360.00			5,555,360.00	5,403,080.00
Bureau of Animal Industry.....	7,214,958.00			7,214,958.00	5,154,458.00
Bureau of Plant Industry.....	2,774,250.00	6,000,000.00		8,774,250.00	4,752,250.00
Forest Service.....	5,374,475.00	775,000.00		6,149,475.00	4,949,475.00
States Relations Service.....	5,052,580.00			5,052,580.00	4,030,000.00
Weather Bureau.....	1,555,240.00			1,555,240.00	1,551,820.00
Bureau of Roads.....	11,608,240.00			11,608,240.00	6,000,000.00
Bureau of Markets.....	1,520,755.00			1,520,755.00	1,472,745.00
Eradication of cotton bollworm.....	250,000.00			250,000.00	250,000.00
Food survey, etc.....	11,345,400.00			11,345,400.00	9,000,000.00
Miscellaneous.....	4,639,290.60			4,639,290.60	3,905,488.00
Purchase and sale of nitrate of soda.....	10,000,000.00			10,000,000.00	9,000,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>66,889,545.60</b>	<b>6,775,000.00</b>		<b>73,664,545.60</b>	<b>55,172,312.00</b>
<b>Department of Commerce:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	307,530.00	7,000.00		314,530.00	307,000.00
Bureau of Standards.....	1,302,000.00	631,450.00		1,933,450.00	1,230,450.00
Census Bureau.....	1,883,400.00			1,883,400.00	1,400,000.00
Coast and Geodetic Survey.....	1,401,970.00	33,015.82		1,434,985.82	1,808,012.82
Lighthouse Service.....	6,639,189.00	370,000.00		7,009,189.00	8,370,000.00
Bureau of Fisheries.....	1,195,560.00	102,500.00		1,298,060.00	1,502,500.00
Miscellaneous.....	1,375,365.00	17,000.00		1,392,365.00	1,617,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>13,605,935.00</b>	<b>1,159,935.82</b>		<b>14,765,900.82</b>	<b>17,334,962.82</b>
<b>Department of Labor:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,116,886.00	329,203.34		1,446,089.34	1,393,180.98
Detention of interned aliens.....	1,000,000.00			1,000,000.00	830,000.00
Immigration Service.....	2,773,300.00			2,773,300.00	3,153,295.00
Employment Service.....	250,000.00	1,323,000.00		1,573,000.00	1,960,000.00
New services.....		485,451.64		485,451.64	1,497,023.75
Miscellaneous.....	312,650.75			312,650.75	300,000.00
Housing Government employees.....		50,000,000.00		50,000,000.00	25,000,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>5,432,836.75</b>	<b>52,139,659.88</b>		<b>57,592,496.63</b>	<b>32,130,499.73</b>
<b>Department of Justice:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,975,420.00	15,750.00	5,000.00	1,996,170.00	1,963,670.00
United States courts.....	7,662,396.00	192,876.77	533,000.00	8,388,272.77	8,311,272.77
Miscellaneous.....	1,636,400.00	600,000.00	1,750.00	2,238,150.00	1,230,210.00
Permanent appropriations.....	175,500.00			175,500.00	175,500.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>11,349,716.00</b>	<b>808,626.77</b>	<b>539,750.00</b>	<b>12,698,092.77</b>	<b>12,758,652.77</b>
<b>District of Columbia:</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	15,318,430.85	909,078.40		16,227,509.25	15,000,000.00
<b>Interest on the public debt, including interest on liberty bonds and certificates of indebtedness:</b>					
Cost of bond issues (to June 30, 1918).....	235,789,617.00			235,789,617.00	235,789,617.00
Increase of compensation.....	18,525,125.44			18,525,125.44	18,525,125.44
Panama Canal.....	15,000,000.00			15,000,000.00	15,000,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>269,314,742.44</b>	<b>745,590.00</b>		<b>270,060,332.44</b>	<b>269,314,742.44</b>
<b>Public debt: Certificates of indebtedness outstanding July 1, 1917.....</b>					
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>285,632,732.00</b>			<b>285,632,732.00</b>	<b>285,632,732.00</b>
<b>One-year Treasury notes:</b>					
Retirement of bank notes.....	23,540,000.00			23,540,000.00	23,540,000.00
Miscellaneous redemption of debt.....	25,000,000.00			25,000,000.00	25,000,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>48,540,000.00</b>			<b>48,540,000.00</b>	<b>48,540,000.00</b>
<b>Special:</b>					
Purchase of obligations of foreign Governments (less \$853,000,000 paid in fiscal year 1917).....	6,115,000,000.00			6,115,000,000.00	6,115,000,000.00
Purchase of farm-loan bonds.....	100,000,000.00			100,000,000.00	75,000,000.00
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>6,215,000,000.00</b>			<b>6,215,000,000.00</b>	<b>6,190,000,000.00</b>
<b>Grand total.....</b>	<b>18,433,013,419.03</b>	<b>\$1,905,616,847.07</b>	<b>\$1,152,799,750.00</b>	<b>21,491,430,016.10</b>	<b>16,115,591,347.72</b>

<sup>1</sup> Includes payments from allotments from "National security and defense."

<sup>2</sup> The balance of the appropriation of \$100,000,000 for "National security and defense" has been allotted to other departments and bureaus; expenditures from allotments are included in the expenditures of the various departments and offices.

<sup>3</sup> This appropriation was allotted to departments and offices, and is included in their estimated expenditures.

<sup>4</sup> This figure includes the estimated expense of loans authorized but not yet issued, but does not include the cost of any issues yet to be authorized.

NOTE.—In certain cases where the estimated expenditure exceeds the total estimated appropriations, the difference is due to expected payments from balances of appropriation brought forward from prior years.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, March 23, 1918.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to state that he is detained at home by important war work; that if he had been here to-day when the so-called Baer bill was under consideration he would have voted for the bill.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

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

S. J. Res. 133. Joint 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.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 30, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KITCHIN, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11123) to amend an act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign Governments, and for other purposes," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 428), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1218) for the relief of Alfred E. Lewis, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 425), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4057) for the relief of Edward Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 426), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3682) for the relief of Asbury Scrivener, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 427), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

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

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 11121) to reimburse the city of Richmond, Va., for expenditures incurred in the preparation and equipment of grounds for the mobilization and encampment of certain organizations of the National Guard of Virginia in pursuance of the order of the Secretary of War, and for housing and caring for certain soldiers or troops of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 11122) to amend section 4 of the act to regulate commerce, passed February 4, 1887, and subsequent amendments thereof; and to abolish what is known as water-competition rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KITCHIN: A bill (H. R. 11123) to amend an act approved September 24, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend additional credit to foreign Governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 296) requesting certain information from the Postmaster General; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. PRICE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 272) authorizing and directing the President of the United States to so amend the selective-service regulations as to place in a deferred classification all registrants who are bona-fide farmers or farm laborers, including owners and managers of farms and overseers of farm operations and laborers regularly employed thereunder, and to formulate regulations for special "food-producing classification lists" by the local boards and prescribing that the classification of such registrant shall not be changed so long as he shall be engaged in such occupation, except that so long as he remains on the "food-producing classification list," he shall be regarded as

not available for military service, and in all respects as though he stood classified in class five; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 11124) granting a pension to Emma Chandonia; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 11125) granting an increase of pension to William D. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 11126) granting a pension to Ella Forbes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11127) granting an increase of pension to John T. Burton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 11128) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Hallcome; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11129) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Thacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 11130) granting a pension to Thomas G. Cockings; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 11131) granting an increase of pension to Dennis P. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11132) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Olewiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 11133) granting an increase of pension to James A. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 271) to pay damages to Roberta McKenzie Osborne; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerks' desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of International Association of Fire Fighters, indorsing all efforts to further democracy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Methodist Episcopal Church of O'Fallon, Mo.; members of Red Cross of Kirkman, Iowa; and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wright City, Mo., favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of Narrow Grove Cooperative Farm Club of Gorin, Mo., and members of Walker Farm Club, of Macon County, Mo., against lowering the price of corn; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution of the Wisconsin Furniture Dealers' Association, protesting against the passage of House bill 9683; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission, favoring the passage of the Graham bill to prohibit the sale of game in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the Crockery Board of Trade of New York, opposing discontinuance of pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, resolutions of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; the Wednesday Morning Club, Cranford, N. J.; and the Central Marin Chamber of Commerce, San Rafael, Cal., urging the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution of the mayor's advisory war committee of the city of Cleveland, asking that the charter of the German-American Alliance be rescinded; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Affidavits to accompany House bill 11061, for the relief of Orrin F. Strickland; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of Mrs. Emma Savage, Earl Temple, Ellen Brown, and 22 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for immediate war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 600 members of the Rocky Mountain district of the Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, praying for the passage of the bill for the payment of the Ellen M. Stone ransom fund; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Central Marin Chamber of Commerce, of San Rafael, Cal., protesting against increased

postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of 62 citizens of Lonsdale, R. I., urging passage of legislation for prohibition during the war and six months after peace has been declared; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Petition of citizens of Carlton County, Minn., against exempting manufactured substitutes for butter from the tax of 10 cents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution of the Medical Symposium Society of California, in re creation of advanced rank for military corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the United Irish Societies of Chicago, in re freedom of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, in re proposed naval base on Pacific coast; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, in opposition to repeal of the bankruptcy act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Cumann na 'm Ban (Inc.) (the Irish Women's Council), of New York City, asking recognition of the new Irish Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Madison Avenue Christian Church, of New Castle, Pa., for war prohibition as a military necessity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of J. A. Katzenmeyer and the Standard Engineering Co., opposing House bill 2878; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *March 30, 1918.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the blessed hope, the glorious anticipation, confirmed by the resurrection of Christ, in the unbroken continuity of life, which promises the adjustment of all wrongs, the clearing up of all misunderstandings, the union of all hearts, and the growth of our spiritual being. For it is written: "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him."

May the Easter Sunday bring solace to the thousands who are mourning the loss of their dear ones on the field of carnage. Help them to look forward to that day when God shall wipe away all tears from all faces.

May we live this day and through all the days to follow, that we shall be prepared for the change which waits upon us all, in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 9504) to amend section 4067 of the Revised Statutes by extending its scope to include women, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had just passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3426. An act to empower the President to requisition for war purposes timber and timber products, rights of way and logging equipment, to construct and operate logging roads and sawmills, and fixing a penalty for the violation thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

### 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, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 5351. An act providing for the disposal of certain lands in block 32 in the city of Port Angeles, State of Washington.

### AMERICAN ARMY IN FRANCE.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Speaker, I read in yesterday's newspapers the statement that Gen. Pershing had placed the entire American Army in France at the military disposition of that brilliant French strategist, Gen. Foch, and that he made the request in his own name and in the name of the American people that their services be utilized in the present battle. I understand that that action was taken by direction of the President of the United States. I rise, Mr. Speaker, to express my personal appreciation of the splendid patriotism of that action. [Applause.] I believe it reflects not only the sentiment and wishes of the American Army in France, but of every loyal American father, of every loyal American mother, who has a boy in that Army. Our sole regret is that we have not ten times as many American soldiers in France to help win this great battle for human liberty and for human rights. [Applause.]

### PAY OF RETIRED WARRANT OFFICERS.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the table the bill (S. 3400) to regulate the pay of retired warrant officers and warrant officers on active duty, with the House amendment, and to further insist upon the House amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3400, with a House amendment, to further insist on the House amendment, and to agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, and Mr. BUTLER.

### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 9054), with Senate amendments, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Agricultural appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. The Senate amendment No. 40, on page 100, increases the guaranteed price for wheat at the local elevators to \$2.50 a bushel. The House never having had any opportunity to pass upon that question, we would like to know whether the managers on the part of the House would be able to give to the House assurance that before the matter is disposed of, after they have compromised their differences with the Senate managers, they will bring it back to the House for a decision upon the merits, instead of disposing of it in the conference report?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the gentleman's question, it is this, that unless the conferees can reach a satisfactory agreement among themselves, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] would desire that the whole matter in its present form be brought back to the House for a separate vote.

Mr. STEENERSON. Of course, we are under this difficulty here. The House never having passed upon it, I presume that without any instructions the managers on the part of the House would act upon the theory that it was their duty to oppose everything that the Senate had proposed. There is a very large number in the House here who believe that the guaranteed price of wheat now existing is unjust and that it tends to decrease the spring-wheat crop, especially because the seeding is now about to begin, and judging from the numerous protests coming in from the farmers I believe that there is quite a sentiment in the House that there is merit in that claim. I do not expect that the conferees will be able to say now just what they favor, but I think that the friends of a higher guaranteed price of wheat ought to have an opportunity to present the matter to the House. Of course, I would be entitled now, if I withdrew